This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

CONVERTED

no records

CONVERTED

no records

THE

GREEK TESTAMENT.

VOL. IV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS: THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES OF ST. JAMES AND ST. PETER: THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN AND ST. JUDE: AND THE REVELATION.

ἀμήν, ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ.

THE

GREEK TESTAMENT:

WITH A CRITICALLY REVISED TEXT: A DIGEST OF VARIOUS READINGS: MARGINAL REFERENCES TO VERBAL AND IDIOMATIC USAGE: PROLEGOMENA: AND A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY.

FOR THE USE OF THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS AND MINISTERS.

BY

HENRY ALFORD, D.D.

LATE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

CONTAINING

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS:
THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES OF ST. JAMES AND ST. PETER:
THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN AND ST. JUDE:
AND THE REVELATION.

NEW EDITION.

Boston:

LEE AND SHEPARD, PUBLISHERS.

1878.

BS1965
1878
v.4

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

CONTENTS OF THE PROLEGOMENA.

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER II.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES.

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

267939

CHAPTER V.

1 JOHN.

CHAPTER VI.

2 & 3 JOHN.

CHAPTER VII.

JUDE.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVELATION.

CHAPTER IX.

APPARATUS CRITICUS.

DIRECTIONS TO THE BINDER.

When the two Parts of Vol. IV. are bound together, Sig. F f should immediately follow p. 420 of the text, and Sig. 1 should follow p. 158 of the Prolegomena. The separate Titles and Contents to Parts I. and II. should be cancelled.

PROLEGOMENA.

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. THE most proper motto to prefix to this section would be that saying of Origen (in Euseb. H. E. vi. 25)—

> εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας[1] τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν.

2. For these latter words represent the state of our knowledge at this day. There is a certain amount of evidence, both external, from tradition, and internal, from approximation in some points to his acknowledged Epistles, which points to St. Paul as its author. But when we come to examine the former of these, it will be seen that the tradition gives way beneath us in point of authenticity and trustworthiness; and as we search into the latter, the points of similarity are overborne by a far greater number of indications of divergence, and of incompatibility, both in style and matter, with the hypothesis of the Pauline authorship.

3. There is one circumstance which, though this is the most notable instance of it, is not unfamiliar to the unbiassed conductor of enquiries into the difficulties of Holy Scripture; viz. that, in modern times at least, most has been taken for granted by those who knew least about the matter, and the strongest assertions always made by men who have

[1] On the sense of γράψας, see below, par. 21 and note.

never searched into, or have been unable to appreciate, the evidence. Genuine research has led in almost every instance, to a modified holding, or to an entire rejection, of the Pauline hypothesis.

4. It will be my purpose, in the following paragraphs, to deal (following the steps of many who have gone before me, and more especially of Bleek) with the various hypotheses in order, as to both their external and internal evidence. It will be impossible in citing the external evidence, to keep these hypotheses entirely distinct: that which is cited as against one will frequently be for another which is not under treatment, and must be referred back to on reaching that one.

5. As preliminary then to all such specific considerations, we will enquire first into the external and traditional ground, then into that which is internal, arising from the Epistle itself, of the supposition that St. Paul was the Author and Writer, or the Author without being the Writer, of the Epistle.

6. Some (e. g. Spanheim, Gerhard, Calov., Wittich, Carpzov, Bengel, Baumgarten, Semler, Storr, al., and more recently Mr. Forster, Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, pp. 625 ff.) think that they see an allusion to our Epistle in 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. But to this there are several objections (see Bleek, Einleitung, § 21); among which the principal is, that no passages can be pointed out in our Epistle answering to the description there given. This point has not been much pressed, even by those who have raised it; being doubtless felt to be too insecure to build any safe conclusion upon[2].

7. The same may be said of the idea that our Epistle is alluded to by St. James, ch. ii. 24, 25. Hug (Einleit. 4th edn. pt. ii. pp. 442 f.), followingStorr (Opusc. Acad. ii. p. 376, Bl.), supposes that the citation of Rahab as justified by works is directly polemical, and aimed at Heb. xi. 31. But as Bleek well remarks, even were we to concede the polemical character of the citation, why need Heb. xi. 31 be fixed on as its especial point of attack? Was it not more than probable, that the followers of St. Paul would have adduced this, among other examples, in their oral teaching?

8. We come then to the first undoubted allusions to the Epistle; which occur in the Ep. of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, dating before the conclusion of the first century. Clement is well acquainted with the Epistles of St. Paul: he quotes by name 1 Cor. (c. 47, p. 305, ed. Migne, see Prolegg. to Vol. II. ch. iii. § i. 2 *a*); he closely imitates Rom. i. 29—32 (c. 35, pp. 277 f.); he frequently alludes to other passages (see Lardner, Credibility, &c. vol. ii. pp. 34—39; some of whose instances are doubtful). But of no Epistle does he make such large and

[2] An exception to this is found in Mr. Forster's work, where he insists on this, as he does on all his arguments, in the strongest and most decided manner.

constant use, as of this to the Hebrews: cf. Lardner, ib. pp. 39—42[3]; and this is testified by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 38:—

> ἐν ᾗ (i. e. the Ep. to the Cor.) τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους πολλὰ νοήματα παραθείς, ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξεὶ ῥητοῖς τισιν ἐξ αὐτῆς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νέον ὑπάρχει τὸ σύγγραμμα[4]:

and by Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccl., vol. ii. p. 853:—

> "Scripsit ex persona Romanæ Ecclesiæ ad Eccl. Corinthiorum valde utilem Epistolam, quæ et in nonnullis locis publice legitur, quæ mihi videtur characteri Epistolæ quæ sub Pauli nomine ad Hebræos fertur, convenire. Sed et multis de eadem Epistola non solum sensibus sed juxta verborum quoque ordinem abutitur. Omnino grandis in utraque similitudo est."

9. Now some have argued from this (e. g. Sykes, Cramer, Storr; not Hug, see his edn. 4, pt. ii. p. 411) that as Clement thus reproduces passages of this as well as of other Epistles confessedly canonical, he must have held this to be canonical, and if he, then the Roman church. in whose name he writes; and if canonical, then written by St. Paul, But Bleek well observes, that this whole argument is built on an unhistorical assumption respecting the Canon of the N. T., which was certainly not settled in Clement's time; and that, in fact, his use of this Epistle proves no more than that it was well known and exceedingly valued by him. It is a weighty testimony *for the Epistle*, but says nothing as to its Author[5].

10. The first notices in any way touching the question of the authorship meet us after the middle of the second century. And it is remarkable enough, that from these notices we must gather, that at that early date there were the same various views respecting it, in the main, which now prevail; the same doubt whether St. Paul was the author, or some other Teacher of the apostolic age; and if some other, then what part St. Paul had, or whether any, in influencing his argument or dictating his matter.

11. The earliest of these testimonies is that of PANTÆNUS, the chief of the catechetical school in *Alexandria* about the middle of the second century. There is a passage preserved to us by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 14) from the Hypotyposeis of Clement of Alexandria, in which the latter says—

> ἤδη δέ, ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐπεὶ ὁ κύριος ἀπόστολος ὢν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος ὡς ἂν τὰ εἰς ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον διά

[3] Bleek, Einl. p. 92 note: and Stuart, Introd. § 12.

[4] Stuart however is quite in error in supposing συνεπιμαρτυρούσης τῆς γραφῆς, c. 23, p. 260, to apply to our Epistle. Those words are used of O. T. passages, which he, as well as our Epistle, quotes verbatim from the LXX. See Tholuck, Hebr. edn. 3, p. 2, note.

[5] See this, and the inference from it, treated more fully below, § vi. 2.

τε τὴν πρὸς τὸν κύριον τιμήν, διά τε τὸ ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἐθνῶν κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ ἀπόστολον[6].

12. There can be no doubt that by *ὁ μακάριος πρεσβύτερος* here, Clement means Pantænus. Eusebius (H. E. v. 11; vi. 13) tells us of Clement, *ἐν αἷς συνέταξεν ὑποτυπώσεσιν ὡς ἂν διδασκάλου τοῦ Πανταίνου μέμνηται*: and in the latter place he adds, *ἐκδοχάς τε αὐτοῦ γραφῶν καὶ παραδόσεις ἐκτιθέμενος.*

13. Nor can there be any doubt, from these words, that Pantænus believed the Epistle to be the work of St. Paul. But as Bleek observes, we have no data to enable us to range this testimony in its right place as regards the controversy. Being totally unacquainted with the context in which it occurs, we cannot say whether it represents an opinion of Pantænus's own, or a general persuasion; whether it is adduced polemically, or merely as solving the problem of the anonymousness of the Epistle for those who already believed St. Paul to be the Author. Nothing can well be more foolish, and beside the purpose, than the reason which it renders for this anonymousness: are we to reckon the assumption of the Pauline authorship in it as a subjectivity of the same mind as devised the other? For aught that this testimony itself says it may have been so: we can only then estimate it rightly, when we regard it as one of a class, betokening something like consensus on the matter in question.

14. And such a consensus we certainly seem to be able to trace in the writers of the Alexandrian school. CLEMENT himself, both in his works which have come down to us, and in the fragments of his lost works preserved by Eusebius, frequently and expressly cites the Epistle as the work of St. Paul. Nay, his testimony goes further than this. In a well-known passage of Eusebius (H. E. vi. 14) he cites from the Hypotyposeis as follows:—

> *καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου μὲν εἶναι φησί, γεγράφθαι δὲ Ἑβραίοις Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα ἐκδοῦναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. ὅθεν τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα εὑρίσκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν πράξεων. μὴ προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, εἰκότως· Ἑβραίοις γάρ φησιν ἐπιστέλλων πρόληψιν εἰληφόσι κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποπτεύουσιν αὐτόν, συνετῶς πάνυ οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὄνομα θείς.*

15. Valuable as the above passage is, it fails to point out to us definitively the ground and the extent of the opinion which it expresses. The citations from the Epistle throughout Clement's writings shew us, that his persuasion respecting its having been put into Greek by St. Luke, did not prevent him from every where citing the Greek as the words of St. Paul; either expressly naming him, or indicating him under

[6] See below, par. 71, a very similar sentiment from Jerome.

the words ὁ (θεῖος) ἀπόστολος. See Strom. ii. [2 (8), 4 (12), 22 (136)] pp. 433, 435, 501, P.; iv. [17 (103—105), 20 (128)] pp. 608 f., 621; v. [10 (63)] p. 683; vi. [8 (62)] p. 771. But whether the opinion was derived from tradition, or from his own critical research, there is nothing here to inform us. The reference to the similarity of diction to that in the Acts seems rather to point to the latter source. Nor again can we say whether he is representing (1) a general opinion, prevalent as transmitted in the Alexandrian church, or (2) one confined to himself, or (3) one which had spread through the teaching of Pantænus his master. This last is hardly probable, seeing that he gives for the anonymousness of the Epistle a far more sensible reason than that which he immediately after quotes from Pantænus. We can derive from the passage nothing but a surmise respecting the view prevalent in Alexandria at the time. And that surmise would lead us to believe that St. Paul was not there held to have been the writer of the Epistle in its present Greek form, however faithfully that present form may represent his original meaning.

16. We now come to the testimony of ORIGEN; from which, without being able to solve the above historical question, we gain considerably more light on the subject of the tradition respecting the Epistle.

17. In his own ordinary practice in his writings, Origen cites the Epistle as the work of St. Paul, using much the same terms as Clement in so doing: viz. either ὁ Παῦλος, or ὁ ἀπόστολος. See e. g. Princip. iii. 1. 10, vol. i. p. 117; iv. 13, p. 171; iv. 22, p. 183: De Oratione, c. 27, pp. 245, 249 f.: Exhort. ad Martyr. 44, p. 303; and many other passages in Bleek, al. In the Homilies on Joshua, vii. c. 1, vol. ii. p. 412, he distinctly ascribes fourteen Epistles to St. Paul. But in what sense he makes these citations, we must ascertain by his own more accurately expressed opinion on the matter; from which it will appear, how unfairly Origen has been claimed by superficial arguers for the Pauline authorship, as on their side.

18. Before however coming to this, it may be well to adduce two or three passages in which he indicates the diversity of opinion which prevailed. In his Comm. on Matt. xxiii. 27 (vol. iii. p. 848), speaking of the slaying of the Prophets, he cites, as from St. Paul, 1 Thess. i. 14, 15, and Heb. xi. 37, 38; and then adds, "Sed *pone aliquem abdicare Epistolam ad Hebræos quasi non Pauli,* necnon et secretum (ἀπόκρυφον) adjicere Isaiæ, sed quid faciet in sermones Stephani" &c. And then after a caution against apocryphal works foisted in by the Jews (among which he clearly does not mean to include our Epistle, cf. his Comm. on Matt. xiii. 57, p. 465 [7]), he adds, "Tamen *si quis suscipit ad Hebræos quasi Epistolam Pauli*" &c.

[7] καὶ Ἡσαΐας δὲ πεπρίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱστόρηται· εἰ δέ τις οὐ προσίεται τὴν ἱστορίαν διὰ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀποκρύφῳ Ἡσαΐᾳ αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι, πιστευσάτω τοῖς ἐν τῇ πρὸς

Again, in his Ep. to Africanus, c. 9, vol. i. p. 19, in the course of removing the doubt of his friend as to the authenticity of the history of Susanna, he mentions the traditional death of Isaiah, which he says is *ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς μαρτυρούμενα, ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν φανερῶν* (canonical) *βιβλίων γεγραμμένα* (meaning, not that the Epistle was not one of these books, but that the account of Isaiah's martyrdom is not in any canonical book of the O. T.). Then he adds—

> *ἀλλ' εἰκός τινα θλιβόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς ταῦτα ἀποδείξεως συγχρήσασθαι τῷ βουλήματι τῶν ἀθετούντων τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς οὐ Παύλῳ γεγραμμένην· πρὸς ὃν ἄλλων λόγων κατ' ἰδίαν χρῄζομεν εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ εἶναι Παύλου τὴν ἐπιστολήν.*

It would have been of some interest to know who these *τινες* were, and whether their *ἀθέτησις* arose from the absence of ancient tradition as to the Pauline authorship, or from critical conclusions of their own, arrived at from study of the Epistle itself. But of this Origen says nothing.

19. The principal testimony of his own is contained in two fragments of his lost Homilies on this Epistle, preserved by Eusebius, H. E. vi. 25:—

> *περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει·*
>
> *"ὅτι ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει, ἀλλά ἐστιν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογῆσαι ἄν. πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφῆσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ."*
>
> *τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων·*
>
> *"ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἴποιμ' ἂν ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὡσπερεὶ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι. τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπό τινων μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ὑπό τινων δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις."*

We learn from these remarkable fragments several interesting particulars: among which may be mentioned—

First, Origen's *own opinion as to the Epistle,* deduced from grounds

Ἑβραίους οὕτω γεγραμμένοις (Heb. xi. 37)· *τὸ γὰρ ἐπρίσθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν ἀναφέρεται.*

which he regards as being clear to all who are on the one hand accustomed to judge of style, and, on the other, versed in the apostolic writings; viz. that its Author in its present form is not St. Paul, but some one who has embodied in his own style and form the thoughts of that Apostle. One thing however he leaves in uncertainty; whether we are to regard such disciple of St. Paul, or the Apostle himself, as speaking in the first person throughout the Epistle.

20. Secondly, *the fact that some churches, or church, regarded the Epistle as the work of St. Paul.* But here again the expression is somewhat vague. The εἴ τις ἐκκλησία may be an uncertain indication of several churches, or it may be a pointed allusion to one. If the latter, which from αὕτη following is the more probable, the church would probably be the Alexandrian, by what we have already seen of the testimonies of Pantænus and Clement. The words αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ must be taken as meaning, "I have no wish to deprive it of this its peculiar advantage:" and the ground, οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι, must be, his own conviction, that the νοήματα of the Epistle proceeded originally from the Apostle. Who the ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες were, it is impossible for us to say. Possibly, if we confine our view to one church, no more than Pantænus and Clement, and their disciples. One thing is very plain; that they cannot have been men whose παράδοσις satisfied Origen himself, or he would not have spoken as he has. Be they who they might, one thing is plain; that their παράδοσις is spoken of by him as οὐκ εἰκῇ, not as resting on external matter of fact, but as finding justification in the internal character of the Epistle; and that it did not extend to the fact of St. Paul having written the Epistle, but only to its being, in some sense, his.

21. Thirdly, *that the authorship of the Epistle was regarded by Origen as utterly unknown.* Thus only can we interpret the words, τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν. For that it is in vain to attempt to understand the word ὁ γράψας of the mere scribe, in the sense of Rom. xvi. 22 (as Olshausen and Delitzsch), is shewn by its use in the same sentence, Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις[8].

[8] The answer given to this decisive objection by Delitzsch (Introd. p. xvii) is, in fact, incorrect. He says, "It is in vain to adduce ὁ γράψας τ. εὐαγ. κ. τ. πράξ., for there also Luke was working up material not his own, but ready to his hands." But even granting this, which is not all true, e.g. of Acts xx.—end, and some other portions, it does not shew that the word is used in an emphatic sense of 'compiler,' but only in its common sense of 'writer,' any peculiar circumstances of writing not being in consideration. Moreover there is here another consideration. The sentence in which these words occur is not subordinate to the former one, in which he expressed his own conjecture that some one had written down the thoughts of the Apostle: but by the οὖν which begins it is co-ordinated with that previous sentence, and resumes again the whole subject.

22. This passage further testifies respecting *external tradition*, as it had come down to Origen himself. He speaks of ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία: clearly meaning these words of *historical tradition*, and thereby by implication excluding from that category the παράδοσις of the Pauline authorship. And this historical tradition gave two views: one that Clement of Rome was the Writer; the other, that St. Luke was the Writer.

23. And this last circumstance is of importance, as being our only clue out of a difficulty which Bleek has felt, but has not attempted to remove. We find ourselves otherwise in this ambiguity with regard to the origin of one or the other hypothesis. If the Pauline authorship was the original historical tradition, the difficulties presented by the Epistle itself were sure to have called it in doubt, and suggested the other: if on the other hand the name of any disciple of St. Paul was delivered down by historical tradition as the writer, the apostolicity and Pauline character of the thoughts, coupled with the desire to find a great name for an anonymous Epistle, was sure to have produced, and when produced would easily find acceptance for, the idea that St. Paul was the author. But the fact that Origen speaks of ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία, not as *for*, but as *against* the Pauline hypothesis, seems to shew that the former of these alternatives was really the case.

24. As far then as we have at present advanced, we seem to have gathered the following as the probable result, as to the practice and state of opinion in the Alexandrine church:—

(*a*) That it was customary to speak of and quote from the Epistle as the work of St. Paul.

(*b*) That this was done by writers of discernment, and familiarity with the apostolic writings, not because they thought the style and actual writing to be St. Paul's, but as seeing that from the nature of the thoughts and matter, the Epistle was worthy of and characteristic of that Apostle; thus feeling that it was not without reason that those before them had delivered the Epistle down to them as St. Paul's.

(*c*) That we no where find trace of historical tradition asserting the Pauline authorship: but on the contrary, we find it expressly quoted on the other side[9].

25. We now pass to other portions of the church: and next, to *proconsular Africa*. Here we find, in the beginning of the third century, the testimony of TERTULLIAN, expressly ascribing the Epistle to Barnabas. The passage occurs De Pudicitia, c. 20, vol. ii. p. 102, where, when he has shewn from the writings of the Apostles themselves the necessity "de ecclesia eradicandi omne sacrilegium pudicitiæ sine ulla restitutionis mentione," he proceeds—

[9] On the phænomenon of the *diversity* of traditions, see below, par. 36 ff.

"Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis Apostolorum testimonium superinducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Extat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos, adeo satis auctoritatis viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiæ tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6). Et utique receptior apud ecclesias Epistola Barnabæ illo apocrypho pastore mœchorum (the Pastor of Hermas). Monens itaque discipulos, 'omissis omnibus initiis' &c. (citing Heb. vi. 4—8). Hoc qui ab Apostolis didicit et cum Apostolis docuit, nunquam mœcho et fornicatori secundam pœnitentiam promissam ab Apostolis norat."

26. From the way in which the Epistle is here simply cited as the work of Barnabas, we clearly see that this was no mere opinion of Tertullian's own, but at all events the accepted view of that portion of the church. He does not hint at any doubt on the matter. But here again we are at a loss, from what source to derive this view. Either, supposing Barnabas really the author, genuine historical tradition may have been its source,—or lacking such tradition, some in the African church may originally have inferred this from the nature of the contents of the Epistle; and the view may subsequently have become general there. One thing however the testimony shews beyond all doubt: that the idea of a Pauline authorship was wholly unknown to Tertullian, and to those for whom he wrote.

27. If it were necessary further to confirm evidence so decisive, we might do so by citing his charge against Marcion, of falsifying the number of the Epistles of St. Paul (Adver. Marc. v. 21, vol. ii. p. 524):—

"Miror tamen, quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum, de ecclesiastico statu compositas, recusaverit. Affectavit, opinor, etiam numerum Epistolarum interpolare."

Now seeing that Marcion held *ten* Epistles only of St. Paul, it would appear by combining this with the former testimony, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not here reckoned among them.

28. Among the witnesses belonging to the end of the second and beginning of the third century, none is of more weight than IRENÆUS, a Greek of Asia Minor by birth, and Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, and thus representing the testimony of the church in both countries. In his great work against Heresies, he makes frequent use of the Epistles of St. Paul, expressly quoting twelve of them. There is no citation from the Epistle to Philemon, which may well be from its brevity, and its personal character. But no where in this work has he cited or referred to the Epistle to the Hebrews at all, although it would have been exceedingly apposite for his purpose, as against the Gnostics of his time. Eusebius, H. E. v. 26, says—

καὶ (φέρεται Εἰρηναίου) βιβλίον τι διαλέξεων διαφόρων (called by Jerome (Catalog. Script. Eccles., vol. ii. p. 873), "liber variorum tractatuum"), ἐν ᾧ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῆς λεγομένης Σοφίας Σολομῶντος μνημονεύει, ῥητά τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν παραθέμενος.

From this it would seem that Eusebius was unable to find any citations of the Epistle in other works of Irenæus known to him. And he does not even here say that Irenæus mentioned St. Paul as the author of the Epistle.

29. Indeed we have a testimony which goes to assert that this Father distinctly denied the Pauline authorship. Photius (Bibl. Cod. 232, vol. iii. (Migne) p. 291 *b*) cites a passage from Stephen Gobar, a tritheist of the sixth century, in which he says ὅτι Ἱππόλυτος καὶ Εἰρηναῖος τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου οὐκ ἐκείνου εἶναί φασιν. The same is indeed asserted of Hippolytus by Photius himself (Cod. 121, p. 94 *a*: λέγει δὲ ἄλλα τέ τινα τῆς ἀκριβείας λειπόμενα, καὶ ὅτι ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴ οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου): but it is strange, if Irenæus had asserted it, that Eusebius should have made no mention of the fact, adducing as he does the citation of the Epistle by him. At the same time, Gobar's language is far too precise to be referred to the mere fact that Irenæus does not cite the Epistle as St. Paul's, as some have endeavoured to refer it[1]: and it is to be remembered, that Eusebius does not pretend to have read or seen all the works of Irenæus then extant; his words are (H. E. v. 25), καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰς ἡμετέραν ἐλθόντα γνῶσιν τῶν Εἰρηναίου τοσαῦτα. Bleek puts the alternative well, according as we accept, or do not accept, the assertion of Gobar. If we accept it, it would shew that Irenæus had found some where prevalent the idea that St. Paul was the author; otherwise he would not have taken the pains to contradict such an idea. If we do not accept it as any more than a negative report, meaning that Irenæus no where cites the Epistle as St. Paul's, then at all events, considering that he constantly cites St. Paul's Epistles *as* his, we shall have the presumption, that he neither accepted, nor knew of, any such idea as the Pauline authorship[2].

30. If we now pass to *the church of Rome*, we find, belonging to the period of which we have been treating, the testimony of the presbyter CAIUS. Of him Eusebius relates (H. E. vi. 20).

ἦλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαΐου, λογιωτάτου ἀνδρός, διάλογος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατὰ Ζεφυρῖνον πρὸς Πρόκλον, τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσεως (Mon-

[1] e.g. Storr, § 11 ff.

[2] On the spuriousness of the celebrated fragment in which Irenæus is supposed to cite Heb. xiii. 15 as St. Paul's, see Bleek, note, Ap. 118. If it be genuine, then it must be from some work of Irenæus unknown alike to Eusebius and Gobar. The fragment will be found p. 1253, ed. Migne, and with Pfaff's very copious notes, in Stieren's Irenæus, i. pp. 854–887; and the whole controversy respecting it is reprinted, for any one who has leisure to read it, in Stieren, vol. ii. pp. 361—528.

tanism) ὑπερμαχοῦντα, κεκινημένος, ἐν ᾧ τῶν δι' ἐναντίας τὴν περὶ τὸ συντάττειν καινὰς γραφὰς προπέτειάν τε καὶ τόλμαν ἐπιστομίζων, τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποστόλου δεκατριῶν μόνον ἐπιστολῶν μνημονεύει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναριθμήσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς· ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου τυγχάνειν[3].

These words, μὴ συναριθμήσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς, can lead only to one of two inferences: that Caius, not numbering the Epistle among those of St. Paul, either placed it by itself, or did not mention it at all. In either case, he must be regarded as speaking, not his own private judgment merely, but that of the church to which he belonged, in which, as we further learn, the same judgment yet lingered more than a century after.

31. Another testimony is that of the fragment respecting the canon of the N. T. first published by Muratori, and known by his name, generally ascribed to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century (Routh, Reliq. Sacr. i. pp. 394 ff.). In this fragment it is stated, that St. Paul wrote Epistles to seven churches; and his thirteen Epistles are enumerated, in a peculiar order: but that to the Hebrews is not named, unless it be intended by the second mentioned in the following sentence: "Fertur etiam ad Laudecenses, alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine ficta ad hæresem Marcionis: et alia plura quæ in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest: fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit." But this is very improbable: though some have imagined an allusion in the last clause to the Vatican LXX text of the passage cited Heb. xii. 15.

32. As far then as we have advanced, the following seems to be our result. *No where, except in the Alexandrine church, does there seem to have existed any idea that the Epistle was St. Paul's.* Throughout the whole Western church, it is either left unenumerated among his writings, or expressly excluded from them. That it is wholly futile to attempt, as Hug and Storr have done, to refer this to any influence of the Montanist or Marcionite disputes, has been well and simply shewn by Bleek. The idea of the catholic teachers of the whole Western church disparaging and excluding an apostolical book, because one passage of it (ch. vi. 4—6) seemed to favour the tenets of their adversaries, is too preposterous ever to have been suggested, except in the interests of a desperate cause: and the fact that Tertullian, himself a Montanist, cites Heb. vi. 4—6 on his side, but without ascribing it to St. Paul, is decisive against the notion that his adversaries so ascribed

[3] Jerome, in his Catal. Script. Eccl. 59, vol. ii. p 899, and Photius, Bibl. Cod. 48, p. 12 *a*, repeat this testimony, but, as Bleek has remarked, they both have evidently taken it from Eusebius. If so, the stronger language of Jerome, "decimam quartam, quæ fertur ad Hebræos, *ejus non esse*," is only his own interpretation of the words of Eusebius, and is not to be taken in evidence.

it at any time: for he would have been sure in that case to have charged them with their desertion of such an opinion[4].

33. And even in the Alexandrine church itself, as we have seen, there is no reliable trace of a historical tradition of the Pauline authorship. Every expression which seems to imply this, such e. g. as that much-adduced one of Origen, *οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες παραδεδώκασι*, when fairly examined, gives way under us. The traditional account (*ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία*), though inconsistent with itself, was entirely the other way[5].

34. The fair account then of opinion in the latter end of the second century seems to be this: that *there was then, as now, great uncertainty regarding the authorship of our Epistle*; that the general cast of the thoughts was recognized as Pauline, and that *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες*, whatever that may imply, had not unreasonably (*οὐκ εἰκῇ*) handed it down as St. Paul's: but on what grounds, we are totally unable to say: for ecclesiastical tradition does not bear them out. In proconsular Africa it was ascribed to Barnabas: by the tradition which had come down to Origen and his fellows, to Luke or Clement; while the Western church, even when represented by Irenæus, who was brought up in Asia, and even including the church of Rome the capital of the world, where all reports on such matters were sure to be ventilated, seems to have been altogether without any positive tradition or opinion on the matter.

35. Before advancing with the history, which has now become of secondary importance to us, I will state to what, in my own view, this result points, as regarding the formation of our own conclusion on the matter.

36. It simply leaves us, unfettered by any overpowering judgment of antiquity, to examine the Epistle for ourselves, and form our own opinion from its contents. Even were we to admit the opinion of a Pauline authorship to the rank of an early tradition, which it does not appear in the strict sense to have been, we should then have ancient ecclesiastical tradition broken into various lines, and inconsistent with itself: not requiring our assent to one or other of its numerous variations. Those who are prepared to follow it, and it alone, will have to make up their minds whether they will attach themselves to the catechetical school of

[4] Hug supposes that Tertullian does not mention its being St. Paul's, because he wishes to argue with the Catholics 'ex concesso.' This is a curious specimen of the lengths of subtlety to which controversy will carry an ingenious mind.

[5] It is curious to see how such writers as Stuart can treat plain Greek to serve their purpose: "He does not say that either *ἱστορία παλαιά*, or *παράδοσις παλαιά*, brings down this report: but simply *ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία*, i. e. *report has come to us; or it is reported; there is a report* (*ἡ*); *report says*—that either Luke or Clemens wrote it."

Alexandria, and if so, whether to that portion of it (if such portion existed, which is not proved) which regarded the Epistle as purely and simply the work of St. Paul, or to that which, with Clement, regarded the present Epistle as a Greek version by St. Luke of a Hebrew original by St. Paul,—or to the West African church, which regarded it as written by Barnabas; or to the ἱστορία mentioned by Origen, in its Clementine or its Lucan branch; or to the negative view of the churches of Europe.

37. For to one or other of these courses, and on these grounds, would the intelligent follower of tradition be confined. It would be in vain for him to allege, as a motive for his opinion, the *subsequent* universal prevalence of one or other of these views, unless he could at the same time shew that that prevalence was owing to the overpowering force of an authentic tradition, some where or other existing. That the whole church of Rome believed the Pauline authorship in subsequent centuries, would be no compensation for the total absence of such belief at that time when, if there were any such authentic tradition any where, it must have prevailed in that church. That the same was uniformly asserted and acted on by the writers of the Alexandrine church in later ages, does not tend to throw any light on the vague uncertainty which hangs over the first appearances of the opinion, wherever it is spoken of and its grounds alleged by such earlier teachers as Clement and Origen.

38. And these considerations are much strengthened, when we take into account what strong reasons there were why the opinion of the Pauline authorship, when once advanced by men of authority in teaching, should gain general acceptance. We see this tendency already prevailing in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen; who, notwithstanding the sentences which have been quoted from them, yet throughout their writings acquiesce for the most part in a conventional habit of citing the Epistle as the work of St. Paul. And as time passed on, a belief which so conveniently set at rest all doubts about an important anonymous canonical writing, spread (and all the more as the character of the times became less and less critical and enquiring) over the whole extent of the church.

39. It will be well to interpose two cautions, especially for young students. It has been very much the practice with the maintainers of the Pauline authorship to deal largely in sweeping assertions regarding early ecclesiastical tradition. They have not unfrequently alleged on their side the habit of citation of Clement and Origen, as shewing their belief respecting the Epistle, uncorrected by those passages which shew what that belief really was. Let not students then be borne away by these strong assertions, but let them carefully and intelligently examine for themselves.

40. Our second caution is one regarding the intelligent use of ancient testimony. Hitherto, we have been endeavouring to trace up to their first origin the beliefs respecting the Epistle. Whence did they first arise? Where do we find them prevailing in the earliest times, and there, why? Now this is the only method of enquiry on the subject which is or can be decisive, as far as external evidence is concerned. In following down the stream of time, materials for this enquiry soon fail us. And it has been the practice of some of the fautors of the Pauline authorship, to amass long 'catenæ' of names and testimonies, from later ages, of men who simply *swelled the ranks of conformity to the opinion when it once became prevalent.* Let students distrust all such accumulations as evidence. They are valuable as shewing the growth and prevalence of the opinion, but in no other light. No accretions to the river in its course can alter the situation and character of the fountain-head.

41. We proceed now with the history of opinion, which, as before remarked, is become very much the history of the spread of the belief of a Pauline authorship.

At *Alexandria*, as we might have expected, the conventional habit of quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's gradually prevailed over critical suspicion and early tradition.

42. DIONYSIUS, president of the catechetical school, and afterwards Bishop of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century, cites Heb. x. 34 [6] expressly as the words of St. Paul. PETER, bishop (cir. 300), who suffered under Diocletian, cites Heb. xi. 32 as St. Paul's (τοῦ ἀποστόλου [7]).

HIERAX or Hieracas, of Leontopolis, who lived about the same time, and who, although the founder of a heresy, appears not to have severed himself from the church, is repeatedly adduced by Epiphanius as citing the Epistle as τοῦ ἀποστόλου: and the same Epiphanius says of the Melchisedekites (see on ch. vii. 3), that they attempted to support their view ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους τοῦ Παύλου ἐπιστολῆς.

ALEXANDER, bishop cir. 312, in Theodoret, H. E. i. 5, says in an Epistle to Alexander, Bishop of Constantinople—

> *σύμφωνα γοῦν τούτοις βοᾷ καὶ ὁ μεγαλοφωνότατος Παῦλος, φάσκων περὶ αὐτοῦ Ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν.*

ANTONIUS, the celebrated promoter of the monastic life in Egypt, in one of his seven epistles to various monasteries [8], which remain to us in a Latin version, says—

[6] In his Epistle to Fabius, Bp. of Antioch (Eus. H. E. vi. 41), *ἐξέκλινον δὲ καὶ ὑπανεχώρουν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ κ. τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις οἷς κ. Παῦλος ἐμαρτύρησε μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξαντο.*

[7] Routh, Reliq. Sacr. iv. p. 34, *ὡς λέγει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἐπιλίποι δ' ἂν ἡμᾶς διηγουμένους ὁ χρόνος.*

[8] See Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccl. 88, vol. ii. p. 925.

"De quibus Paulus ait, Quia non perceperunt repromissiones propter nos (Heb. xi. 13, 39, 40)."

43. But the most weighty witness for the view of the Alexandrine church at this time is Athanasius, in the middle of the fourth century. In his Epistola Festalis, vol. ii. p. 767, he enumerates *τὰ κανονιζόμενα κ. παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία*, among which he names fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, and among them our Epistle, without alluding to any doubt on the subject. And in his other writings passim he cites the Epistle as St. Paul's (see many examples in Bleek, p. 136).

44. Belonging to nearly the same time in the same church are the anonymous Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ,—Orsiesius or Oriesis, whose Doctrina de Institutione Monachorum remains in a Latin version by Jerome,—Marcus Diadochus, whose discourse against the Arians we still possess,—in all of which the Epistle is either expressly or implicitly cited as the work of St. Paul.

45. It would be to little purpose to multiply names, in a church which by this time had universally and undoubtingly received the Pauline authorship. Bleek has adduced with copious citations, Didymus (the teacher of Jerome and Rufinus),—Marcus Eremita (cir. 400),—Theophilus of Alexandria (cir. 400),—Isidore of Pelusium (+450),—Cyril of Alexandria (+444): concerning which last it is to be observed, that though Nestorius had adduced passages from the Epistle on his side, as being St. Paul's, Cyril, in refuting them, does not make the slightest reference to the formerly existing doubt as to the authorship.

46. And so it continued in this church in subsequent times: the only remarkable exception being found in Euthalius (cir. 460), who, though he regards the Epistle as of Pauline origin, and reckons fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, yet adduces the old doubts concerning it, and believes it to be a translation made by Clement of Rome from a Hebrew original by the Apostle. The passage, which is a very interesting one, will be found in Migne's Patr. Gr. vol. 85, p. 776, and is cited at length by Bleek. I give an abridgment of it:—

> *ἡ δὲ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπ. δοκεῖ μὲν οὐκ εἶναι Παύλου διά τε τὸν χαρακτῆρα, κ. τὸ μὴ προγράφειν, ὡς ἐν ἁπάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, καὶ τὸ λέγειν* (ch. ii. 3, 4) . . . *τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἠλλάχθαι τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἐπ., φανερὰ ἡ αἰτία· πρὸς γὰρ Ἑβραίους τῇ σφῶν διαλέκτῳ γραφεῖσα ὕστερον μεθερμηνευθῆναι λέγεται, ὡς μέν τινες, ὑπὸ Λουκᾶ, ὡς δὲ οἱ πολλοί, ὑπὸ Κλήμεντος· τοῦ γὰρ καὶ σώζει τὸν χαρακτῆρα.*

Then he gives the usual reason for the want of a superscription, viz. that St. Paul was not the Apostle of the Jews, but of the Gentiles, citing Gal. ii. 9, 10: and proceeds, *μαρτυρεῖται δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἡ ἐπιστολὴ εἶναι Παύλου, τῷ γράφειν*—ch. x. 34, in which the reading *τοῖς*

δεσμοῖς μου is his point: *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν*—ch. xiii. 18, 19: *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν*—ch. xiii. 23, in which he interprets *ἀπολελυμένον, sent forth εἰς διακονίαν,* which he says no one could do but St. Paul: and then, *τοῦτον τάχιον προσδοκῶν, τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἔθος πολλαχοῦ, σὺν αὐτῷ παρουσίαν ἐπαγγέλλεται.*

This testimony is valuable, as shewing that in the midst of the prevalence of the now accepted opinion, a spirit of intelligent criticism still survived.

47. If we now turn to *other parts of the Eastern church,* we find the same acceptation of the Pauline authorship from the middle of the third century onwards. Bleek gives citations from METHODIUS, Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, cir. 290 (which seem to me more decisive as to recognition of the Epistle than he thinks them): from PAUL of SAMOSATA, Bishop of Antioch in 264: from JACOB, Bishop of NISIBIS, cir. 325: from EPHREM SYRUS (+378).

48. A separate notice is required of the testimony of EUSEBIUS of Cæsarea, the well-known church historian. In very many passages throughout his works, and more especially in his commentary on the Psalms, he cites the Epistle, and always as the work of St. Paul, or of ὁ ἀπόστολος, or ὁ ἅγιος ἀπ., or ὁ θεῖος ἀπ. In his Eccl. History also he reckons it among the Epistles of St. Paul; e. g. H. E. ii. 17, *διηγήσεις . . . τῶν πάλαι προφητῶν ἑρμηνευτικάς, ὁποίας ἥ τε πρὸς Ἑβραίους καὶ ἄλλαι πλείους τοῦ Παύλου περιέχουσιν ἐπιστολαί.* In the chapter (iii. 25) which treats especially of the canon of the N. T., while there is no express mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is evident, by comparing his words there and in another place, that he reckons it as confessedly one of the writings of St. Paul. For there he says, speaking of those N. T. books which are ὁμολογούμενα, "*received by all*"—

> *καὶ δὲ τακτέον ἐν πρώτοις τὴν ἁγίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτύν· οἷς ἕπεται ἡ τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφή· μετὰ δὲ ταύτην τὰς Παύλου καταλεκτέον γραφὰς κ.τ.λ.*

And in iii. 3, *τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι και σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες.*

Still it would appear that Eusebius himself believed the Epistle to have been written in Hebrew by St. Paul and translated. In H. E. iii. 38, a passage part of which has been above cited (par. 8), he says—

> *Ἑβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρίου γλώττης ἐγγραφῶς ὡμιληκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Κλήμεντα τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἑρμηνεῦσαι λέγουσι τὴν γραφήν· ὃ καὶ μᾶλλον εἴη ἂν ἀληθές, τῷ τὸν ὅμοιον τῆς φράσεως χαρακτῆρα τήν τε τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολήν, καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἀποσώζειν, καὶ τῷ μὴ πόρρω τὰ ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι.*

If such was his view, however, he was hardly consistent with himself: for in his comm. on Ps. ii. 7, vol. v. p. 88, he seems to assume that the Epistle was written in Greek by the Apostle himself:—

> ὁ μέν τοίγε Ἑβραῖος ἐλέγετο κύριον εἶναι τῆς λέξεως ἔτεκον, ὅπερ καὶ Ἀκύλας πεποίηκεν· ὁ δὲ ἀπόστολος νομομαθὴς ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους (i. 5) τῇ τῶν ο΄ ἐχρήσατο:

an inconsistency which betrays either carelessness, or change of opinion.

49. Marks of the same inconsistency further appear in another place (H. E. vi. 13), where he numbers our Epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί, saying of the writings of Clement of Alexandria, κέχρηται δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων γραφῶν μαρτυρίαις, τῆς τε λεγομένης Σολομῶντος σοφίας, καὶ τῆς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Σιράχ, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς, τῆς τε Βαρνάβα καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ Ἰούδα. It has been suggested that the inconsistency may be removed by accepting this last as a mere matter of fact, meaning, as in H. E. iii. 3, ὅτι γε μήν τινες ἠθετήκασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, οὐ δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν: cf. also H. E. vi. 20, end.

50. As we pass downwards, I shall mention but cursorily those writers who uniformly quote the Epistle as St. Paul's; pausing only to notice any trace of a different opinion, or any testimony worth express citation. The full testimonies will be found in Bleek, and most of them in Lardner, vol. ii.

51. Of the class first mentioned in the foregoing paragraph, are Cyril of Jerusalem (+ 386); Gregory of Nazianzum (+ 389); Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus (+ 402); Basil the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (+ 379); his brother Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa (cir. 370); Titus of Bostra (+ cir. 371); Chrysostom (+ 407); Theodore of Mopsuestia (+ cir. 428); Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus in Cilicia (+ 457).

52. In the works of this latter Father we find it asserted that the Epistle was written from Rome. Also we find the Arians charged with setting it aside as spurious:—

> θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν δρῶσιν οἱ τὴν Ἀρειανικὴν εἰσδεξάμενοι νόσον κατὰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν λυττῶντες γραμμάτων καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποκρίνοντες καὶ νόθον ταύτην ἀποκαλοῦντες (Procem. ad Hebr. init. vol. iii. p. 541).

The same accusation is found—in the Dialogue on the Trinity, ascribed sometimes to Athanasius, sometimes to Theodoret: where the orthodox interlocutor makes the rather startling assertion, ἀφ' οὗ κατηγγέλη τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ χριστοῦ Παύλου εἶναι πεπίστευται ἡ ἐπιστολή:—and in Epiphanius, Hær. lxix. 14, p. 738, where at the same time he charges them with misusing Heb. iii. 2, τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, for the purposes of their error. (See the passages at length in Bleek.) From this, and from the Epistle of Arius to Alexander, where he professes his faith and cites Heb. i. 2 (Epiph. ubi supra, § 7, p. 733), it is plain that

the Arians did not reject the Epistle altogether. Nay, they hardly denied its Pauline authenticity; for in that case we should have Athanasius in his polemics against them, and Alexander, defending this authenticity, whereas they always take it for granted. Moreover in the disputation of Augustine with the Arian Gothic Bishop Maximinus, we find the latter twice quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's[9]. So that whatever may have been done by individual Arians, it is clear that as a party they did not reject either the Epistle itself or its Pauline authorship.

53. Correspondent with the spread of the acceptance of the Epistle as St. Paul's, was its reception, in the MSS., into the number of his Epistles. It was so received in the character of a recent accession, variously ranked: either at the end of those addressed to churches, or at the end of all. Epiphanius (Hær. xlii. vol. i. p. 373), at the end of the fourth century, says, speaking of the Epistle to Philemon—

> οὕτως γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Μαρκίωνι κεῖται (viz. ninth, between Col. and Phil.) παρὰ δὲ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἐσχάτη κεῖται· ἐν τισὶ δὲ ἀντιγράφοις τρισκαιδεκάτη πρὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους τεσσαρεςκαιδεκάτης τέτακται· ἄλλα δὲ ἀντίγραφα ἔχει τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δεκάτην, πρὸ τῶν δύο τῶν πρὸς Τιμόθεον, καὶ Τίτον καὶ Φιλήμονα.

The Epistle holds the place first here mentioned, viz. *last of all*, in the Iambi ad Seleucum, supposed by some to be the work of Gregory of Nazianzum, but more probably that of his contemporary Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium (see Bleek, p. 156, note 187): but the latter place in the arrangement of Athanasius (Bl. p. 135, note 143), of the Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ (wrongly ascribed to Athanasius, but belonging to the Alexandrian school, Bl. p. 137. 7), of the Council of Laodicæa (Bl. p. 154): of Theodoret and Euthalius: of our uncial MSS. A, B, C, H, ℵ, and cursive 16, 17, 22, 23, 46, 47, 57, 71, 73, al.; and of the Memphitic version.

54. The motives for these differing arrangements were obvious. Some placed it last, as an addition to the Epistles of St. Paul; others, to give it more its proper rank, put it before the Epistles to individuals. But had it been originally among St. Paul's Epistles, there can be no doubt that it would have taken its place according to its importance, which is the principle of arrangement of the undoubted Pauline Epistles in the canon.

55. A trace of a peculiar arrangement is found in B, the Vatican Codex. In that MS., all the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul form one con-

[9] Augustini collat. cum Maximino, 4, Aug. Opp. viii. p. 469 (725 Migne): *Maximin.* "Quod Christus est in dextera Dei, quod interpellat pro nobis, sic etiam in alio loco ipse prosequitur Paulus dicens (Col. iii. 1). Sic ad Hebræos ipse scribens ait: 'Purificatione peccatorum facta' &c. (Heb. i. 3):" and ib. 9, p. 471 (728): *Maximin.* "Dicit enim sic Paulus ad Hebræos: 'Non enim in manufactis templis intravit Christus' &c. (Heb. ix. 24)."

tinued whole, numbered throughout by sections. But the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, as has been observed, stands after 2 Thess., does not correspond, in the numeration of its sections, with its present place in the order. It evidently once followed the Epistle to the Galatians, that Epistle ending with § 59, Heb. beginning with § 60,—and Eph. (the latter part of Heb. being deficient) with § 70. This would seem to shew that the MS. from which B was copied, or at all events which was at some previous time copied for its text, had Heb. after Gal.; which would indicate a still stronger persuasion that it was St. Paul's [1]. In the Sahidic version only does it appear in that place which it would naturally hold according to its importance: i. e. between 2 Cor. and Gal. But from the fact of no existing Greek manuscript having it in this place, we must ascribe the phænomenon to the caprice of the framer of the version.

56. Returning to the Western church, we find that it was some time after the beginning of the third century before the Epistle was generally recognized as St. Paul's; and that even when this became the case, it was not equally used and cited with the rest of his Epistles.

About the middle of the third century flourished in the church of Rome NOVATIAN, the author of the celebrated schism which went by his name. We have works of his [2] full of Scripture citations, and on subjects which would have been admirably elucidated by this Epistle. Yet no where has he quoted or alluded to it. That he would not have had any feeling adverse to it, is pretty clear; for no passage in the N. T. could give such apparent countenance to his severer view "de lapsis," as Heb. vi. 4—6. Yet, judging by the Tractatus ad Novatianum Hæreticum [3], he never cited it for his purpose. Nor does that treatise, full as it is of Scripture citations, adduce one from our Epistle.

57. Contemporary with Novatian, we have, in the West African church, CYPRIAN, Bishop of Carthage (+ 258). In all his writings, he never cites, or even alludes to, our Epistle; which he would certainly have done for the same reason as Novatian would have done it, had he recognized it as the work of St. Paul; the whole of whose Epistles he cites, with the exception of that to Philemon. In all probability, Tertullian's view ("Da magistrum") was also his, that it was written by Barnabas (see above, par. 25).

[1] It is one of the most grievous and inexcusable faults in Mai's edition of the Codex Vaticanus, that these numbers, forming such a valuable record of ancient arrangement, have been wantonly tampered with, "*ne sectionum numerationem absurde perturbatam exhiberemus.*" See note at end of Thessalonians, p. 429 of the English reprint.

[2] De Trinitate, and De Cibis Judaicis: printed in Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. iii. pp. 885—964, and in Gallandi, Bibl. Patr. iii. pp. 287—323. On the latter of them, see Neander, Kirchengesch. pt. iii. p. 1166; on the former, Cave, Hist. Lit. Ann. 251.

[3] Migne, Patr. Lat. iii. pp. 1205—1218: Gallandi, Bibl. Patr. iii. pp. 371—376. The author is unknown.

58. A little later we have a witness from another part of the Latin church, VICTORINUS, Bishop of Pettau on the Drave, in Pannonia (+ cir. 303). He asserts in the most explicit manner, both in his fragment De Fabrica Mundi and in his commentary on the Apocalypse, that St. Paul wrote only to seven churches; and in the latter he enumerates the churches:—

> "In toto orbe septem ecclesias omnes esse, et septem nominatas unam esse catholicam, Paulus docuit primo: quod ut servaret ipse, et ipsum septem ecclesiarum non excessit numerum: sed scripsit ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses: postea singularibus personis scripsit, ne excederet numerum septem ecclesiarum [4]."

We may add to this, that the Epistle to the Hebrews is never quoted in this Commentary.

59. About the middle of the fourth century, we find the practice beginning in the Latin church, of quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's: but at first only here and there, and not as if the opinion were the prevailing one. Bleek traces the adoption of this view by the Latins to their closer intercourse with the Greeks about this time owing to the Arian controversy, which occasioned several of the Western theologians to spend some time in the East, where the Epistle was cited, at first by both parties, and always by the Catholics, as undoubtedly St. Paul's. Add to this the study of the Greek exegetical writers, and especially of Origen, and we shall have adduced enough reasons to account for the gradual spread of the idea of the Pauline authorship over the West.

60. A fitting example of both these influences is found in HILARY, Bishop of Poitiers (+ 368), who seems to have been the first who thus regarded the Epistle. He quotes it indeed but seldom, in comparison with other parts of Scripture, and especially with St. Paul's Epistles; but when he does, it is decisively and without doubt, as the work of the Apostle. These citations are found in his treatise De Trinitate, which he wrote in his exile in Phrygia, and in his Commentary on the Psalms, "in quo opere," says Jerome (Catal. 100, vol. ii. p. 933), "imitatus Origenem, nonnulla etiam de suo addidit."

61. LUCIFER of Cagliari (+ 371) also cites the Epistle as St. Paul's, but once only, De non conveniendo cum Hær. c. 11, pp. 782 f. (Migne): though he frequently cites Scripture, and especially St. Paul's Epistles. And it is observable of him, that he was exiled by the Emperor Constantius, and spent some time in Palestine and the Thebaid.

62. Fabius Marius VICTORINUS belongs to these same times. He

[4] On the almost certain genuineness of this Commentary, see Bleek, p. 179, note 229: on which it may be said, that even if it should be held to be of *later* date, it would thereby only become a more remarkable testimony in this matter.

was born in Africa, and passed the greater part of his days as a rhetorician at Rome: being baptized as a Christian late in life. Most of his remaining works are against the Arians: and in them he cites our Epistle two or three times, and as St. Paul's; still, it has been observed (by Bleek), not with such emphasis as the other books of Scripture, but more as a mere passing reference. He is said by Jerome (Catal. 101, p. 935) to have written "Commentarii in Apostolum," i. e. on the Pauline Epistles: yet it would appear, from what Cassiodorus implies in the sixth century [5], that *up to his time no Latin writer had commented on the Epistle*, that he did not include it among them.

63. Other Latin writers there are of this time, who make no use of our Epistle, though it would have well served their purpose in their writings. Such are—PHŒBADIUS, Bishop of Agen, in S.W. Gaul (+ aft. 392); ZENO, Bishop of Verona (cir. 360); PACIANUS, Bishop of Barcelona (cir. 370); HILARY the Deacon, generally supposed to be the author of the Comm. on St. Paul's Epistles found among the works of Ambrose (cir. 370) [6]; OPTATUS, Bishop of Milevi (cir. 364—375), who wrote De Schismate Donatistarum. All these quote frequently from other parts of the N. T. and from St. Paul's Epistles.

64. On the other hand, AMBROSE, Bishop of Milan (+ 397), combating strongly the Arians of his time, and making diligent use of the writings of Origen, Didymus, and Basil, often uses and quotes the Epistle, and always as the work of St. Paul. (See copious citations in Bleek.) In one celebrated passage in his treatise De Pœnitentia (ii. 2 (6, 7), vol. iii. p. 417), where he is impugning the allegation by the Novatians of Heb. vi. 4 ff., he defends the passage from misunderstanding; confesses its apparent inconsistency with St. Paul's conduct to the sinner at Corinth; does not think of questioning the apostolical authority of the passage, but asks, "Numquid Paulus adversus factum suum prædicare potuit?" and gives two solutions of the apparent discrepancy.

65. We have an important testimony concerning our Epistle from PHILASTRIUS, Bishop of Brescia (+ cir. 387), who while he cites the Epistle as unhesitatingly as his friend Ambrose, in his treatise De Hæresibus (§ 89, Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. xii. p. 1200), says—

> "Hæresis quorundam de epistola Pauli ad Hebræos. Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebræos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabæ esse apostoli, aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi. Alii autem Lucæ evangelistæ aiunt epistolam etiam ad

[5] Divin. Litt. c. 8 (vol. ii. p. 543), cited in Bleek.

[6] The Epistle is once cited in the comm., but so that it is distinguished from the writings of St. Paul. Speaking of St. Paul, he says (on 2 Tim. i. 3), "Sic enim aliquando persequutus est ecclesiam ut Dei amore hoc ageret, non malevolentia. Nam simili modo *et* in epistola ad Hebræos *scriptum est*: quia Levi qui decimas accepit, decimas dedit Melchisedech" &c. See Bleek, p. 139.

Laodicenses scriptam [7]. Et quia addiderunt in ea quædam non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia: et, si legitur a quibusdam, non tamen in ecclesia legitur populo, nisi tredecim epistolæ ipsius, et ad Hebræos interdum. Et in ea quia rhetorice scripsit sermone plausibili, inde non putant ejusdem apostoli. Et quia et *factum Christum* dixit in ea (ch. iii. 2), inde non legitur. De pœnitentia autem (ch. vi. 4 ff.), propter Novatianos æque."

Then he proceeds to give orthodox explanations of both places.

He has also another remarkable passage, Hær. 88, p. 1199:—

"Propter quod statutum est ab apostolis et eorum successoribus, non aliud legi debere in ecclesia catholica, nisi legem et prophetas et evangelia et actus apostolorum et Pauli *tredecim* epistolas, et septem alias, Petri duas, Joannis tres, Judæ unam et unam Jacobi, quæ septem actibus apostolorum conjunctæ sunt. Scripturæ autem absconditæ, id est, apocrypha, etsi legi debent morum causa a perfectis, non ab omnibus legi debent, quia non intelligentes multa addiderunt et tulerunt quæ voluerunt hæretici."

These testimonies of Philastrius are curious, and hardly consistent with one another, nor with his own usual practice of citing the Epistle as St. Paul's. They seem to lead us to an inference agreeing with that to which our previous enquiries led, viz. that though some controversial writers in the Latin church at the end of the fourth century were beginning to cite the Epistle as St. Paul's, it was not at that time so recognized in that church generally, nor publicly read: or if read, but seldom.

66. This reluctance on the part of the Latin church to receive and recognize the Epistle was doubtless continued and increased by the use made of some passages in it by the Novatian schismatics. We have seen already, in par. 64, that Ambrose adduces this fact: and Bleek brings several instances of it from other writers. But as time advanced, the intrinsic value of the Epistle itself, and the example of writers of the Greek church, gained for it almost universal reception, and reputation of Pauline authorship in the West. Thus GAUDENTIUS, successor of Philastrius in the see of Brescia in 387, to which he was summoned from travelling in Cappadocia,—and FAUSTINUS, who followed in this, as in other things, the practice of Lucifer of Cagliari,—cite the Epistle without hesitation as St. Paul's. So in general does RUFINUS (+ cir. 411), having spent a long time in Egypt, and

[7] This curious sentence can hardly mean, as Bleek, that they believed the Epistle to the Heb. to be St. Luke's, as also that apocryphal one which is written to the Laodiceans; but that they believed the Epistle to the Heb. to be St. Luke's, and that *it* was also written to the Laod., i. e. was the Epistle alluded to under that designation by St. Paul in Col. iv. 16. What follows is very obscure, but does not seem to me to support this rendering of Bleek's.

being familiar with the writings of Origen. He gives "Pauli apostoli epistolæ quatuordecim" among the writings "quæ patres intra canonem concluserunt [8]:" and in his writings generally cites the Epistle as Pauline without hesitation [9].

67. I shall close this historical sketch with a fuller notice of the important testimonies of JEROME and AUGUSTINE, and a brief summary of those who followed them.

68. JEROME (+ 420) spent a great portion of his life in Egypt, Palestine, and other parts of the East; was well acquainted with the writings of Origen; and personally knew such men as Gregory of Nazianzum, Didymus, Epiphanius, and the other Greek theologians of his time. It might therefore have been expected, that he would, as we have seen other Latin writers do, have adopted the Greek practice, and have unhesitatingly cited and spoken of this Epistle as the work of St. Paul. This however is by no means the case. On the whole his usual practice is, to cite the words of the Epistle, and ascribe them to St. Paul [1]: and in his work De Nominibus Hebraicis (vol. iii. pp. 4 ff. ed. Migne), where he interprets the Hebrew words which occur in Scripture, in the order of the books where they are found, he introduces the Epistle as St. Paul's (p. 113), after 2 Thessalonians.

69. But the exceptions to this practice of unhesitating citation are many and important: and wherever he gives any account of the Epistle, he is far from concealing the doubts which prevailed respecting it. I shall give some of the most remarkable passages.

In the Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, chap. 5, under Paulus (vol. ii. pp. 837, 839), he says—

> "Scripsit autem novem ad septem ecclesias epistolas, ad Romanos unam, ad Corinthios duas, ad Galatas unam, ad Ephesios unam, ad Philippenses unam, ad Colossenses unam, ad Thessalonicenses duas: præterea ad discipulos suos, Timotheo duas, Tito unam, Philemoni unam. Epistola autem quæ fertur ad Hebræos non ejus creditur propter stili sermonisque distantiam, sed vel Barnabæ juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucæ evangelistæ juxta quosdam, vel Clementis, Romanæ postea ecclesiæ episcopi, quem aiunt sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone: vel certe, quia Paulus scribebat ad Hebræos et propter invidiam sui apud eos

[8] In his Expositio Symboli Apostolici, 37, p. 100 (Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. xxi.), published also in Jerome's works, ed. Paris, 1693, vol. ix. p. 70 (vol. iv. p. 62 in the Frankfort ed. of 1684).

[9] The passage quoted by Bleek from the Invectiva in Hieronymum, "Nescio quid tale et in alia epistola, *si quis tamen eam receperit*" &c., is nothing but a citation by him from Jerome's commentary on Eph.: see it at length below, par. 72.

[1] See numerous instances in Bleek, p. 202 f., note. I only cite those which are apposite to the question before us.

nominis titulum in principio salutationis amputaverat. Scripserat autem ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraice, id est suo eloquio disertissime, ut ea quæ eloquenter scripta fuerant in Hebræo eloquentius verterentur in Græcum: et hanc caussam esse, quod a cæteris Pauli epistolis discrepare videatur."

70. In this passage, while he relates the doubts and hypotheses, his own leaning seems to be, to believe that the fact of St. Paul having written in Hebrew, and having omitted a salutation owing to his unpopularity among the Jews, would be enough to account for the phænomena of the Epistle.

71. But in other places, he gives other reasons for the difficulties of the Epistle and for the doubts respecting it. Thus in his Comm. on Gal. i. 1 (vol. vii. p. 374), he says—

"... . Unde et nos possumus intelligere, Joannem quoque baptistam et apostolum appellandum, siquidem ait Scriptura 'Fuit homo missus a Deo cui nomen erat Johannes:' et in epistola ad Hebræos propterea Paulum solita consuetudine nec nomen suum nec apostoli vocabulum præposuisse, quia de Christo erat dicturus, '*Habentes ergo principem sacerdotem et apostolum confessionis nostræ Jesum* (Heb. iii. 1; iv. 14):' nec fuisse congruum ut ubi Christus apostolus dicendus erat, ibi etiam Paulus apostolus poneretur[2]."

Again, on Isa. vi. 9, 10 (vol. iv. p. 97)—

"Pauli quoque idcirco ad Hebræos epistola contradicitur, quod ad Hebræos scribens utatur testimoniis quæ in Hebraicis voluminibus non habentur."

72. In the prologue to his Comm. on Titus, he severely blames the Marcionites and other heretics for excluding arbitrarily certain Epistles from the number of the Apostolic writings, instancing the Pastoral Epistles and this to the Hebrews. He then proceeds (vol. vii. pp. 685 f.)—

"Et si quidem redderent caussas cur eas apostoli non putarent, tentaremus aliquid respondere et forsitan aliquid satisfacere lectori. Nunc vero cum hæretica auctoritate pronuncient et dicant Illa epistola Pauli est, hæc non est, ea auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, qua ipsi non erubescant falsa simulare."

Still that this strong language does not prove him to have been satisfied as to the Pauline authorship, is shewn by two passages in his commentary on this same Epistle to Titus (vol. vii. p. 695):—

"Et hoc diligentius observate, quomodo unius civitatis presbyteros vocans postea eosdem episcopos dixerit. *Si quis vult recipere eam epistolam quæ sub nomine Pauli ad Hebræos scripta est*, et ibi æqualiter inter plures ecclesiæ cura dividitur. Siquidem ad plebem scribit '*Parete principibus vestris*' &c. (Heb. xiii. 17)."

[2] Compare Pantænus above, par. 11.

And (vol. vii. p. 714)—

"Relege *ad Hebræos epistolam Pauli, sive cujuscumque alterius eam esse putas, quia jam inter ecclesiasticas est recepta;* totum illum catalogum fidei enumera, in quo scriptum est '*Fide majus sacrificium Abel a Cain obtulit Deo*' &c. (Heb. xi. 4—8)."

And again in his Comm. on Ezek. xxviii. (vol. v. p. 335)—

"Et Paulus apostolus loquitur, *siquis tamen ad Hebræos epistolam suscipit*, '*Accessistis ad Sion montem*' &c. (Heb. xii. 22)."

And on Eph. ii. (vol. vii. p. 583), having quoted 1 Cor. he says—

"Nescio quid tale et in alia epistola, *si quis tamen eam recipit*, prudentibus quibusque lectoribus Paulus subindicat, dicens, '*Hi omnes testimonium accipientes fidei*' &c. (Heb. xi. 39)."

73. The following expressions regarding the Epistle, testifying to the same doubt, occur in his writings:—

Epistle 73 (125), ad Evangelum (Evagrium), § 4 (vol. i. p. 442), "Epistola ad Hebræos, quam omnes Græci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latinorum:" Comm. on Matt. xxvi. (vol. vii. p. 212), "Paulus in epistola sua quæ scribitur ad Hebræos, licet de ea multi Latinorum dubitent:" Catal. 59 (vol. ii. p. 899), "sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur:" Comm. in Isa. vi. (vol. iv. p. 91), "quam Latina consuetudo non recipit:" ib. in c. viii. (vol. iv. p. 125), "licet eam Latina consuetudo inter canonicas scripturas non recipiat:" in Zach. viii. 1—3 (vol. vi. p. 838), "Paulus, si tamen in suscipienda epistola Græcorum auctoritatem Latina lingua non respuit, sacrata oratione disputans ait" &c.

74. A passage requiring more express notice is found in his Epistle to Dardanus, § 3 (vol. i. p. 970), where after citing testimonies from Heb. xi. xii., he proceeds—

"Nec me fugit quod perfidia Judæorum hæc testimonia non suscipiat, quæ utique veteris Testamenti auctoritate firmata sunt. Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur: et nihil interesse cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quod si eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, nec Græcorum quidem ecclesiæ Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt: et tamen nos utraque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent (quippe qui et gentilium literarum raro utantur exemplis) sed quasi canonicis."

75. There are some points in this important testimony, which seem to want elucidation. Jerome asserts, for example, that by *all preceding Greek writers the Epistle had been received as St. Paul's:* and yet immediately after, he says that most (of them, for so only can "*plerique*" naturally be interpreted) think it to be Barnabas's or Clement's[3]: and think it to be of no consequence (whose it is), seeing that it is the production of a "*vir ecclesiasticus*," and is every day read in the churches. Now though these expressions are not very perspicuous, it is not difficult to see what is meant by them. A general conventional reception ("*susceptio*") of the Epistle as St. Paul's prevailed among the Greeks. To this their writers (without exception according to Jerome: but that is a loose assertion, as the preceding pages will shew) conformed, still in most cases entertaining their own views as to Barnabas or Clement having written the Epistle, and thinking it of little moment, seeing that confessedly it was the work of a "*vir ecclesiasticus*," and was stamped with the authority of public reading in the churches. The expression "*vir ecclesiasticus*" seems to be in contrast to "*homo hæreticus*[4]."

76. The evidence here however on one point is clear enough: and shews that in Jerome's day, i. e. in the beginning of the fifth century, the custom of the Latins did not receive the Epistle to the Hebrews among the canonical Scriptures.

77. Jerome's own view, as far as it can be gathered from this passage, is, that while he wishes to look on the Epistle as decidedly canonical, he does not venture to say who the author was, and believes the question to be immaterial: for we cannot but suppose him, from the very form of the clause "*et nihil interesse*" &c., to be giving to this view his own approbation.

78. And consistent with this are many citations of the Epistle scattered up and down among his works: as, e. g.—

Comm. on Isa. lvii., vol. iv. p. 677—

> "Mons . . . de quo ad Hebræos loquitur qui scribit epistolam" &c.

Comm. on Amos viii., vol. vi. p. 339—

> "Quod quicunque est ille qui ad Hebræos scripsit epistolam disserens ait" &c.

Comm. on Jer. xxxi. 31, vol. iv. p. 1072—

[3] By no possible ingenuity can these words be made to mean, as Dr. Davidson interprets them, that "the Greeks ascribed the style and language of it to Barnabas or Clement, though the ideas and sentiments were Paul's." The genitives, "Pauli," and "Barnabæ vel Clementis," are strictly correspondent and correlative. In the same sense as they "suscipiebant" the Epistle as being the one, in that sense they "arbitrabantur" that it was the other; and in no other sense.

[4] A similar use of ἐκκλησιαστικός occurs in Euseb. H. E. iii. 25, where see Heinichen's notes.

"Hoc testimonio apostolus Paulus, sive quis alius scripsit epistolam, usus est ad Hebræos" &c.[5]

And intimations conveyed in other places, besides that above cited from the Catalogus (par. 69) :—

Ep. 53 (103), ad Paulinum, § 8, vol. i. p. 280—

"Paulus apostolus ad septem scribit ecclesias (octava enim ad Hebræos a plerisque extra numerum ponitur)" &c.

Comm. on Zachar. vol. vi. p. 854 f.—

"Et in Esaia legimus, 'Apprehendent septem mulieres' &c. Quæ igitur septem ibi mulieres appellantur, id est ecclesiæ, quarum numerus et in Paulo apostolo continetur (ad septem enim scribit ecclesias, ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses), et in Joannis apocalypsi in medio septem candelabrarum, id est, ecclesiarum, Ephesiorum &c., varietate et auro purissimo Dominus cinctus ingreditur : nunc in propheta Zacharia decem nominantur" &c.

79. And as Bleek has very satisfactorily shewn, no difference in time can be established between these testimonies of his, which should prove that he once doubted the Pauline authorship and was afterwards convinced, or vice versâ. For passages inconsistent with one another occur in one and the same work, e. g. in the Comm. on Isaiah, in which, notwithstanding the testimonies above adduced from it, he repeatedly cites the Epistle as the work of St. Paul[6]. And these Commentaries on the Prophets were among his later works.

80. We may safely then gather from that which has been said, what Jerome's view on the whole really was. He commonly, and when not speaking with deliberation, followed the usual practice of citing the Epistle as St. Paul's. But he very frequently guards himself by an expression of uncertainty : and sometimes distinctly states the doubt which prevailed on the subject. That his own mind was not clear on it, is plain from many of the above-cited passages. In fact, though quoted on the side of the Pauline authorship, the testimony of Jerome is quite as much against as in favour of it. Even in his time, after so long a prevalence of the conventional habit of quoting it as St. Paul's, he feels himself constrained, in a great proportion of the cases where he cites it, to cast doubt on the opinion, that it was written by the Apostle.

81. The testimony of AUGUSTINE (+ 430) is, on the whole, of the same kind. It was his lot to take part in several synods in which the canon of the N. T. came into question. And it is observable,

[5] See also on Isa. lvii. vol. iv. p. 700; l. ib. p. 583; xxiv. ib. p. 338; viii. ib. p. 125; vii. p. 108; &c.

[6] Cf. on ch. lvi. vol. iv. p. 659; on ch. xlv. ib. p. 543; on ch. viii. ib. p. 125; on ch. vii. ib. p. 108; on ch. vi. p. 91; &c.

thatwhile in two of these, one held at Hippo in 393, when he was yet a presbyter, the other the 3rd council of Carthage in 398, we read of—

"Pauli apostoli epistolæ tredecim : ejusdem ad Hebræos una,"—
clearly shewing that it was not without some difficulty that the Epistle gained a place among the writings of the Apostle,—in the 5th council of Carthage, held in 419, where Augustine also took a part, we read—

"epistolarum Pauli apostoli numero quatuordecim."
So that during this interval of 25 years, men had become more accustomed to hear of the Epistle as St. Paul's, and at last admitted it into the number of his writings without any distinction[7].

82. We might hence have supposed that Augustine, who was not only present at these councils, but took a leading part in framing their canons, would be found citing the Epistle every where without doubt as St. Paul's. But this is by no means the case. Bleek has diligently collected many passages in which the unsettled state of his own opinion on the question appears. In one remarkable passage, De Doctrina Christiana, ii. 8 (12), vol. iii. pt. i. p. 40 (Migne), where he says of his reader—

> "In canonicis autem scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurium auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illæ sint quæ apostolicas sedes habere et epistolas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in scripturis canonicis, ut eas quæ ab omnibus accipiuntur ecclesiis catholicis, præponat eis quas quidam non accipiunt : in eis vero quæ non accipiuntur ab omnibus, præponat eas quas plures gravioresque accipiunt, eis, quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis ecclesiæ tenent,"—

having said this, he proceeds to enumerate the canonical books of the O. and N. T. ("totus autem canon scripturarum, *in quo istam considerationem versandam dicimus,* his libris continetur" &c.), giving fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, among which he places the Epistle to the Hebrews *last:* which, as we have seen, was not its usual place at that time.

83. Plainer testimonies of the same uncertainty are found in other parts of his writings : e. g. De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione, i. c. 27 (50), vol. x. pt. i. p. 137—

> "Ad Hebræos quoque epistola, quamquam nonnullis incerta sit, tamen quoniam legi, quosdam . . . eam quibusdam opinionibus suis testem adhibere voluisse, magisque me movet auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium, quæ hanc quoque in canonicis habent, quanta pro nobis testimonia contineat, advertendum est."

[7] See the canons of the respective councils in Bleek, pp. 217, 218; and in Mansi, Concil. Collect. vol. iii. pp. 891, 924; vol. iv. p. 430.

Inchoata Expositio Epistolæ ad Romanos (written in A.D. 394), § 11, vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 2095—

"Excepta epistola quam ad Hebræos scripsit, ubi principium salutatorium de industria dicitur omisisse, ne Judæi, qui adversus eum pugnaciter oblatrabant, nomine ejus offensi vel inimico animo legerent, vel omnino legere non curarent quod ad eorum salutem scripserat: unde nonnulli eam in canonem scripturarum recipere timuerunt. Sed quoquo modo se habeat ista quæstio, excepta hac epistola, omnes quæ nulla dubitante ecclesia Pauli apostoli esse firmantur, talem continent salutationem" &c.

De Civitate Dei, xvi. 22, vol. vii. p. 500—

"In epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, quam plures apostoli Pauli esse dicunt, quidam vero negant."

De Fide, Spe et Caritate (A.D. 421), c. 8 (2), vol. vi. p. 235—

"In epistola ad Hebr., qua teste usi sunt illustres catholicæ regulæ defensores."

84. Sometimes indeed he cites our Epistle simply with the formulæ "Audisti exhortantem apostolum," Serm. lv. 5, vol. v. p. 376: "Audi quod dicit apostolus," Serm. lxxxii. 8 (11), p. 511: see also Serm. clix. 1, p. 868; clxxvii. 11, p. 960: Expos. Verb. ad Rom. § 19, vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 2102: sometimes with such words as these, "quos reprehendit scriptura dicens," Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. § 12, vol. iv. pt. ii. p. 1712: "Aperuit Scriptura, ubi legitur," Contra Maxim. Ar. ii. 25, vol. viii. p. 803. But much more frequently he cites either merely "epistola ad Hebræos" (In Ps. cxviii. Serm. xvii. § 2, vol. iv. pt. ii.: De Trinit. iii. 11 (22), vol. viii. ib. xiii. 1 (3), xiv. 1; Serm. lxxxii. § 15), or "epistola quæ scribitur ad Hebræos" (In Joan. Tract. lxxix. § 1, vol. iii. pt. ii.), or "epistola quæ est ad Hebræos" (In Joan. Tract. xcv. § 2: Contra Serm. Arian. c. 5, vol. viii.: De Trinit. xii. 13 (20); xv. 19 (34)), or "epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos" (De Genesi ad Litt. x. 9, vol. x. pt. i.: In Ps. cxviii. Serm. xvi. c. 6: De Fide et Opp. c. 11 (17), vol. vi.: De Civit. Dei x. 5). It is certainly a legitimate inference from these modes of quotation, that they arose from a feeling of uncertainty as to the authorship. It would be inconceivable, as Bleek remarks, that Augustine should have used the words "in epistola quæ inscribitur ad *Romanos*, ad *Galatas*" &c.

85. It is of some interest to trace the change of view in the Romish church, which seems to have taken place about this time. In the synod of Hippo, before referred to (par. 81), and in the 3rd council of Carthage (ib.), it was determined to consult "*the church over the sea*" for confirmation of the canon of Scripture as then settled: "de confirmando isto canone transmarina ecclesia consulatur." And what was meant by this, is more fully explained by a similar resolution of the 5th council of Carthage (ib.): "Hoc etiam fratri et consacerdoti nostro, sancto Boni-

facio urbis Romanæ episcopo, vel aliis earum partium episcopis pro confirmando isto canone innotescat, quia et a patribus ita accepimus legendum." Whether these references were ever made, we have no means of knowing: but we possess a document of the same age, which seems to shew that, had they been made, they would have resulted in the confirmation of the canonical place of the Epistle. Pope Innocent I. in his letter to Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse (A.D. 405 ff.), enumerates the books of the N. T. thus: "Evangeliorum libri quatuor, Pauli apostoli epistolæ quatuordecim, epistolæ Joannis tres" &c.[8]

86. Yet it seems not to have been the practice of the writers of the Roman church at this time to cite the Epistle frequently or authoritatively. That there are no references to it in Innocent's own writings, and in those of his successors Zosimus (417—419) and Bonifacius (419—422), may be accidental: but it can hardly be so, that we have none in those of his predecessor Siricius, who often quotes Scripture: in those of Cælestine I. (422—432), some of whose Epistles are regarding the Nestorian controversy: in the genuine writings of Leo the Great (440—461).

87. Bleek adduces several contemporary Latin writers in other parts of the world, who make no mention of nor citation from our Epistle. Such are Orosius (cir. 415), Marius Mercator, Evagrius (cir. 430), Sedulius. Paulinus of Nola (+ 431) cites it once, and as St. Paul's[9]. After the middle of the fifth century, the practice became more usual and familiar. We find it in Salvianus (+ aft. 495), Vigilius of Tapsus (cir. 481), Victor of Vite, Fulgentius of Ruspe (+ 533), his scholar Fulgentius Ferrandus (+ cir. 550), Facundus of Hermiane (cir. 548), &c.: and in the list of canonical books drawn up in 494 by a council of seventy bishops under Pope Gelasius, where we have "epistolæ Pauli apostoli numero quatuordecim, ad Romanos epistola una, ... ad Philemonem epistola una, ad Hebræos epistola una."

88. In the middle of the sixth century we find Pope Vigilius, who took a conspicuous part in the controversy on the *three chapters*, in his answer to Theodore of Mopsuestia, impugning the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ instead of χάριτι θεοῦ, Heb. ii. 9 (see in loc. in the Commentary), without in any way calling in question the authority or authenticity of the Epistle.

89. To the same time (cir. 556) belongs the work of Cassiodorus, De Divinis Lectionibus; who, while he speaks of various Latin commenta-

[8] Galland. Biblioth. viii. pp. 563 ff. Bl. p. 230.

[9] Bleek hardly does this citation justice in saying, that it does not appear certainly by it that Paulinus held the Epistle to be the work of the same Apostle as that to the Ephesians. Witness his words, Ep. l. (xliii.) 18, p. 296, "Itidem apostolus spiritaliter exponens arma cælestia . . . . gladium spiritus dicit verbum Dei (Eph. vi. 17); de quo ad Hebræos ait, '*Vivus est sermo Dei*' &c. (Heb. iv. 12)." Surely this is explicit enough.

ries on the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, knew apparently of none on that to the Hebrews, and consequently got Mutianus to make the Latin version of Chrysostom's homilies on it, "ne epistolarum ordo continuus indecoro termino subito rumperetur."

90. Gregory the Great (590—605) treats our Epistle simply as St. Paul's, and in his Moral. in Job xxxv. 20 (48), p. 1166 vol. ii. (Migne), lays a stress on the circumstance that the Church received as the Apostle's fourteen canonical Epistles only, though fifteen were written by him: the fifteenth being probably the Epistle to the Laodiceans.

91. The testimonies of Isidore of Hispala (Seville: + 636) are remarkable. Citing the Epistle usually without further remark as St. Paul's, and stating the number of his Epistles as fourteen, he yet makes the number of churches to which the Apostle wrote, *seven*, and enumerates them, including the Hebrews, not observing that he thus makes them eight (Prœmiorum in O. et N. T. § 92, vol. v. p. 215):—

> "Paulus apostolus quatuordecim epistolis prædicationis suæ perstrinxit stylum. Ex quibus aliquas propter typum septiformis ecclesiæ septem scripsit ecclesiis, conservans potius nec excedens modum sacramenti, propter septiformem Sancti Spiritus efficaciam. Scripsit autem ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses, ad Hebræos: reliquas vero postmodum singularibus edidit personis, ut rursus ipsum illum septenarium numerum ad sacramentum unitatis converteret."

Again, Etymol. vi. 2. 44 f., vol. iii. p. 248, in enumerating the writings of St. Paul, he says—

> "Paulus apostolus suas scripsit epistolas quatuordecim, ex quibus novem septem ecclesiis scripsit, reliquas discipulis suis Timotheo, Tito, et Philemoni. Ad Hebræos autem epistola plerisque Latinis ejus esse incerta est propter dissonantiam sermonis, eandemque alii Barnabam conscripsisse, alii a Clemente scriptam fuisse suspicantur."

And almost in the same words, De Officiis i. 12. 11, vol. vi. p. 376.

92. After this time the assertors of an independent opinion, or even reporters of the former view of the Latin church, are no longer found, being overborne by the now prevalent view of the Pauline authorship. Thomas Aquinas indeed (+ 1274) mentions the former doubts, with a view to answer them: and gives reasons for no superscription or address appearing in the Epistle.

And thus matters remained in the church of Rome until the beginning of the sixteenth century: the view of the Pauline authorship universally obtaining: and indeed all enquiry into the criticism of the Scriptures being lulled to rest.

93. But before we enter on the remaining portion of our historical

enquiry, it will be well to gather the evidence furnished by the Græco-Latin MSS., as we have above (par. 53) that by the Greek MSS.

The Codex Claromontanus (D, of cent. vi.: see Proleg. to Vol. II. ch. v. § i.) contains indeed the Epistle, but in a later hand: and after the Epistle to Philemon we have an enumeration of the lines in the O. and N. T., which does not contain the Epistle to the Hebrews: thus shewing, whatever account is to be given of it, that the Epistle did not originally form part of the Codex.

The Codex Boernerianus (G, cent. ix.: see ibid.) does not contain our Epistle.

The Codex Augiensis (F, of cent. ix.: see ibid.) does not contain the Epistle in Greek, but in Latin only.

These evidences are the more remarkable, as they all belong to a period when the Pauline authorship had long become the generally received opinion in the Latin church.

94. We now pass on at once to the opening of the sixteenth century: at which time of the revival of independent thought, not only among those who became connected with the Reformation, but also among Roman-Catholic writers themselves, we find the ancient doubts concerning the Pauline authorship revived, and new life and reality infused into them.

95. Bleek mentions first among these LUDOVICUS VIVES, the Spanish theologian, who in his Commentary on Aug. de Civit. Dei, on the words "in epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos," says, "Significat, incertum esse auctorem:" and on the words, "in epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, quam plures apostoli esse dicunt, quidam vero negant," says, "Hieronymus, Origenes, Augustinus et alii veterum de hoc ambigunt: ante ætatem Hieronymi a Latinis ea epistola recepta non erat inter sacras."

96. A more remarkable testimony is that of CARDINAL CAJETAN, as cited by Erasmus[1]—

> "Thomas Bionensis Cardinalis Cajetanus adhuc vivens, cum alibi, tum in libello contra Lutheranos de Eucharistia, sine Pauli nomine citat hanc epistolam: uno loco subjicit, *quod juxta genuinum sensum tractat auctor illius epistolæ*. Si non dubitabat de auctore, quid opus erat illa periphrasi?"

Bellarmine (De Controvers. Fid. Christ. p. 54) cites Cajetan as objecting to the idea that St. Paul wrote the Epistle, ch. ix. 4, as inconsistent with 1 Kings viii. 9, and saying, "Igitur aut mentitur Paulus, aut hujus epistolæ auctor non est[2]."

[1] In his Declarat. xxxiii. ad Censuras Facult. Theol. Paris: Opp. Erasm. Leyd. vol. ix. fol. 166.

[2] These testimonies are cited from a commentary on the Epistle; Epp. Paulin. ad Græc. verit. castig. et juxta sensum literal. enarr. Venet. 1531, fol. My own lot has been that of Bleek: Cajetan's Schriften selbst habe ich nicht nachsehen können.

97. Erasmus gives it as his decided opinion that the Epistle is not written by St. Paul: and alleges at length the principal arguments on which it is founded. The passage is a long one, but very important, and I shall quote it entire. It occurs at the end of his Annotations on the Epistle, Opp. vol. vi. foll. 1023-4:—

"Optime Lector, nihilo minoris velim esse tibi hanc epistolam quod a multis dubitatum sit Pauli esset an alterius. Certe cujuscunque est, multis nominibus digna est quæ legatur a Christianis. Et ut a stilo Pauli, quod ad phrasin attinet, longe lateque discrepat: ita ad spiritum ac pectus Paulinum vehementer accedit. Verum ut non potest doceri certis argumentis cujus sit, quod nullius habeat inscriptionem: ita compluribus indiciis colligi potest, si non certis, certe probabilibus, ab alio quopiam quam a Paulo scriptam fuisse. Primum quod sola omnium Pauli nomen non præferat, tametsi non me fugit, hoc utcunque dilui ab Hieronymo, sed ita ut magis retundat adversarii telum, quam adstruat quod defendit: 'Si ideo,' inquit, 'Pauli non est quod Pauli nomen non præferat, igitur nullius erit, cum nullius præferat titulum.' Sed audi ex adverso. Si ideo quisque liber hujus aut illius credi debet quod ejus titulum præferat, igitur et evangelium Petri apocryphum Petro tribui debet, quod præferat Petri nomen. Deinde quod tot annis, nempe usque ad ætatem Hieronymi, non recepta fuerit a Latinis, quemadmodum ipse testatur in epistolis suis. Ad hanc conjecturam facit quod Ambrosius, cum omnes Paulinas epistolas sit interpretatus, in hanc unam nihil scripserit. Præterea quod enarrans Esaiæ caput vi. recensuit Hieronymus, quod in hoc quædam testimonia citentur ex veteri Testamento, quæ non reperiantur in Hebræorum voluminibus, de quibus nonnihil attigimus hujus epistolæ cap. xii. Adde huc, quod quum nemo Scripturarum testimonia disertius aptiusque citet quam Paulus, tamen locum ex Psalmo viii. refert in contrarium sensum, illinc colligens Christum dejectum, quum totus Psalmus attollat dignitatem humanæ conditionis. Ut ne dicam interim, inesse locos aliquot, qui quorundam Hæreticorum dogmatibus prima fronte patrocinari videantur: velut illa, quod velum separans sancta sanctorum interpretatur cœlum: ac multo magis, quod palam adimere videatur spem a baptismo relapsis in peccatum, idque non uno in loco: cum Paulus et eum receperit in communionem sanctorum, qui dormierat cum uxore patris. Adde huc, quod divus Hieronymus cum aliis aliquot locis ita citat hujus epistolæ testimonia, ut de auctore videatur ambigere: tunc edisserens caput Hieremiæ xxxi., 'Hoc,' inquit, 'testimonio Paulus apostolus, sive quis alius scripsit epistolam, usus est ad Hebræos.' Rursum in Esaiæ capite l., 'Dicitur et in epistola quæ fertur ad Hebræos: aliisque locis pene innumeris, alicubi negans referre

cujus sit, modo salubria doceat.' Item capite vi., 'Unde et Paulus apostolus in epistola ad Hebræos, quam Latina consuetudo non recipit.' Rursus enarrans Esaiæ caput viii. citans hujus epistolæ testimonium dicit, 'In epistola quæ ad Hebræos inscribitur docet, licet eam Latina consuetudo inter canonicas Scripturas non recipiat.' Item enarrans Matthæi caput xxvi., 'Licet,' inquit, 'de ea Latinorum multi dubitent.' Item in Zachariæ caput viii. citans addit, 'Si tamen in suscipienda epistola Græcorum auctoritatem Latina lingua non respuit.' Item in epistola ad Paulinum, 'Octava enim ad Hebræos a plerisque extra numerum ponitur.' Idem in Catalogo refert Gajum in hac fuisse sententia, ut tredecim duntaxat epistolas adscriberet Paulo, quæ est ad Hebræos negaret illius esse. Deinde subjicit suo nomine Hieronymus, 'Sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli non habetur.' Consimilem ad modum Origenes, Homilia xxvi. in Matthæum, cum adducat hujus epistolæ testimonium, non audet tamen ab adversario flagitare, ut Pauli videatur, ac remittit pene ut sit eo loco, quo liber qui inscribitur, Secreta Esaiæ. Et Augustinus citaturus hujus epistolæ testimonium, De Civitate Dei libro xvi. capite xxii., præfatur hunc in modum: 'De quo, in epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, quam plures apostoli Pauli esse dicunt, quidam vero negant, multa et magna conscripta sunt.' Quin idem alias frequenter adducens hujus epistolæ testimonium, 'Scriptum est,' inquit, 'in epistola ad Hebræos,' omisso Pauli nomine: 'Sic intellectum est in epistola ad Hebræos:' et, 'De illo etiam in epistola legitur, quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos.' Hæc atque hujusmodi cum plus centies occurrant, nusquam, quod sane meminerim, citat Pauli nomine, cum in cæteris citationibus Pauli titulum libenter sit solitus addere. Ambrosius licet in hanc unam non ediderit Commentarios, tamen ejus testimoniis non infrequenter utitur, et videtur eam Paulo tribuere. Quin Origenes apud Eusebium testatur a plerisque dubitatum, an hæc epistola esset germana Pauli, præsertim ob stili dissonantiam, quanquam ipse Paulo fortiter asserit: locus est Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ libro vi. capite xvii. Rursus ejusdem libri capite xv. narrat, apud Latinos hanc epistolam non fuisse tributam Paulo apostolo. Restat jam argumentum illud, quo non aliud certius, stilus ipse, et orationis character, qui nihil habet affinitatis cum phrasi Paulina. Nam quod afferunt hic quidam, Paulum ipsum Hebraice scripsisse, cæterum Lucam argumentum epistolæ, quam memoria tenebat, suis explicuisse verbis, quantum valeat, viderint alii. Neque enim in verbis solum aut figuris discrimen est, sed omnibus notis dissidet. Et ut Paulus Græce scribens multum ex idiomate sermonis Hebraïci retulit, ita et in hac, quam ut volunt isti scripsit Hebraïce, nonnulla sermonis illius vestigia residerent.

Quid quod ne Lucas quidem ipse in actis apostolorum, hoc est in argumento, quod facile recipit orationis ornamenta, parum abest ab hujus epistolæ eloquentia. Equidem haud interponam hoc loco meam sententiam. Cæterum admodum probabile est quod subindicavit divus Hieronymus in Catalogo Scriptorum Illustrium, Clementem, Romanum Pontificem a Petro quartum, auctorem hujus epistolæ fuisse. Clementis enim meminit Paulus, et hic Timothei facit mentionem. Sed præstat, opinor, ipsa Hieronymi verba super hac re adscribere: 'Scripsit,' inquit, 'nempe Clemens sub persona Romanæ ecclesiæ ad ecclesiam Corinthiorum valde utilem epistolam, quæ et in nonnullis locis publice legitur, quæ mihi videtur characteri epistolæ, quæ sub Pauli nomine ad Hebræos fertur convenire. Sed et multis de eadem epistola non solum sensibus, sed juxta verborum quoque ordinem abutitur. Omnino grandis in utraque similitudo est.' Hactenus divus Hieronymus, satis civiliter indicans prudenti doctoque lectori, quid ipse suspicetur. Idem in epistola ad Dardanum testatur hanc a Latinis non fuisse receptam sed a plerisque Græcis scriptoribus hactenus receptam, ut crederent esse viri ecclesiastici, Pauli tamen esse negarent: sed Barnabæ potius aut Clementi tribuerent, aut juxta nonnullos Lucæ, quod idem diligenter annotavit Hieronymus in Pauli Catalogo. Ex his dilucidum est, ætate Hieronymi Romanam ecclesiam nondum recepisse auctoritatem hujus epistolæ: et Græcos qui recipiebant judicasse non esse Pauli: denique Hieronymus ad Dardanum negat referre cujus sit, quum sit ecclesiastici viri. Et tamen hodie sunt qui plusquam hæreticum esse putant si quis dubitet de auctore epistolæ, non ob aliud, nisi quod in templis additur Pauli titulus. Si ecclesia certo definit esse Pauli, captivo libens intellectum meum in obsequium fidei: quod ad sensum meum attinet, non videtur illius esse, ob causas quas hic reticuisse præstiterit. Et si certo scirem non esse Pauli, res indigna est digladiatione. Nec hac de re tantum verborum facerem, nisi quidam ex re nihili tantos excitarent tumultus."

Other passages to the same effect are cited in Bleek.

98. Luther spoke still more plainly. In his introduction to his version of the Epistle, he maintains that it cannot be St. Paul's, nor indeed the writing of any Apostle: appealing to such passages as ch. ii. 3; vi. 4 ff.; x. 26 ff.; xii. 17. But whose it is, he does not there pretend to say, further than that it comes from some scholar of the Apostles, well versed in the Scriptures. And with this view his manner of citation is generally consistent. His well-known conjecture, that the Writer of the Epistle was Apollos, is expressed in his Commentary on Genesis xlviii. 20: "Auctor epistolæ ad Hebræos, quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo, eruditissime

allegat hunc locum." In his Epistel a. Christent. Hebr. i. 1 ff. the following occurs:—

> Das ist eine starke, mächtige und hohe Epistel, die da hoch herfähret und treibet den hohen Artikel des Glaubens von der Gottheit Christi, und ist ein glaubwürdiger Wahn, sie sei nicht St. Pauli, darum daß sie eine geschmücktere Rede führet, denn St. Paulus an andern Orten gepfleget. Etliche meinen sie sei St. Lucä, etliche St. Apollo, welchen St. Lucas rühmet, wie er in der Schrift mächtig sei gewesen wider die Juden, Apgs. xviii. 24. Es ist ja wahr, daß keine Epistel mit solcher Gewalt die Schrift führet, als diese, daß ein treflicher apostolischer Mann gewesen ist, er sei auch wer er wolle.

99. Here he seems to imply that others had already conjectured Apollos to be the author. But this does not appear to be so: and he may, as Bleek imagines, be merely referring to opinions of learned men of his own day, who had either suggested, or adopted his own view.

100. CALVIN's opinion was equally unfavourable to the Pauline authorship. While in his Institutes he ordinarily cites the Epistle as the words of "the Apostle," and defends its apostolicity in the argument to his commentary ("Ego vero eam inter apostolicas sine controversia amplector, nec dubito, Satanæ artificio fuisse quondam factum, ut illi autoritatem quidam detraherent"), yet he sometimes cites the "autor epistolæ ad Hebræos;" and when he comes to the question itself, declares his view very plainly:—

> "Quis porro eam composuerit, non magnopere curandum est. Putarunt alii Paulum esse, alii Lucam, alii Barnabam, alii Clementem.—Scio Chrysostomi tempore passim inter Paulinos a Græcis fuisse receptum: sed Latini aliter senserunt, maxime qui propiores fuerunt apostolorum temporibus. Ego ut Paulum agnoscam autorem, adduci nequeo. Nam qui dicunt, nomen fuisse de industria suppressum, quod odiosum esset Judæis, nihil afferunt. Cur enim mentionem fecisset Timothei, si ita esset? hoc enim indicio se prodebat. Sed ipsa docendi ratio et stilus alium quam Paulum esse satis testantur: et scriptor unum se ex apostolorum discipulis profitetur c. 2, quod est a Paulina consuetudine longe alienum."

And similarly on ch. ii. 3 itself:—

> "Hic locus indicio est, epistolam a Paulo non fuisse compositam. Neque enim tam humiliter loqui solet, ut se unum fateatur ex apostolorum discipulis: neque id ambitione, sed quia improbi ejusmodi prætextu tantundem detrahere ejus doctrinæ moliebantur. Apparet igitur non esse Paulum, qui ex auditu se habere evangelium scribit, non autem ex revelatione."

See also his comment on ch. xii. 13.

101. Very similar are the comments of BEZA, at least in his earlier

editions: for all the passages quoted by Bleek, from his introduction, on ch. ii. 3 and xiii. 26, as being in his own edition of Beza 1582, and from Spanheim, as not extant in that edition, are, in the edition of 1590, which I use, expunged, and other comments, favourable to the Pauline origin, substituted for them.

102. And this change of opinion in Beza only coincided with influences which both in the Romish and in the Protestant churches soon repressed the progress of intelligent criticism and free expression of opinion. Cardinal Cajetan was severely handled by Ambrosius Catharinus, who accused him of the same doubts in relation to this Epistle as those entertained by Julian respecting the Gospel of St. Matthew: Erasmus was attacked by the theologians of the Sorbonne in a censure which concludes thus [s]: "Mira autem arrogantia atque pertinacia est hujus scriptoris, quod, ubi tot catholici doctores, pontifices, concilia declarant, hanc epistolam esse Pauli, et idem universalis ecclesiæ usus ac consensus comprobat, hic scriptor adhuc dubitat tanquam toto orbe prudentior." And finally the council of Trent, in 1546, closed up the question for Romanists by declaring, "Testamenti Novi . . . quatuordecim epistolæ Pauli apostoli, ad Romanos &c. . . . ad Hebræos." So that the best divines of that church have since then had only that way open to them of expressing an intelligent judgment, which holds the matter of the Epistle to be St. Paul's, but the style and arrangement that of some other person: so Bellarmine, De Controversiis, Paris, 1613, fol. pp. 51 f.: so Estius, in his introduction to the Epistle, which is well worth reading, as a remarkable instance of his ability and candour:—

> "Cum aliis omnino dicendum arbitramur, subjectum sive materiam totius epistolæ, simul et ordinem a Paulo fuisse subministratum, sed compositionem et ornatum esse cujusdam alterius, cujus opera Paulus utendum putaverit, sive Clemens Romanus is fuerit, sive Lucas individuus apostoli comes et laborum socius, quod magis est verisimile."

At the end of the same chapter of his introduction he enquires at length, "an sit fidei, Paulum esse auctorem: an hæreticum sit, aliter sentire." And he concludes, "temerarium esse, si quis epistolam ad Hebræos negaret esse Pauli apostoli, sed hæreticum ob id solum pronuntiare non ausim:" giving as his own opinion, "Neque vero dubitamus an Paulus apostolus materiam scribendæ hujus epistolæ suppeditaverit, ordinemque præscripserit, sed an ipse sit auctor scriptionis seu compositionis."

103. In the Protestant churches we find, as might be expected, a longer prevalence of free judgment on the matter. It will be seen by

[s] Erasm. Opp. Lugd. Bat. 1706, vol. ix. fol. 865.

the copious citations in Bleek (pp. 254 ff.), that Melanchthon remained ever consistent in quoting the Epistle simply as "epistola ad Hebræos:" that the Magdeburg Centuriators distinctly denied the Pauline origin ("His et similibus rationibus mota prudens vetustas, quæ omnia ad ἀναλογίαν fidei examinare solita est, de epistola ad Hebræos jure dubitasse videtur"): that Brenz, in the Confessio Wirtembergica, distinguishes in his citations this Epistle from those of St. Paul.

104. At the same time we find inconsistency on the point in Brenz himself: in the Commentary on the Epistle written by his son, the Pauline authorship is maintained: also by Flacius Illyricus (1557) on a priori grounds. In the Concordien-Formel, the Epistle is cited in the original German without any name, whereas in the Latin version we have "apostolus ait," and the like. And this latter view continued to gain ground. It is maintained by Gerhard (1641) and Calov. (1676): and since the middle of the seventeenth century has been the prevailing view in the Lutheran church.

105. In the Calvinistic or Reformed Church, the same view became prevalent even earlier. Of its various confessions, the *Gallican*, it is true, sets the Epistle at the end of those of St. Paul, thus: . . . "ad Titum una, ad Philemonem una: epistola ad Hebræos, Jacobi epistola:" but the Belgic, Helvetic, and Bohemian Confessions cite and treat it as St. Paul's.

106. The exceptions to this prevailing view were found in certain Arminian divines, who, without impugning the authority of the Epistle, did not bind themselves to a belief of its Pauline origin. Such were Grotius, who inclines to the belief that it was written by St. Luke: Le Clerc, who holds Apollos to have been the Author: Limborch, who holds it to have been written "ab aliquo e Pauli comitibus, et quidem conscio Paulo, . . atque e doctrina Pauli haustum:" and among the Socinians, Schlichting, who says of it—

> "Licet Paulum ipsum autorem non habuerit, ex ejus tamen, ut sic dicam, officina prodierit, h. e. ab aliquo ex ejus sociis et comitibus fortassis etiam Pauli instinctu ac, ut ita dicam, spiritu scripta fuerit."

107. There was also a growing disposition, both in the Romish and in the reformed churches, to erect into an article of faith the Pauline origin, and to deal severely with those who presumed to doubt it. Many learned men, especially among Protestants, appeared as its defenders: among whom we may especially notice Spanheim (the younger, 1659), Braun and D'Outrein in Holland, our own Owen (1667), Mill (1707), Hallet (the younger, 1727), Carpzov (1750), Sykes (1755), J. C. Wolf (1734), and Andr. Cramer (1757), to whom Bleek adjudges the first place among the upholders of the Pauline authorship.

108. Since the middle of the last century, the ancient doubts have revived in Germany; and in the progress of more extended and accurate critical enquiry, have now become almost universal. The first that carefully treated the matter with this view was Semler (1763), in his edition of Baumgarten's Commentary on the Epistle. Then followed Michaelis, in the later editions of his Introduction: in the earlier, he had assumed the Pauline authorship. The same doubts were repeated and enforced by Ziegler, J. E. C. Schmidt (1804), Eichhorn (1812), Bertholdt (1819), David Schulz (who carried the contrast which he endeavours to establish between the Writer of this Epistle and St. Paul to an unreasonable length, and thereby rather hindered than helped that side of the argument), Seyfferth (who sets himself to demonstrate from the Epistle itself, that it cannot have been written by St. Paul, but has no hypothesis respecting the Writer), Böhme (who holds Silvanus to have been the Writer, from similarities which he traces between our Epistle and 1 Peter, the Greek of which he holds also to have proceeded from him), De Wette (who inclines to Apollos as the author, but sees an improbability in his ever having been in so close a relation to the Jewish Christians of Palestine), Tholuck (whose very valuable and candid enquiry in his last edition results in a leaning towards Apollos as the Writer), Bleek (whose view is mainly the same), Wieseler (who supports Barnabas as the probable Writer), Lünemann (who strongly upholds Apollos), Ebrard (who holds St. Paul to have been the Author, St. Luke the Writer), Delitzsch (who holds St. Luke to have been the Writer).

109. The principal modern upholders of the purely Pauline authorship in Germany have been Bengel (+ 1752), Storr (1789), and recently Hofmann.

110. In our own country, the belief of the direct Pauline origin, though much shaken at the Reformation [4], has recovered its ground far more extensively. The unwillingness to disturb settled opinion on the one hand, and it may be the disposition of our countrymen to take up opinions in furtherance of strong party bias, and their consequent inaptitude for candid critical research on the other, have mainly contributed to this result. Most of our recent Theologians and Commentators are to be found on this side. Among these may be mentioned Whitby, Macknight, Doddridge, Lardner, Stuart (American), Forster (Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews), and Bishop Wordsworth, in the third vol. of his Greek Testament; also Conybeare and Howson (Life of St. Paul), but doubtingly, and Davidson (Introd. to N. T.), who holds that St. Luke co-operated with the Apostle in making the Epistle what it now appears.

111. I am obliged, before passing to the internal grounds on which

[4] See the opinions of several of the Reformers below, § vi. 17 ff.

the question is to be treated, to lay down again the position in which we are left by the preceding sketch of the history of opinion.

112. It is manifest that with testimony so divided, *antiquity cannot claim to close up the enquiry:* nor can either side allege *its* voice as decisive. In the very earliest times, we find the Epistle received by some as St. Paul's: in the same times, we find it ascribed by others, and those men of full as much weight, to various other authors.

113. I briefly thus restate what has already been insisted on in paragraphs 35—40, because the time has not yet entirely passed by, when writers on the subject regard our speculations concerning the probable author of the Epistle as limited by these broken fragments of the rumours of antiquity: when a zealous and diligent writer among ourselves allows himself to treat with levity and contempt the opinion that Apollos wrote it, simply on the ground that he is a claimant "altogether unnoticed by Christian antiquity[5]." What we require is this: that we of this age should be allowed to do just that which the ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες did in their age,—examine the Epistle simply and freely for and by itself, and form our conclusion accordingly, as to its Author, readers, and date: having respect indeed to ancient tradition, where we can find it, but not, where it is so broken, and inconsistent with itself, bound by any one of its assertions, or limited in our conclusions by its extent.

114. I now proceed to the latter and more important portion of our enquiry: whether the internal phænomena of the Epistle itself point to St. Paul as its Author and Writer,—or Author without being the Writer,—and if they do not either of these, whom, as an Author, their general character may be regarded as indicating.

115. But as this portion is most important, so has it been most diligently and ingeniously followed out by disputants on both sides. And it is not my intention to enter here on the often-fought battle of comparisons of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, and tabular statements of words and phrases. The reader will find these given at great length and with much fairness in Davidson, who holds the balance evenly between previous disputants. And if he wishes to go still further into so wide a field of discussion, he may consult Mr. Forster's large volume, which is equally fertile in materials for both conclusions, often without the writer being conscious that it is so[6].

116. The various items of evidence on this head will be presented to

[5] See Forster's Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Dedication, p. ix.

[6] As e.g. when he alleges, which he often does, the same thought expressed by different words, or different cognate forms of the same root, in Hebrews and the Pauline Epistles, as indicating *identity* of authorship. The conclusion of most examiners of evidence would be in the opposite direction.

my reader in the references throughout the Epistle. He will there see, as indeed from the tables in any of the writers on the subject,—how like, and yet how unlike, the style of our Epistle is to that of the great Apostle: how completely the researches of such books as Mr. Forster's have succeeded in proving the likeness, how completely at the same time they have failed to remove one iota of the unlikeness: so that the more we read and are borne along with their reasonings, the closer the connexion becomes, in faith and in feeling, of the writer of the Epistle with St. Paul, but the more absolutely incompatible the personal identity: the more we perceive all that region of style and diction to have been in common between them, which men living together, talking together, praying together, teaching together, would naturally range in; but all that region wherein individual peculiarity is wont to put itself forth, to have been entirely distinct.

117. I need only mention, as an indication to the student how to arrive at such convictions for himself, the different tinge given to the same or similar thoughts; the wholly differing rhythm of sentences wherein perhaps many words occur in common; the differing spirit of citation (to say nothing of the varying modus citandi); the totally distinct mode of arguing; the rhetorical accumulation; the equilibrium, even in the midst of fervid declamation, of periods and clauses; the use of different inferential and connecting particles. All of these great and undeniable variations may be easily indeed frittered down by an appearance of exceptions ranged in tables; but still are indelibly impressed on the mind of every intelligent student of the Epistle, and as has been observed, are unanswerable, just in proportion as the points of similarity are detailed and insisted on [7].

118. It is again of course easy enough to meet such considerations in either of two ways; the former of which recommends itself to the mind which fears to enquire from motives of reverence, the latter to the superficial and indolent.

119. It may be said, that the Holy Spirit of God, by whose inspiration holy men have written these books of the New Testament, may bring it about, that the same person may write variously at different times, even be that variety out of the limits of human experience; that the same man, for instance, should have written the Epistle to the Romans and the First Epistle of St. John. In answer to which we may safely say, that what the Holy Spirit *may* or *can* do, is not for us to speculate upon: in this His proceeding of inspiration, He has given us abundant and undeniable examples of what He *has done;* and by such examples are we to be guided, in all questions as to the analogy of His proceedings in more doubtful cases. As matter of fact, the style

[7] See this carried out further below, § v. 9, 10.

and diction of St. Paul differ as much from those of St. John as can well be conceived. When therefore we find in the sacred writings phænomena of difference apparently incompatible with personal identity in their authors, we are not to be precluded from reasoning from them to the non-identity of such authors, by any vague assertions of the omnipotence of the Almighty Spirit.

120. Again it may be strongly urged, that the same person, writing at different times, and to different persons, may employ very various modes of diction and argument. Nothing can be truer than this: but the application of it to the question of identity of authorship is matter of penetration and appreciation. Details of diversity which may be convincing to one man, may be wholly inappreciable, from various reasons, by another. As regards the matter before us, it may suffice to say, that the incompatibility of styles was felt in the earliest days by Greeks themselves, as the preceding testimonies from Clement of Alexandria and Origen may serve to shew. Further than this we can say nothing which will be allowed as of any weight by those who unfortunately fail to appreciate the difference. We can only repeat our assurance, that the more acumen and scholarship are brought to bear on the enquiry, aided by a fairly judging and unbiassed mind, the more such incompatibility will be felt: and say, in the words of Origen cited above, par. 19, *ὅτι ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως . . . οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ... πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογῆσαι ἄν.*

121. I now proceed to consider the principal notices in the Epistle itself, which have been either justly or unjustly adduced, as making for or against the Pauline authorship.

122. In ch. xiii. 23, we read, *γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς.* This notice has been cited with equal confidence on both sides. The natural inference from it, apart altogether from the controversy, would be, that the Writer of the Epistle was in some other place than Timotheus, who had been recently set free from an imprisonment (for this and no other is the meaning of the participle), and that he was awaiting Timotheus's arrival: on which, if it took place soon, he hoped to visit the Hebrews in his company.

123. It is manifest, that such a situation would fit very well some point of time after St. Paul's liberation from his first Roman imprisonment. Supposing that he was dismissed before Timotheus, and, having left Rome, expecting him to follow, had just received the news of his liberation, the words in the text would very well and naturally express this. It is true, we read of no such imprisonment of Timotheus: and this fact seems to remove the date of the occurrence out of the limits of the chronology of the Pauline Epistles. But if the command of the

Apostle in 2 Tim. iv. 9 was obeyed, and Timotheus, on arriving, shared his imprisonment, the situation here alluded to may have occurred not long after.

124. On the other hand, the notice would equally well fit some companion of St. Paul, either St. Luke, or Silvanus, or Apollos, writing after the Apostle's death. All these would speak of Timotheus as ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν.

125. On the whole then, this passage carries no weight on either side. I own that the ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς has a tinge of authority about it, which hardly seems to fit either of the above-mentioned persons. But this impression may be fallacious: and it is only one of those cases where, in a matter so doubtful as the authorship of this Epistle, we are swayed hither and thither by words and expressions, which perhaps after all have no right to be so seriously taken.

126. Similar remarks might be made on the notice of ch. xiii. 25, ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, as carrying no weight either way. As regards its meaning, it is indeed surprising that Bleek should maintain, that it *excludes* the supposition of the writer being in Italy, in the face of the classical and N. T. usage of the prepositions of origin,—ὁ ἐκ Πελοποννήσου πόλεμος,—Λάζαρος ὁ ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, and the like. The preposition may doubtless be taken as used with reference to those who were to receive the salutation: it may be the salutation, not the persons, which the preposition brings away from Italy. It may be as if I were to write to a friend, 'I have the best wishes for you from Canterbury:' which, although it would not be the most usual way of expressing my meaning, and *might* be said if I were elsewhere, yet would be far from excluding the supposition that I was myself writing from that city [a].

127. If the words then do not forbid the idea that the Writer was in Italy, I do not see how they can be used for or against the Pauline authorship. As observed before, the Apostle may have been somewhere in that country waiting for Timotheus, when liberated, to join him. And we may say the same with equal probability of any of St. Paul's companions to whom the Epistle has been ascribed. The only evidence which can be gathered from the words, as being exceedingly unlike any thing occurring in the manifold formulæ of salutation in St. Paul's Epistles, is of a slighter, but to my mind of a more decisive kind.

128. The evidence supposed to be derivable from ch. x. 34 (rec.), καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου συνεπαθήσατε, vanishes with the adoption of the reading τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε, in which almost all the critical editors concur.

[a] That N. T. usage renders the other meaning *more probable*, does not belong to the argument here in the text, but is maintained below, in § ii. 28.

129. The notice ch. xiii. 7, *μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.*, will more properly come under consideration when we are treating of the probable readers, and of the date of the Epistle[9]. I may say thus much in anticipation, that it can hardly be fairly interpreted consistently with the known traditions of the death of St. Paul, and at the same time with the hypothesis of his authorship.

130. The well-known passage, ch. ii. 3, requires more consideration. It stands thus :—

> *πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας, ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη;*

The difficulty, that St. Paul should thus include himself among those who had received the gospel only at second hand, whereas in Gal. i. 12 he says of it, *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, has been felt both in ancient and modern times. Euthalius, Œcumenius, and Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, and all the moderns have alleged it, either to press or to explain the difficulty. I must own that, in spite of all which has been so ingeniously said by way of explanation by the advocates of the Pauline authorship, the words appear to me quite irreconcileable with that hypothesis.

131. To pass by the ancient explanations, which will hardly be adopted in our own day[1],—the most prevalent modern one has been, that the Apostle here adopts the figure *συγκατάβασις*, or *communicatio*, by which a writer or speaker identifies himself with his readers or hearers, even though, as matter of actual fact, that identification is not borne out strictly. Such "*communication*" is most commonly found in hortatory passages, but is not confined to them. A writer may, for the purpose of his argument, and to carry persuasion, place himself on a level with his readers in respect of matters of history, just as well as of moral considerations. The real question for us is, whether this is a case in which such a figure would be likely to be employed.

132. And to this the answer must be, it seems to me, unhesitatingly in the negative. That an Apostle, who ever claimed to have received the gospel not from men but from the Lord himself,—who was care-

[9] See below, § ii. 29, 30; § iii. 2.

[1] Œc.: *τίνες δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες; οἱ θεσπέσιοι δηλονότι μαθηταί· ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίσῃ, οὐ λέγει καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀκηκοέναι παρὰ χριστοῦ, καίτοι ἤκουσεν.*

Thl.: *πῶς οὖν ἀλλαχοῦ οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων φησὶν ἀκοῦσαι; διότι ἐκεῖ μὲν μέγα καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τὸ κατεπεῖγον αὐτὸν συστῆσαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ μαθητής· διεβάλλετο γὰρ ὡς μὴ τοῦ κυρίου ἀκούσας· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκινδύνευε τὸ αὐτοῦ κήρυγμα παρὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἀπιστηθῆναι. νῦν δὲ οὐ τοσαύτη χρεία τούτου· οὔτε γὰρ Ἑβραίοις ἐκήρυξεν, οὔτε διεβάλλετο πρὸς τούτους ὡς ἀνθρώπων μαθητής, καὶ οὐχὶ χριστοῦ. ἢ ὅτι καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐπάγων "συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι," δείκνυσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ παρέλαβε ταῦτα.*

ful to state that when he met the chief Apostles in council they added nothing to him,—should at all, and especially in writing (as the hypothesis generally assumes) to the very church where the influence of those other Apostles was at its highest, place himself on a level with their disciples as to the reception of the gospel from them,—is a supposition so wholly improbable, that I cannot explain its having been held by so many men of discernment, except on the supposition that their bias towards the Pauline authorship has blinded them to the well-known character and habit of the Apostle.

133. And to reply to this, that he thus speaks of himself when his Apostolical authority is called in question, as it was in the Galatian church, and partially also in the Corinthian, but does not so where no such slight had been put upon his office, is simply to advance that which is not the fact: for he does the same in an emphatic manner in Eph. iii. 2, 3, *εἴγε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον κ.τ.λ.*: in which Epistle, to whomsoever addressed, there exist no traces of any rivalship to his own authority being in his view.

134. Certain other passages have been adduced as bearing out the idea of *συγκατάβασις* here. But none of them, when fairly considered, really does so. For to take them one by one:—

In Eph. ii. 3: Col. i. 12, 13: Titus iii. 3, there is no such figure, but the Apostle is simply stating the matter of fact, and counts himself to have been one of those spoken of.

In 1 Cor. xi. 31, 32, he is asserting that which is true of all Christians equally; himself as liable to fall into sin and thus to need chastisement, being included.

In 1 Thess. iv. 17,—where see note,—there is no such figure, for the Apostle is merely giving expression to the expectation that he himself should be among them who should be alive in the flesh at the coming of our Lord.

In Jude, ver. 17, there is no such figure. St. Jude, in writing thus, is giving us plain proof that he himself was not one of the Apostles.

135. Much stress has been laid, and duly, on the entire absence of personal notices of the Writer, as affecting the question of the Pauline authorship. This is so inconsistent with the otherwise invariable practice of St. Paul, that some very strong reason must be supposed, which should influence him in this case to depart from that practice. Such reason has been variously assigned. And first, with reference to the omission of any superscription or opening greeting. It has been supposed that he would not begin by designating himself as an Apostle, because the Lord Himself was the Apostle (ch. iii. 1) of the Jewish people (so Pantænus, above, par. 11). Or, because the Jewish Christians in Palestine were unwilling to recognize him as such, only as an

Apostle to the Gentiles (so Theodoret, Procem. Ep. ad Hebr.: and al.). But to this it might be answered, Why then not superscribe himself δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ or the like, as in Phil. i. 1 and Philem. 1, or simply Παῦλος, as in 1 and 2 Thess.? But a further reply has been given, and very widely accepted: that being in disfavour among the Jews, he did not prefix his name, for fear of exciting a prejudice against his Epistle, and so perhaps preventing the reading of it altogether. (So Clement of Alexandria, above, par. 14. So also Chrys. (Homil. iii. p. 371), καὶ τοῦτο δὴ τῆς Παύλου σοφίας· ἵνα γὰρ μὴ μετάσχῃ τοῦ μίσους τὰ γράμματα, καθάπερ προσωπείῳ τινὶ τῇ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀφαιρέσει κρύψας ἑαυτόν, οὕτως αὐτοῖς λανθανόντως τὸ τῆς παραινέσεως ἐπιτίθησι φάρμακον· ὅταν γὰρ πρός τινα ἀηδῶς ἔχωμεν, κἂν ὑγιές τι λέγῃ, οὐ προθύμως οὐδὲ μεθ' ἡδονῆς δεχόμεθα τὰ λεγόμενα· ὅπερ οὖν, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τότε συμβῇ, ἀφεῖλε τὴν ἰδίαν προσηγορίαν τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ὥστε μηδὲν τοῦτο γενέσθαι κώλυμα τῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἀκροάσει· οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἄπιστοι μόνον Ἰουδαῖοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πιστεύσαντες αὐτοὶ ἐμίσουν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπεστρέφοντο.) But this cannot have been the purpose of the Author throughout, as is sufficiently shewn by such notices as those of ch. xiii. 18, 19, 23, which would have been entirely without meaning, had the readers not been aware, who was writing to them. Yet, it is said, these notices do not occur till the end of the Epistle, when the important part of it has already been read through. Are we then to suppose that St. Paul seriously did in this case, that which he ironically puts as an hypothesis in 2 Cor. xii. 16, ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος, δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον? And if he did it, how imperfectly and clumsily! Could he not as easily have removed *all* traces of his own hand in the Epistle, as those at the beginning only? And how are we to suppose that the Epistle came to the church to which it was addressed? Did he put it in at a window, or over a wall? Must it not have come by the hand of some friend or companion? Must it not have been given into the hand of some ἡγούμενος? How happened it that the question was never asked, From whom does this come? or if asked, how could it be answered but in one way? And when thus answered, how could it fail but the Epistle would thenceforth be known as that of St. Paul?

136. It may be said that these last enquiries would prove too much: that they would equally apply, whoever wrote the Epistle: and that the name of the Author was, on the view which they imply, equally sure to have been attached to it. But we may well answer, that this, however plausible, is not so in reality. It does not follow, because the name of the great Apostle was sure to be generally attached to it if he really wrote it, that every other name was equally sure. Many of his disciples and companions, eminent as they were, bore no authority to be compared with his. This is true even of St. Luke and Barnabas: much more of Titus, Silas, and Clement. And if one of these had been the

acknowledged author, there being no notices in the Epistle itself whereby he might be with certainty recognized after the first circumstances of its sending were forgotten, how probable, that a writing, committed to the keeping of a particular church, should have been retained indeed as a sacred deposit by them, but, in the midst of persecutions and troubles, have lost the merely traditional designation which never had become inseparable from it. In the one case, the name of St. Paul would commend the Epistle, and so would take the first, and an inalienable place: in the other, the weight and preciousness of the Epistle would survive the name of its Writer, which would not of itself have been its commendation. The like might have happened to the Gospel, or Acts, of St. Luke, but for the fact, that in this case not one particular church, but the whole Christian world, was the guardian of the deposit, and of the tradition attached to it.

137. Another solution has been suggested by Steudel: that the book has more the character of a treatise than of an Epistle, and therefore was not begun in epistolary form: some letter being probably sent with it, or the customary personal messages being orally delivered. But the postulate may be safely denied. Our Epistle is veritably an Epistle: addressed to readers of whom certain facts were specially true, containing exhortations founded on those facts, and notices arising out of the relation of the writer to his readers; which last sufficiently shew, that no other Epistle could have accompanied it, nor indeed any considerable trusting to the oral supplementing of its notices.

138. Yet another solution has been given by Hug and Spanheim: that in an oratorical style like that of the opening of this Epistle, it was not probable that a superscription would precede. True: but what, when conceded, does this indicate? Is it not just as good an argument to shew that one who never begins his Epistles thus, is not the Writer, as to account for his beginning thus, supposing him the Writer? The reason for our Epistle beginning as it does, is unquestionably, the character of the whole, containing few personal notices of the relation of the Writer to his readers. But granted, as we have sufficiently shewn, that it was not the object of the Author to remain unknown to his readers, I ask any one capable of forming an unbiassed judgment, is it possible that were St. Paul that author, and any conceivable Hebrew church those readers, no more notices should be found, not perhaps of his apostleship, but of the revelations of the Lord to him, of his pure intent and love towards them? Any one who can suppose this, appears to me, I own,—however it may savour of presumption to say so,—deficient in appreciation of the phænomena of our Epistle, and still more of the character of the great Apostle himself.

139. In Bleek's Introduction to his Commentary, on which, in the main features, this part of my Prolegomena is founded, several inte-

resting considerations are here adduced as bearing on the question of the authorship, arising out of the manner in which variuos points which arise are dealt with, as compared with the manner usual with St. Paul. Such considerations are valuable, and come powerfully in aid of a conclusion otherwise forced upon us: but when that conclusion is not acquiesced in, they are easily diluted away by its opponents. They are rather confirmatory than conclusive: and have certainly not had justice done them by the supporters of the Pauline hypothesis; who, as they seem to themselves to have answered one after another of them, represent each in succession as the main ground on which the anti-pauline view is rested.

140. I would refer my English readers for the discussion of these points to Dr. Davidson's Introduction to the N. T., vol. iii., where they are for the most part treated fairly, though hardly with due appreciation of their necessarily subordinate place in the argument. The idea which a reader, otherwise uninformed, would derive from Dr. Davidson's paragraphs, is that those who allege these considerations make them at least co-ordinate with others, of which they in reality only come in aid.

141. The same may be said of the whole mass of evidence resting on modes of citation, ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, style of periods, and the like. It abounds on the one hand with striking coincidences, on the other with striking discrepancies: each of these has been made much of by the ardent fautors of each side,—while the more impartial Commentators have weighed both together. The general conclusion in my own mind derived from these is, that the author of this Epistle cannot have been the same with the author of the Pauline Epistles. The coincidences are for the most part those which belong to men of the same general cast of thought on the great matters in hand: the discrepancies are in turns of expression, use of different particles, different rhythm, different compounds of cognate words, a mode of citation not independent but rather divergent,—and a thousand minor matters which it is easy for those to laugh to scorn who are incapable of estimating their combined evidence, but which when combined render the hypothesis of one and the same author entirely untenable.

142. To the phænomena of citation in our Epistle I shall have occasion to advert very soon, when dealing with the enquiry who the author really was. (See below, parr. 149, 152, 158, 180.) The reader will find them treated at great length in Bleek, Davidson, and Forster.

143. Before advancing to clear the way for that enquiry by other considerations, I will beg the reader to look back with me once more over the *course and bearing of the external evidence as regards the Pauline hypothesis.*

144. The recognition of the Epistle as Pauline begins about the

middle of the second century, and, in one portion only of the church—the Alexandrine. Did this rest on an original historical tradition? We have seen reason to conclude the negative. Was it an inference from the subject and contents of the Epistle, which, when once made, gained more and more acceptance, from the very nature of the case? This, on all grounds, is more probable. Had an ancient tradition connected the name of St. Paul with it, we should find that name so connected not in one portion only, but in every part of the church. This however we do not find. We have no trace of its early recognition as Pauline elsewhere than in Alexandria. And even there, the earliest testimonies imply that there was doubt on the subject. Elsewhere, various opinions prevailed. Tertullian gives us Barnabas: Origen mentions two views, pointing to St. Luke and to Clement of Rome. None of these claim our acceptance as grounded on authentic historical tradition. But each of them has as much right to be heard and considered, as the Alexandrine. And the more, because that was so easy a deduction from the contents of the Epistle, and so sure to be embraced generally, whereas they had no such source, and could have no such advantage.

145. But there was one view of our Epistle, which never laboured under the uncertainty and insufficient reception which may be charged against the others: viz. that entertained by the church of Rome. It is true, its testimony is only negative: it amounts barely to this—"the Epistle is not St. Paul's." But this evidence it gives "semper, ubique, ab omnibus." And its testimony is of a date and kind which far outweighs the Alexandrine, or any other. Clement of Rome, the disciple of the Apostles, refers frequently and copiously to our Epistle, not indeed by name, but so plainly and unmistakeably that no one can well deny it. He evidently knew the Epistle well and used it much and approvingly. Now, had he recognized it as written by St. Paul,—he might not indeed have *cited* it as such, seeing that unacknowledged centos of N. T. expressions are very common with him,—but is it conceivable that he should altogether have concealed such his recognition from the church over which he presided? Is it not *certain*, that had Clement received it as the work of St. Paul, we should have found that tradition dominant and firmly fixed in the Roman church? But that church is just the one, where we find no trace of such a tradition: a fact wholly irreconcileable with such recognition by Clement. And if Clement did not so recognize it, are we not thereby brought very much nearer the source itself, than by any reported opinion in the church of Alexandria?

146. I shall have occasion again to return to this consideration: I introduce it here to shew, that in freely proposing to ourselves the enquiry, 'Who wrote the Epistle?' as to be answered entirely

from the Epistle itself, we are not setting aside, but are strictly following, the earliest and weightiest historical testimonies respecting it, and the inferences to be deduced from them. And if any name seems to satisfy the requirements of the Epistle itself, those who in modern times suggested that name, and those who see reason to adopt it, are not to be held up to derision, as has been done by Mr. Forster, merely because that name was not suggested by any among the ancients. The question is as open now as it was in the second century. They had no reliable tradition: we have none. If an author is to be found, αὐτὸ δείξει.

147. With these remarks, I come now to the enquiries, (1) What data does the Epistle furnish for determining the Author? and (2) In what one person do those characteristics meet?

148. (1. *a*) *The* WRITER *of the Epistle is also the* AUTHOR. It is of course possible, that St. Paul may have imparted his thoughts to the Hebrew church by means of another. This may have been done in one of two ways: either by actual translation, or by transfusion of thought and argument: setting aside altogether the wholly unlikely hypothesis, that the Epistle was drawn up and sent as St. Paul's by some other, without his knowledge and consent.

149. But first, the Epistle IS NOT A TRANSLATION. The citations throughout, with one exception (noticed below, § ii. par. 35 note), are from the LXX, and are of such a kind, that the peculiarities of the LXX version are not unfrequently interwoven into the argument, and made to contribute towards the result: which would be impossible, had the Epistle existed primarily in Hebrew. Besides, the prevalence of alliterations and paronomasiæ, and the Greek rhythm, to which so many rhetorical passages owe their force, would of themselves compel us to this conclusion[2].

150. And secondly, there are insuperable difficulties in the way of the hypothesis of any such secondary authorship as has very commonly been assumed, from the time of Origen downwards. Against this militate in their full strength all the considerations derived from those differences of style and diction, which in this Epistle are inseparably interwoven into the argument: against this the whole arrangement and argumentation of the Epistle, which are very different from those of St. Paul, shewing an independence and originality which could hardly have been found in the work of one who wrote down the thoughts of another: against this also the few personal notices which occur, and which manifestly belong to the Author of the Epistle. Supposing St. Paul to be speaking by another in all other places, how are we to make the transition in these? The notices which on the hypothesis of

[2] See this treated more fully below, § v. parr. 1—8.

pure Pauline authorship, seemed difficult of explanation, appear to me absolutely to defy it, if the secondary authorship be supposed.

151. (β) *The Author of the Epistle was a* JEW. This, as far as I know, has never been doubted. The degree of intimate acquaintance shewn with the ceremonial law might perhaps have been acquired by a Gentile convert: but the manner in which he addresses his readers, evidently themselves Jews, is such as to forbid the supposition that he was himself a Gentile. Probability is entirely against such an address being used: and also entirely against the Epistle finding acceptance, if it had been used.

152. (γ) He was, however, *not a pure Jew*, speaking and quoting Hebrew: but a HELLENIST: a Jew brought up in Greek habits of thought, and in the constant use of the LXX version. His citations are from that version, and he grounds his argument, or places his reason for citing, on the words and expressions of the LXX, even where no corresponding terms are found in the Hebrew text.

153. (δ) *He was one intimately acquainted with the way of thought, and writings of St. Paul.* I need not stay here to prove this. The elaborate tables which have been drawn up to prove the Pauline authorship are here very valuable to us, as we found them before in shewing the differences between the two writers. Dr. Davidson, Mr. Forster, or Bleek, in his perhaps more pertinent selections from the mass, will in a few minutes establish this to the satisfaction of any intelligent reader. That our Author has more especially used one portion of the writings of the great Apostle, and why, will come under our notice in a following section.

154. (ε) And, considering the probable date of the Epistle, which I shall by anticipation assume to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, such a degree of acquaintance with the thoughts and writings of St. Paul could hardly, at such a time, have been the result of mere reading, but must have been derived from *intimate acquaintance*, as a companion and fellow-labourer, *with the great Apostle himself.* The same inference is confirmed by finding that our author was nearly connected with Timotheus, the son in the faith, and constant companion of St. Paul.

155. (ζ) It is moreover necessary to assume, that the Author of our Epistle was *deeply imbued with the thoughts and phraseology of the Alexandrian school.* The coincidences in thought and language between passages of this Epistle and the writings of Philo, are such as no one in his senses can believe to be fortuitous. These will for the most part be found noticed in the references, and the Commentary: those who wish to see them collected together, may consult Bleek, vol. i. pp. 398—402 note, where other sources of information on the subject are also pointed out, especially Carpzov, Exercit. Sacr. in S. Pauli Epist. ad

stately period[6], nothing of the deep tinge, which would be visible even in narrative, of the threatening of judgment. Within the limits of the same heavenly inspiration prompting both, St. Luke is rather the careful and kindly depicter of the blessings of the covenant, our Writer rather the messenger from God to the wavering, giving them the blessing and the curse to choose between: St. Luke is rather the polished Christian civilian, our Writer the fervid and prophetic rhetorician. The places of the two are different: and it would shake our confidence in the consistency of human characteristics under the influence of the Holy Spirit, were we to believe Luke, the beloved Physician and Evangelist, to have become so changed, in the foundations and essentials of personal identity, as to have written this Epistle to the Hebrews.

165. If the preceding considerations have any weight, we must regard the coincidences above mentioned as the result of common education and manner of speech, and of common derivation of doctrine from the same personal source. St. Luke had derived his style from the same Alexandrine scholastic training, his doctrine from the same father in the faith, as the Writer of our Epistle.

166. It appears never to have been advanced as a serious hypothesis, that St. Mark is the Writer of our Epistle. There are no points of coincidence between it and his Gospel, which would lead us to think so. He does not appear, after St. Paul's second missionary journey, ever to have been closely joined for any considerable time in travel or in missionary work with that Apostle: and again, he seems to have been a born Jerusalem Jew (Acts xii. 12: see Prolegg. Vol. I. ch. iii. § i.), which, by what has been before said, would exclude him.

167. The fact that Silvanus, or Silas, belonged to the church at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22), would seem to exclude him also. In other points, our tests are satisfied by him. He was the constant companion of St. Paul: was imprisoned with him at Philippi (Acts xvi. 19 ff.), while Timotheus remained at large: is ever named by the Apostle before Timotheus (Acts xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5: 2 Cor. i. 19: 1 Thess. i. 1 · 2 Thess. i. 1): and afterwards is found in close connexion with St. Peter also (1 Pet. v. 12). It must be acknowledged, that as far as mere negative reasons are concerned, with only the one exception above named, there seems no cause why Silvanus may not have written our Epistle. But every thing approaching to a positive reason is altogether wanting. We know absolutely nothing of the man, his learning, his particular training, or the likelihood that he should have

[6] This remark especially applies to that portion of St. Luke's writings which would be sure by the merely superficial observer to be cited as furnishing an answer to it: viz. the prologue of his Gospel. No two styles can be more distinct, than that of this preface, and of any equally elaborated passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

given us such an Epistle as we now possess. His claim is (with that one reservation) unexceptionable: but it must retire before that of any who is recommended by positive considerations [6].

168. A far stronger array of names and claims is made out for CLEMENT OF ROME, one of the *συνεργοί* of St. Paul in Phil. iv. 3. We have seen above (par. 19), that his name was one brought down to Origen by the *φθάσασα εἰς ἡμᾶς ἱστορία*, together with that of St. Luke: we have found him mentioned as held by some to be the *translator*, e. g. by Euthalius (par. 46), Eusebius (par. 48): the author, by Philastrius (par. 65), Jerome (par. 69), al. This latter has in modern times been the opinion of Erasmus (par. 97), and of Calvin (par. 100).

169. We cannot pronounce with any certainty whether Clement was a Jew by birth or not. The probability is against such a supposition. The advocates of this theory however rest his claim mainly on the fact that many expressions and passages of our Epistle occur in the (undoubtedly genuine) Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians [7].

170. But to this it has been satisfactorily replied by Bleek and others, that such passages have much more the air of citations, than that of repetitions of the same thought and diction by their original author, and that they in fact in no wise differ from the many other reproductions of passages of the N. T., especially of St. Paul's Epistles, in the same letter of Clement. Bleek has besides directed attention to the great dissimilarity of the two writings, as indicating different authors. Clement's Epistle has nothing of the Alexandrine character, nothing of the speculative spirit, of that to the Hebrews. His style is pure and correct, but wants altogether the march of periods, and rhetorical rhythm, of our Epistle. Another objection is, that had Clement written it, there could hardly have failed some trace of a tradition to that effect in the church of Rome; which, as we have seen, is not found.

171. The idea that BARNABAS was the author of our Epistle seems to have been prevalent in the African church, seeing that Tertullian quotes him as such without any doubt or explanation (above, par. 25). But it was unknown to Origen, and to Eusebius: and Jerome, in his Catalog. c. 5, vol. ii. p. 838, says "*vel Barnabæ juxta Tertullianum*, vel Lucæ Evangelistæ juxta quosdam, vel Clementis" &c.: so that it is

[6] Mynster and Böhme, from different points of view, have held to Silvanus: the former, assuming that our Epistle was sent with that to the Galatians, and to the same churches: the latter, fancying a great resemblance between our Epistle and the first of St. Peter, and holding it to have been written under the superintendence of that Apostle: a supposition, I need not say, entirely untenable.

[7] Compare e. g. Clem. c. 17, with Heb. xi. 37: c. 36, with Heb. vi. 4; i. 3, 4, 7, 5: c. 12, with Heb. xi. 31: c. 45, with Heb. xi. 32—37: c. 19, with Heb. xii. 1, 2; &c. And see Lardner, vol. i. p. 84 ff.

probable that he recognized the notion as Tertullian's only. And we may fairly assume that Philastrius (par. 65) and others refer to the same source, and that this view is destitute of any other external support than that which it gets from the passage of Tertullian[8].

172. It must then, in common with the rest, stand or fall on internal grounds. And in thus judging of it, we have two alternatives before us. Either the extant Epistle of Barnabas is genuine, or it is not. In the former case, the question is soon decided. So different are the styles and characters of the two Epistles, so different also the view which they take of the Jewish rites and ordinances, that it is quite impossible to imagine them the work of the same writer. The Epistle of Barnabas maintains that the ceremonial commands were even at first uttered not in a literal but in a spiritual sense (cf. Ep. Barn. c. 9, p. 749 f., ed. Migne, and al. fr.): finds childish allusions, e.g. in Greek numerals, to spiritual truths (c. 9, p. 752: *λέγει γάρ· καὶ περιέτεμεν Ἀβρ. ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἄνδρας δέκα κ. ὀκτὼ κ. τριακοσίους. τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ γνῶσις; μάθετε τοὺς δεκαοκτὼ πρώτους, εἶτα τοὺς τριακοσίους. τὸ δὲ δέκα κ. ὀκτώ, ι' δέκα, η' ὀκτώ. ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν. ὅτι δὲ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ τ ἔμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν, λέγει καὶ τοὺς τριακοσίους*): is in its whole diction and character spiritless, and flat, and pointless. If any one imagines that the same writer could have indited both, then we are clearly out of the limits of ordinary reasoning and considerations of probability.

173. But we may take the other and more probable alternative: that the so-called Epistle of Barnabas is apocryphal. Judging then of Barnabas from what we know in the Acts, many particulars certainly seem to combine in favour of him. He was a Levite, not of Judæa, but of Cyprus (Acts iv. 36): he was intimately connected with St. Paul during the early part of the missionary journeys of that Apostle (Acts ix. 27; xv. 41), and in common with him was entrusted with the first ministry to the Gentiles (Acts xi. 22ff.; xv. 12 &c.: Gal. ii. 9 &c.): he was called by the Apostles *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως* (Acts iv. 36), which last word we have seen reason to interpret 'exhortation.'

174. These particulars are made the most of by Wieseler (Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters, pp. 504 ff.), as supporting what he considers the only certain tradition on the subject. But as we have seen this tradition itself fail, so neither will these stand under stricter examination. For Barnabas, though by birth a Cyprian, yet dwelt apparently at Jerusalem (Acts ix. 27; xi. 22): and there, by the context of the narrative, must the field have been situated, which he sold to put its price into the common stock. As a Levite, he must have been thoroughly acquainted with the usages of the Jerusalem temple, which, as before observed, our Writer does not appear to have been. It is

[8] It has been upheld in modern times by J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Twesten, Ullmann, Thiersch, Wieseler. On the last of these, see below, par. 174.

quite out of the question to suppose, as Wieseler does, that Barnabas, a Levite who had dwelt at Jerusalem, would, during a subsequent ministration in Egypt, have cited the usages of the temple at Leontopolis rather than those at Jerusalem. If such usages have been cited, it must be by an Egyptian Jew to whom Jerusalem was not familiar.

175. Perhaps too much has been made, on the other side, of the manifest inferiority of Barnabas to Paul in eloquence[9], and of the fact that as the history goes on in the Acts, the order becomes reversed, and from "Barnabas and Saul" or "Paul" (ch. xi. 30; xii. 25; xiii. 2, 7) we have "Paul and Barnabas" (ch. xiii. 43, 46, 50; xv. 2 bis, 22, 35, with only occasional intermixture of the old order, ch. xiv. 14; xv. 12, 25): Barnabas gradually becoming eclipsed by the eminence of his far greater colleague. For (1) it is very possible that eloquence of the pen, such as that in our Epistle, might not have been wanting to one who was very inferior to St. Paul in eloquence of the tongue: and (2) it was most natural, that in a history written by a companion of St. Paul, and devoted, in its latter portion at least, to the Acts of St. Paul, the name of the great Apostle should gradually assume that pre-eminence to which on other grounds it was unquestionably entitled.

176. It would appear then, that against the authorship by Barnabas there can only be urged in fairness the one objection arising from his residence at Jerusalem: which, on the hypothesis of the Epistle being addressed to the church at Jerusalem, would be a circumstance in his favour with reference to such expressions as the ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν, ch. xiii. 19, and the acquaintance with the readers implied throughout the Epistle. On the whole, it must be confessed, that this view comes nearest to satisfying the conditions of authorship of any that have as yet been treated; and should only be set aside, if one approaching nearer still can be found.

177. It remains that we enquire into the claims of the two remaining apostolic persons on our list, AQUILA and APOLLOS. The former of these, a Jew of Pontus by birth, was once, with his wife Priscilla, resident in Rome, but was found by St. Paul at Corinth on his first arrival there (Acts xviii. 2), having been compelled to quit the capital by a decree of Claudius. It is uncertain whether at that time he was a Christian; but if not, he soon after became one by the companionship of the Apostle, who took up his abode, and wrought at their common trade of tent-making, with Aquila and Priscilla. After this, Aquila became a zealous forwarder of the gospel. We find him (Acts xviii. 18) accompanying St. Paul to Ephesus, and in his company there when he wrote 1 Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19): again at Rome when the

[9] See Bleek, Einl. p. 419 f.

Epistle to the Romans was written (Rom. xvi. 3): at Ephesus again when 2 Tim. was written (2 Tim. iv. 19).

178. From these places it appears, that Aquila was a person of considerable importance among the brethren: that the church used to assemble in his house: that he and his wife Priscilla had exposed their lives for the gospel's sake. And from Acts xviii. 26 we find, that they were also well able to carry on the work of teaching, even with such a pupil as Apollos, who was mighty in the Scriptures.

179. It must be owned that these circumstances would constitute a fair *prima facie* case for Aquila, were it not for certain indications that he himself was rather the ready and zealous patron, than the teacher; and that this latter work, or a great share in it, seems to have belonged to his wife, Prisca or Priscilla. She is ever named with him, even Acts xviii. 26, where the instruction of Apollos is described: and not unfrequently, her name precedes his (Acts xviii. 18: Rom. xvi. 3: 2 Tim. iv. 19): an arrangement so contrary to the custom of antiquity, that some very sufficient reason must have existed for it. At all events, the grounds on which an hypothesis of Aquila's authorship of our Epistle would rest, must be purely of a negative kind, as far as personal capacity is concerned. And it does not appear that any, either in ancient or modern times, have fixed on him as its probable writer.

180. There is yet one name remaining, that of APOLLOS, in whom certainly more conditions meet than in any other man, both negative and positive, of the possible authorship of our Epistle. The language in which he is introduced in the Acts (xviii. 24) is very remarkable. He is there described as Ἰουδαῖός τις, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. Every word here seems fitted to point him out as the person of whom we are in search. He is a Jew, born in Alexandria: here we have at once two great postulates fulfilled: here we at once might account for the Alexandrian language of the Epistle, and for the uniform use of the LXX version, mainly (if this be so) in its Alexandrian form. He is an eloquent man (see note on λόγιος ad loc., Vol. II.), and mighty in the Scriptures. As we advance in the description, even minute coincidences seem to confirm our view that we are here at last on the right track. He is described as ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα τοῦ Ἰωάννου, but being more perfectly taught the way of the Lord by Aquila and Priscilla. No wonder then that a person so instituted should specify βαπτισμῶν διδαχή as one of the components in the θεμέλιον of the Christian life (Heb. vi. 2). It is described as his characteristic, that he ἤρξατο παρρησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ: is it wonderful then that he, of all N.T. writers, should exhort μὴ ἀποβάλητε τὴν παρρησίαν (Heb. x. 35), and declare to his readers that they were the house of Christ ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν . . . κατασχῶμεν (Heb. iii. 6)?

181. Nor, if we proceed to examine the further notices of him, does this first impression become weakened. In 1 Cor. i.—iv., we find him described by inference as most active and able, and only second to St. Paul himself in the church at Corinth. It would be difficult to select words which should more happily and exactly hit the relation of the Epistle to the Hebrews to the writings of St. Paul, than those of 1 Cor. iii. 6, ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα, Ἀπολλῶς ἐπότισεν. And the eloquence and rhetorical richness of the style of Apollos seems to have been exactly that, wherein his teaching differed from that of the Apostle. It is impossible to help feeling that the frequent renunciations, on St. Paul's part, of words of excellency or human wisdom, have reference, partly, it may be, to some exaggeration of Apollos' manner of teaching by his disciples, but also to some infirmity, in this direction, of that teacher himself. Cf. especially 2 Cor. xi. 3.

182. It is just this difference in style and rhetorical character, which, in this case elevated and chastened by the informing and pervading Spirit, distinguishes the present Epistle to the Hebrews from those of the great Apostle himself. And, just as it was not easy to imagine either St. Luke, or Clement, or Barnabas, to have written such an Epistle, so now we feel, from all the characteristics given us of Apollos in the sacred narrative, that if he wrote at all, it would be an Epistle precisely of this kind, both in contents, and in style.

183. For as to the former of these, the contents and argument of the Epistle, we have a weighty indication furnished by the passage in the Acts: εὐτόνως γὰρ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διακατηλέγχετο δημοσίᾳ, ἐπιδεικνὺς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. What words could more accurately describe, if not the very teaching itself, yet the opening of a course of argument likely, when the occasion offered, to lead to the teaching, of our Epistle?

184. Again, we seem to have found in Apollos just that degree of dependence on St. Paul which we require, combined with that degree of independence which the writer of our Epistle must have had. Instructed originally in the elements of the Christian faith by Aquila and Priscilla, he naturally received it in that form in which the great Apostle of the Gentiles especially loved to put it forth. His career however of Christian teaching began and was carried on at Corinth, without the personal superintendence of St. Paul; his line of arguing with and convincing the Jews did not, as St. Paul's, proceed on the covenant of justification by faith made by God with Abraham, but took a different direction, that namely of the eternal High-priesthood of Jesus, and the all-sufficiency of His one Sacrifice. Faith indeed with him occupies a place fully as important as that assigned to it by St. Paul: he does not however dwell on it mainly as the instrument of our justification before God, but as the necessary condition of approach to Him, and of

persistence in our place as partakers of the heavenly calling[1]. The teaching of this Epistle is not indeed in any particular inconsistent with, but neither is it dependent on, the teaching of St. Paul's Epistles.

185. We may advance yet further in our estimate of the probability of Apollos having written as we find the Author of this Epistle writing.

The whole spirit of the First Epistle to the Corinthians shews us, that there had sprung up in the Corinthian church a rivalry between the two modes of teaching; unaccompanied by, as it assuredly was not caused by, any rivalry between the teachers themselves, except in so far as was of necessity the case from the very variety of the manner of teaching. And while the one fact, of the rivalry between the teachings and their disciples, is undeniable, the other fact, that of absence of rivalry between the Teachers, is shewn in a very interesting manner. On the side of St. Paul, by his constant and honourable mention of Apollos as his second and helper: by Apollos, in the circumstance mentioned 1 Cor. xvi. 12, that St. Paul had exhorted him to accompany to Corinth the bearers of that Epistle, but that he could not prevail on him to go at that time: he only promised a future visit at some favourable opportunity. Here, if I mistake not, we see the generous confidence of the Apostle, wishing Apollos to go to Corinth and prove, in spite of what had there taken place, the unity of the two apostolic men in the faith: here too, which is important to our present subject, we have the self-denying modesty of Apollos, unwilling to incur even the chance of being set at the head of a party against the Apostle, or in any way to obtrude himself personally, where St. Paul had sown the seed, now that there had grown up, on the part of some in that Church, a spirit of invidious personal comparison between the two.

186. If we have interpreted aright this hint of the feeling of Apollos as regarded St. Paul; if, as we may well suppose in one *ζέοντι τῷ πνεύματι*, such a feeling was deeply implanted and continued to actuate him,—what more likely to have given rise to the semi-anonymous character of our present Epistle? He has no reason for strict concealment of himself, but he has a strong reason for not putting himself prominently forward. He does not open with announcing his name, or sending a blessing in his own person: but neither does he write through-

[1] The word *δικαιόω*, which occurs twenty-eight times in the Epistles of St. Paul, is not once found in the Epistle to the Hebrews: and the citation from Hab. ii. 4, *ὁ δίκαιός (μου) ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*, though it forms the common starting-point for St. Paul, Rom. i. 17, and the Writer of our Epistle, ch. x. 38, leads them in totally different directions: St. Paul, to unfold the doctrine of *righteousness by faith;* our Writer, to celebrate the triumphs of the *life of faith.*

out as one who means to be unknown: and among the personal notices at the end, he makes no secret of circumstances and connexions, which would be unintelligible, unless the readers were going along with a writer personally known to them. And thus the two-sided phænomena of our Epistle, utterly inexplicable as they have ever been on the hypothesis of Pauline authorship or superintendence, would receive a satisfactory explanation.

187. It will be plainly out of place to object, that this explanation would only hold, on the hypothesis that our Epistle was addressed to the Jews *at Corinth*. The same spirit of modest self-abnegation would hardly, after such an indication of it, be wanting in Apollos, to whatever church he was writing. But I reserve it for the next section to enquire how far this view is confirmed or impugned by our conclusion as to the church to which the Epistle was, in all probability, originally addressed [2].

188. The history of the hypothesis that Apollos was the author of our Epistle, has been given by implication, from the time of Luther, its apparent originator, above in parr. 98—108. It may be convenient to give here, in one conspectus, the principal names in its favour: Luther, Osiander, Le Clerc, Heumann (1711), Lorenz Müller (1717), Semler, Ziegler, Dindorf, Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, the R.-Catholics Feilmoser and Lutterbeck (the latter with this modification, that he believes St. Paul to have written the 9 last verses, and the rest to have been composed by Apollos in union with St. Luke, Clement, and other companions of the Apostle),—De Wette, Lünemann.

189. The objection which is commonly set against these probabilities is, that we have no ecclesiastical tradition pointing to Apollos: that it is unreasonable to suppose that the church to which the Epistle was sent should altogether have lost all trace of the name of an author who must have been personally known to them. This has been strongly urged, and by some, e. g. Mr. Forster, regarded as a ground for attempting to laugh to scorn the hypothesis, as altogether unworthy of serious consideration [3].

190. But if any student has carefully followed the earlier paragraphs of this section, he will be fully prepared to meet such an objection, and will not be deterred from the humble search after truth by such scorn. He will remember how we shewed the failure of every attempt to establish a satisfactory footing for any view of the authorship as being the tradition of the church: and proved that, with regard to any research into the subject, we of this day approach it as those of old did in their day, with full liberty to judge from the data furnished by the Epistle itself.

[2] See below, § ii. par. 36.
[3] Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, preface, pp. ix, x.

191. And he will also bear in mind, that the day is happily passing away with Biblical writers and students, when the strong language of those, who were safe in the shelter of a long-prescribed and approved opinion, could deter any from humble and faithful research into the various phænomena of God's word itself: when the confession of having found insoluble difficulties was supposed to indicate unsoundness of faith, and the recognition of discrepancies was regarded as affecting the belief of divine inspiration. We have at last in this country begun to learn, that Holy Scripture shrinks not from any tests, however severe, and requires not any artificial defences, however apparently expedient.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. That the book before us is an *Epistle*, not a homily or treatise, is too plain to require more than a passing assertion. Its personal and circumstantial notices are inseparable from it, and the language is throughout epistolary, as far as the nature of the subject would permit.

2. And it is almost equally plain, that it is an Epistle *addressed* to JUDÆO-CHRISTIANS. The attempt to dispute this [4] must be regarded rather as a curiosity of literature, than as worthy of serious attention. The evidence of the whole Epistle goes to shew, that the readers had been Jews, and were in danger of apostatizing back into Judaism again. Not a syllable is found of allusions to their conversion from the alienation of heathenism, such as frequently occur in St. Paul's Epistles: but every where their original covenant state is assumed, and the fact of that covenant having been amplified and superseded by a better one is insisted on.

3. If then it was written to Judæo-Christians, on whom are we to think as its intended recipients?

4. *Was it addressed to the whole body of such converts throughout the world?* This view has found some few respectable names to defend it [5]. But it cannot be seriously entertained. The Epistle assumes throughout a local habitation, and a peculiar combination of circumstances, for those who are addressed: and concludes, not only with greetings from

[4] Lünemann refers to Röth, "Epistolam vulgo ad Hebræos inscriptam non ad Hebr. i. e. Christianos genere Judæos, sed ad Christianos genere Gentiles et quidem ad Ephesios datum esse" (Francf. a. M. 1836).

[5] So the Schol. in one of Matthæi's codices: γράφει . . . . πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύσασιν Ἑβραίοις: so Euthal., Œc., Braun, Baumgarten, Heinrichs, Schwegler, and our own Lightfoot, Harmony, i. p. 340.

οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας, but with an expressed intention of the Writer to visit those addressed, in company with Timotheus; which would be impossible on this œcumenical hypothesis.

5. If then we are to choose some one church, the first occurring to us is the *mother church at Jerusalem*, perhaps united with the daughter churches in Palestine. And this, in one form or other, has been the usual opinion: countenanced by many phænomena in the Epistle itself. At and near Jerusalem, it is urged, (α) would that attachment to the temple-worship be found which seems to be assumed on the part of the readers: there again (β) were the only examples of churches almost purely Judaic in their composition: there only (γ) would such allusions as that to going forth to suffer with Christ ἔξω τῆς πύλης (ch. xiii. 12) be understood and appreciated.

6. But these arguments are by no means weighty, much less decisive. For (α) we do not find any signs in our Epistle that its readers were to be persons who had the temple-service before their eyes; the Writer refers much more to his LXX, than to any existing practices: and men with their Bibles in their hands might well have been thus addressed, even if they had never witnessed the actual ceremonies themselves. Besides which, all Jews were supposed to be included in the temple-rites, wherever dwelling, and would doubtless be quite as familiar with them as there can be any reason here for assuming. And again, even granting the ground of the argument, its inference is not necessary, for there was another Jewish temple at Leontopolis in Egypt, wherein the Mosaic ordinances were observed.

7. With regard to (β), it may well be answered, that such an exclusively Jewish church, as would be found in Palestine only, is not required for the purposes of our Epistle. It is beyond question that the Epistle of St. James was written to Jewish Christian converts; yet it is expressly addressed to the dispersion *outside* Palestine, who must every where have been mingled with their Gentile brethren. Besides, it has been well remarked[6], that the Epistle itself leads to no such assumption of an exclusively Jewish church. It might have been sent to a church in which both Jews and Gentiles were mingled, *in mediam rem*, to find its own readers: and such an idea is countenanced by the ἐξερχώμεθα κ.τ.λ., ch. xiii. 13, compared with the μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, ch. x. 25. It has been well shewn by Riehm[7], that our Writer's whole procedure as concerns Gentile Christians can only be accounted for by his regarding the Jewish people,—τὸν λαόν, or τὸν λαὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ch. ii. 17; iv. 9; xiii. 12,—σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, ch. ii. 16,

[6] By Holzmann, on Schneckenburger über den Hebräerbrief, in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1859, part ii.; an article to which I have been indebted for several suggestions on this part of my subject.

[7] Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes, Ludwigsburg 1858, pp. 168–172.

—as the primary stock, into which all other men were to be engrafted for the purposes of salvation: as a theocratic rather than a physical development. For that the Lord Jesus tasted death ὑπὲρ παντός, is as undeniably his doctrine.

8. The argument (γ) is evidently not decisive. Wherever there were Jews, priding themselves on their own nationality, and acquainted with the facts of our Lord's death, such an exhortation might be used. The type is derived from the usage of the tabernacle; the antitype, from a known historical fact: the exhortation is, as explained by Theodoret (see note on ch. xiii. 13), to come forth out of the then legal polity of Judaism, content to bear the reproach accruing in consequence: all of which would be as applicable any where, as in Palestine, or at Jerusalem.

9. There seems then to be at least *no necessity* for adopting Jerusalem or Palestine as containing the readers to whom our Epistle was addressed. But on the other hand there are reasons against such an hypothesis, of more or less weight. These I will state, not in order of their importance, but as they most naturally occur.

10. The language and style of our Epistle, if it was addressed to Jews in Jerusalem or Palestine, is surely unaccountable. For, although Greek was commonly spoken in Palestine, yet on the one hand no writer who wished to obtain a favourable hearing with Jews there on matters regarding their own religion, would choose Greek as the medium of his communication (cf. Acts xxii. 2). And the Gospel of St. Matthew is no case in point: for whatever judgment we may form respecting the original language of our present Gospel, there can be no doubt that the apostolic oral teaching, on which our first three Gospels are founded, was originally extant in Aramaic: whereas it is impossible to suppose the Epistle to the Hebrews a translation, or originally extant in any other tongue than Greek. And, on the other hand, not only is our Epistle Greek, but it is such Greek, as necessarily presupposes some acquaintance with literature, some practice not merely in the colloquial, but in the scholastic Greek, of the day. And this surely was as far as possible from being the case with the churches of Jerusalem and Palestine.

11. A weighty pendant to the same objection is found in the unvarying use of the LXX version by our Writer, even, as in ch. i. 6; ii. 7; x. 5, where it differs from the Hebrew text. "How astonishing is this circumstance," says Wieseler (ii. p. 497), "if he was writing to inhabitants of Palestine, with whom the LXX had no authority!"

12. Another objection is, that it is not possible to conceive either of St. Paul himself or of any of his companions, that they should have stood in such a relation to the Jerusalem or Palestine churches, as we find subsisting between the Writer of our Epistle and his readers. To

suppose such a relation in the case of the Apostle himself, is to cut ourselves loose from all the revealed facts of his course, and suppose a totally new mind to have sprung up in Jerusalem towards him. And least of all his companions could such a relation have subsisted in the case of Apollos and Timotheus; at least for many years, far more than history will allow, after the speech of St. James in Acts xxi. 20.

13. Connected with this last difficulty would be the impossibility, on the hypothesis now in question, of giving any satisfactory meaning to the notice in ch. xiii. 24, ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. If the Writer was, as often supposed, in Rome, how unnatural to specify the *Jews residing there* by this name! if in Italy, how unnatural again that he should send greeting from Christian Jews so widely scattered, thereby depriving the salutation of all reality! If again he was not in Rome nor in Italy, what reason can be suggested for his sending an especial salutation to Jews in Palestine from some present with him who happened to be from Italy? The former of these three suppositions is perhaps the least unlikely: but the least unlikely, how unlikely!

14. Again, the historical notices in our Epistle do not fit the hypothesis in question. The great notice of ch. ii. 3, would be strictly true of any church rather than that of Jerusalem, or those in Palestine generally. At any date that can reasonably be assigned for our Epistle (see below, § iii.), there must have been many living in those churches, who had heard the Lord for themselves. And though it may be said that they had, properly speaking, received the *tidings of salvation* from those that heard Him, yet such a body, among whom Jesus Himself had lived and moved in the flesh, would surely not be one of which to predicate the words in the text so simply and directly. Rather should we look for one of which they might be from the first and without controversy true.

15. Another historical notice is found ch. vi. 10, διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες, which would be less applicable to the churches of Jerusalem and Palestine, than to any others. For it was they who were the *objects*, not the subjects of this διακονία, throughout the ministry of St. Paul: and certainly from what we know of their history, their situation did not improve after that Apostle's death. This διακονία εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους was a duty enjoined by him on the churches of Galatia (1 Cor. xvi. 1: Rom. xv. 26), Macedonia, and Achaia, and doubtless by implication on other churches also (see Rom. xii. 13): the ἅγιοι being *the poor saints at Jerusalem*. And though, as Schneckenburger replies to this, some of the Jerusalem Christians may have been wealthy, and able to assist their poorer brethren, yet we must notice that the διακονία here is predicated not of some among them, but of

the church, as such, in general: which could not be said of the church in Jerusalem.

16. There are some notices, on which no stress can be laid either way, as for, or as against, the claim of the Jerusalem church. Such are, that found ch. xii. 4, which in the note there we have seen reason to apply rather to the figure there made use of, than to any concrete fact assignable in history: and that in ch. v. 12, which manifestly must not be taken to imply that no teachers had at that time proceeded from the particular church addressed, but that its members in general were behind what might have been expected of them in spiritual knowledge.

17. It may again be urged, that the absence, no less than the presence of historical allusions, makes against the hypothesis. If the Epistle were addressed to the church at Jerusalem, it seems strange that no allusion should be made in it to the fact that our Lord Himself had lived and taught among them in the flesh, had before their eyes suffered death on the Cross, had found among them the first witnesses of His Resurrection and Ascension [8].

18. If then we cannot fit our Epistle to the very widely spread assumption that it was addressed to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem and Palestine, we must obviously put to the test, in search of its original readers, the various other churches which came within the working of St. Paul and his companions. Of many of these, which have in turn become the subjects of hypotheses, it is hardly necessary to give more than a list. Wall believed the Epistle to have been written to the Hebrew Christians of Proconsular Asia, Macedonia, and Greece: Sir I. Newton, Bolten, and Bengel, to Jews who had left Jerusalem on account of the war, and were settled in Asia Minor: Credner, to those in Lycaonia: Storr, Mynster, and Rinck, to those in Galatia: Lyra and Ludwig, to those in Spain: Semler and Nösselt, to those in Thessalonica: Böhme, to those in Antioch: Stein, to those in Laodicea (see the citation from Philastrius in § i. 65, and note): Röth, to those in Antioch: Baumgarten-Crusius, to those at Ephesus and Colossæ.

19. Several of these set out with the assumption of a Pauline authorship: and none of them seems to fulfil satisfactorily any of the main conditions of our problem. If it was to any one of these bodies of Jews that the Epistle was addressed, we know so little about any one of them, that the holding of such an opinion on our part can only be founded on the vaguest and wildest conjecture. To use arguments against such hypotheses, would be to fight with mere shadows.

[8] So Köstlin, in the Theologischer Jahrbücher for 1854, p. 371, cited in Holzmann's article before referred to, p. 295.

20. But there are *three churches* yet remaining which will require more detailed discussion: CORINTH, ALEXANDRIA, and ROME. The reason for including the former of these in this list, rather than in the other, is, that on the view that Apollos was the Writer, the church in which he so long and so effectively laboured seems to have a claim to be considered.

21. But the circumstances of the Jewish portion of the church at CORINTH were not such as to justify such an hypothesis. It does not appear to have been of sufficient importance in point of numbers: nor can the *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη* of ch. ii. 3 have been asserted of them, seeing that they owed their conversion to the ministry of St. Paul.

22. ALEXANDRIA is maintained by Schmidt and Wieseler to have been the original destination of the Epistle. There, it is urged, were the greatest number of resident Jews, next to Jerusalem: there, at Leontopolis in Egypt, was another temple, with the arrangements of which the notices in our Epistle more nearly correspond than with those in Jerusalem[9]: from thence the Epistle appears first to have come forth to the knowledge of the church. Add to which, the canon of Muratori (see above, § i. 31) speaks of an Epistle "ad Alexandrinos," which may probably designate our present Epistle. Besides all this, the Alexandrine character of the language, and treatment of subjects in the Epistle, and manner of citation, are urged, as pointing to Alexandrine readers.

23. And doubtless there is some weight in these considerations: enough, in the mere balance of probabilities, to cause us to place this hypothesis far before all others which have as yet been treated. Still there are some circumstances to be taken into account, which rather weaken its probability. One of these is that, various as are the notices of the Epistle from early Alexandrine writers, we find no hint of its having been addressed to their own church, no certain tradition concerning its author. Another arises from the absence of all positive history of the church there in apostolic times, by which we might try, and verify, the few historic notices occurring in the Epistle. Indeed as far as the more personal of those notices are concerned, the same objections lie against Alexandria, as have before been urged against Palestine: the difficulty of assigning a reason for the salutation from *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας*, and of imagining, within the limits which must be set to the date of the Epistle, any such relation of Timotheus to the readers, as is supposed in ch. xiii. 23.

24. These objections would lead us, at all events, to pass on to the end of our list before we attempt to pronounce on the preponderance of

[9] See this argued in detail in Wieseler, pp. 498 ff.

probability, and take into consideration the claims of ROME herself. These were in part put forward by Wetstein [1], and have more recently been urged in Holzmann's article on Schneckenburger in the Studien u. Kritiken for 1859, pt. 2, pp. 297 ff.

25. They may be briefly explained to be these: (1) The fact of the church at Rome being just such an one, in its origin and composition, as this Epistle seems to presuppose. It has been already seen (par. 7) that when, as we are compelled, we give up the idea of its having been addressed to a church exclusively consisting of Judæo-Christians, we necessarily are referred to one in which the Jewish believers formed a considerable portion, and that the primary stock and nucleus, of the church. Now this seems to have been the case at Rome, from the indications furnished us in the Epistle to the Romans. "The Jew first, and also the Gentile," is a note frequently struck in that Epistle: and the Church at Rome seems to be the only one of those with which St. Paul had been concerned, which would entirely answer to such a description.

26. (2) The great key to the present question, the historical notice ch. ii. 3, fits exceedingly well the circumstances of the church of Rome. That church had arisen, not from the preaching of any Apostle among them, but from a confluence of primitive believers, the first having arrived there probably not long after our Lord's Ascension: see Acts ii. 10. In Rom. i. 8, written in all probability in the year 58 A.D., St. Paul states, ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ: and in xvi. 19, ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο: the inferences from which, and their proper limitation, I have discussed in the Prolegomena to that Epistle, Vol. II. § ii. 2. γ. And in Rom. xvi. 7, we find a salutation to Andronicus and Junius, Jews (see note there) οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἳ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν χριστῷ. So that here we have a church, the only one of all those with which St. Paul and his companions were concerned, of which it could be said, that the gospel ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων (τὸν κύριον) εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη: the Apostle himself not having arrived there till long after such βεβαίωσις had taken place.

27. Again (3) it was in Rome, and Rome principally, that Judaistic Christianity took its further development and forms of error: it was there, not in Jerusalem and Palestine, that at this time the διδαχαὶ ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι, against which the readers are warned, ch. xiii. 9, were springing up. "As soon as the gloom of the earliest history begins to

[1] N. T. vol. ii. p. 386 f.: "Si conjecturæ locus est, existimaverim potius ad Judæos qui Romæ degebant et Christo nomen dederant scriptam fuisse: quo admisso facile intelligimus qui factum, tum ut Paulus, qui Roma quidem sed non Italia excedere jussus erat, brevi se rediturum speraret, tum ut Itali Romanos salutarent, tum denique ut Clemens Romanus frequenter illa uteretur."

clear a little, we find face to face at Rome Valentinians and Marcionites, Praxeas and the Montanists (Proclus), Hegesippus and the Elcesaites, Justin, and Polycarp. Here it was that there arose in the second half of the second century the completest exposition of theosophic Judaism, the Clementines, the literary memorial of a manœuvre which had for its aim the absorption of the whole Roman Church into Judæo-Christianity[2]." We have glimpses of the beginning of this state of Judaistic development even in St. Paul's lifetime, at two distinct periods; when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, cir. A.D. 58, cf. Rom. xiv. xv. to ver. 13,—and later, in that to the Philippians, cir. A.D. 63 (see Prolegg. Vol. III. § ii. 5): cf. Phil. i. 14—17: again in the bitterness conveyed in βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν, and the following verses, Phil. iii. 2 ff.

28. It is also to be remarked (4) that the personal notices found in our Epistle agree remarkably well with the hypothesis that it was addressed to the church at Rome. The information respecting Timotheus could not come amiss to those who had been addressed ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργός μου, Rom. xvi. 21; who had been accustomed to the companionship of Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος among them, Phil. i. 1: Col. i. 1: Philem. 1: and the ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας of ch. xiii. 24 receives a far more likely interpretation than that conceded as possible above, § i. 126, if we believe the Writer to be addressing his Epistle from some place where were present with him Christians from Italy, who would be desirous of sending greeting to their brethren at home. If he was writing e. g. at Alexandria, or at Ephesus, or at Corinth, such a salutation would be very natural. And thus we should be giving to οἱ ἀπό its most usual N. T. meaning, of persons who *have come from* the place indicated: cf. οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων, Matt. xv. 1; οἱ ἀπὸ Κιλικίας κ. Ἀσίας, Acts vi. 9; οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰόππης, ib. x. 23. Even Bleek, who holds our Epistle to have been addressed to the church in Palestine, takes this view, and assigns as its place of writing, Ephesus or Corinth. But then, what sense would it have, to send greeting to Palestine from οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας?

29. Another set of important notices which this hypothesis will illustrate is found, where past persecution, and the death of eminent men in the church, are alluded to. These have ever presented, on the Palestine view, considerable difficulties. Any assignment of them to known historical occurrences would put them far too early for any probable date of our Epistle: and it has been felt that the deaths by martyrdom of St. Stephen, St. James the Great, and the like, were far from satisfying the τὴν ἔκβασιν τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, which they were commanded to consider: and though the time during which the Epistle

[2] Holzmann, ut supra, p. 299.

must have reached Jerusalem was indeed one of great and unexampled trouble and disorganization, we know of no general persecution of Christians as such, since that which arose on account of Stephen, which was hardly likely to have been in the Writer's mind.

30. But on the Roman hypothesis, these passages are easily explained. About 49 or 50, Claudius "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes, Roma expulit" (Sueton. Claud. c. 25). This time may well be alluded to by the ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας of ch. x. 32; for under the blundering expression "*impulsore Chresto tumultuantes*" it is impossible not to recognize troubles sprung from the rising of the Jews against the Christian converts. Thus also will the τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε receive a natural interpretation, as imprisonments and trials would necessarily have accompanied these "*assiduos tumultus,*" before the final step of expulsion took place; and the τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε may be easily understood, either as a result of the tumults themselves, or of the expulsion, in which they had occasion to test their knowledge that they had for themselves κρείσσονα ὕπαρξιν καὶ μένουσαν.

31. It is true there are some particulars connected with this passage, which do not seem so well to fit that earlier time of trouble, as the Neronian persecution nearly fifteen years after. The only objection to taking that event as the one referred to, would be the expression τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, and the implication conveyed in ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες . . . ὑπεμείνατε: considering that we cannot go beyond the destruction of Jerusalem, at the latest eight years after, for the date of our Epistle. Still it is not impossible that both these expressions might be used. A time of great peril passed away might be thus alluded to, even at the distance of five or six years: and it might well be, that the majority of the Roman Jewish Christians had become converts during the immediately preceding imprisonment of St. Paul, and by his means.

32. On this supposition, still more light is thrown on this passage, and on the general tenor of the martyrology in the eleventh chapter. Thus the πολλὴ ἄθλησις παθημάτων is fully justified: thus, the ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι, which finds almost an echo in the "*pereuntibus addita ludibria*" of Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44, and is so exactly in accord, when literally taken, with the cruel exposures and deaths in the circus. The δέσμιοι and the ἁρπαγή too, on this supposition, would be matters of course. And I own, notwithstanding the objection stated above, that all this seems to fit the great Neronian persecution, and in the fullest sense, that only.

33. To that period also may we refer the notice in ch. xiii. 7, μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν. It

may be indeed, that this refers simply to a natural death in the faith of Christ: but it is far more probable, from the ἀναθεωροῦντες, and the μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν, that it points to death by martyrdom; πίστις having been so strongly illustrated in ch. xi., as bearing up under torments and death.

34. On this hypothesis, several other matters seem also to fall into place. The γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον may well refer to the termination of some imprisonment of Timotheus consequent upon the Neronian persecution, from which perhaps the death of the tyrant liberated him. Where this imprisonment took place, must be wholly uncertain. I shall speak of the conjectural probabilities of the place indicated by ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται, when I come to treat of the time and place of writing[3].

35. The use evidently made in our Epistle of the Epistle to the Romans, above all other of St. Paul's[4], will thus also be satisfactorily accounted for. Not only was the same church addressed, but the Writer had especially before him the matter and language of that Epistle, which was written in all probability from Corinth, the scene of the labours of Paul and Apollos.

36. The sort of semi-anonymous character of our Epistle, already treated of when we ascribed the authorship to Apollos, will also come in here, as singularly in accord with the circumstances of the case, and with the subsequent tradition as regards the Epistle, in case it was addressed to the church in Rome. Supposing, as we have gathered from the notices of Apollos in 1 Cor., that he modestly shrunk from being thought to put himself into rivalry with St. Paul, and that after the death of the Apostle he found it necessary to write such an Epistle as this to the Church in the metropolis, what more likely step would he take with regard to his own name and personality in it, than just that which we find has been taken: viz. so to conceal these, as to keep them from having any prominence, while by various minute personal notices he prevents the concealment from being complete? And with regard to the relation evidently subsisting between the Writer and his readers, all we can say is that, in defect of positive knowledge on this head connecting Apollos with the church at Rome, it is evidently in the metropolis, of all places, where such a relation may most safely be

[3] See below, § iii. 4.

[4] This has been noticed by many; and may be established by the student for himself by consulting those Commentators and writers, who have drawn up tables of verbal coincidence with a view of proving the Pauline authorship. There is reason for thinking that the peculiar form of the quotation ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω in ch. x. 30, agreeing neither with the Hebrew text of Deut. xxxii. 35, nor with the LXX there, is owing to its having been taken direct from Rom. xii. 19. And the whole form of exhortation in our ch. xiii. 1—6, reminds us forcibly of that in Rom. xii. 1—21. See also Rom. xiv. 17, as compared with Heb. xiii. 9, in § iv. 1, note.

assumed. There a teacher, whose native place was Alexandria, and who had travelled to Ephesus and Corinth, was pretty sure to have been: there many of his Christian friends would be found: there alone, in the absence of positive testimony, could we venture to place such a cycle of dwelling and teaching, as would justify the ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν of our ch. xiii. 19: in the place whither was a general confluence of all, and where there is ample room for such a course after the decease of St. Paul.

37. And what more likely fate to befall the Epistle in this respect, than just that which did befall it in the Roman church: viz. that while in that church, and by a contemporary of Apollos, Clement, we find the first use made of our Epistle, and that the most familiar and copious use,—its words are never formally cited, nor is any author's name attached? And was not this especially likely to be the case, as Clement was writing to the Corinthians, the very church where the danger had arisen of a rivalry between the fautors of the two teachers?

38. And as time goes on, the evidence for this hypothesis seems to gather strength, in the nature of the traditions respecting the authorship of our Epistle. While in Africa and the East they are most various and inconsistent with one another, and the notion of a Pauline origin is soon suggested, and gains rapid acceptance, it is in the church of Rome alone, and among those influenced by her, that we find an ever steady and unvarying assertion, that it *was not written by St. Paul.* By whom it *was* written, none ventured to say. How weighty the reasons may have been, which induced silence on this point, we have now lost the power of appreciating. The fact only is important for us, that the few personal notices which occur in it were in course of time overborne, as indications of its author, by the prevalent anonymous character: and that the same church which possessed as its heritage the most illustrious of St. Paul's own Epistles, was ever unanimous in disclaiming, on the part of the Apostle of the Gentiles, the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

39. The result of the above enquiry may be shortly stated. As the current of popular opinion in the church has gradually set in towards the Pauline authorship, inferring that a document at first sight so Pauline must have proceeded from the Apostle himself: so has it also set in towards the church at Jerusalem as the original readers, inferring that the title πρὸς Ἑβραίους must be thus interpreted. But as in the one case, so in the other, the general popular opinion does not bear examination. As the phænomena of the Epistle do not bear out the idea of the Pauline authorship, so neither do they that of being addressed to the Palestine churches. And as in the other case there is *one man*, when we come to search and conjecture, pointed out as most

likely to have written the Epistle, so here, when we pursue the same process, there is *one place* pointed out, to which it seems most likely to have been addressed. At Rome, such a Church existed as is indicated in it: at Rome, above all other places, its personal and historical notices are satisfied: at Rome, we find it first used: at Rome only, is there an unanimous and unvarying negative tradition regarding its authorship. To ROME then, until stronger evidence is adduced, we believe it to have been originally written.

SECTION III.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. Almost all Commentators agree in believing that our Epistle was written *before the destruction of Jerusalem.* And rightly: for if that great break-up of the Jewish polity and religious worship had occurred, we may fairly infer that some mention of such an event would have been found in an argument, the scope of which is to shew the transitoriness of the Jewish priesthood and the Levitical ceremonies. It would be inconceivable, that such an Epistle should be addressed to Jews after their city and temple had ceased to exist.

2. This then being assumed, as our 'terminus ad quem,' i. e. A.D. 70, or at the latest assigned date, 72, it remains to seek for a 'terminus a quo.' Such would appear to me to be fixed by *the death of St. Paul:* but inasmuch as (1) this would not be recognized either by the advocates of the Pauline authorship, or by those who believe that the Epistle, though possibly written by another, was superintended by the Apostle, and seeing (2) that the date of that event itself is wholly uncertain, it will be necessary to look elsewhere for some indication. And the only traces of one will, I conceive, be found by combining several hints furnished by the Epistle. Such are, (α) that the *first generation,* of those who had seen and heard the Lord, was at all events nearly *passed away:* (β) that *the first leaders of the church had died,* probably under the persecution elsewhere alluded to: (γ) that *Timotheus* had *been imprisoned,* and was then *set free,* probably in connexion with that same persecution. If these notices are to be taken, as maintained above (§ ii. 31 ff.), to apply to the Neronian persecution, then the Epistle cannot have been written till some considerable time after that, in order to justify the expression ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας of our ch. x. 32. Now that persecution broke out in 64, and lasted four years, i. e. till Nero's death in 68. And I may notice, that even those who are far from adopting the views here advocated as to the Author and readers of the Epistle, yet consider, that the liberation of Timotheus

may well have been connected with the cessation of the Neronian persecution.

3. If we follow these indications, we shall get the year 68 as our 'terminus a quo,' and the *time* of writing the Epistle will be 68—70, i. e. during the siege of Jerusalem by the armies of Titus, to which we may perhaps discern an allusion in ch. xiii. 14, *οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν.*

4. With regard to the *place* of writing, we are almost entirely in the dark. Taking the usual N. T. sense, above maintained, for *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας*,—'persons whose home is in Italy, but who are now here,'—it *cannot have been written in Italy*. Nor is Apollos (for when we are left, as now, to the merest conjecture, it is necessary to shape our course by assuming our own hypothesis) likely, after what had happened, again to be found fixed at Corinth. Jerusalem, and indeed Palestine, would be precluded by the Jewish war then raging; Ephesus is possible, and would be a not unlikely resort of Timotheus after his liberation (ch. xiii. 23), as also of Apollos at any time (Acts xviii. 24): Alexandria, the native place of Apollos, is also possible, though the *ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται*, applied to Timotheus, would not so easily fit it, as on his liberation he would be more likely to go to some parts with which he was familiar than to Alexandria where he was a stranger. In both these cities there may well have been *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας* sojourning: and this very phrase seems to point to some place of considerable resort. On the whole then, I should incline to EPHESUS, as the most probable place of writing: but it must be remembered that on this head all is in the realm of the vaguest conjecture.

SECTION IV.

OCCASION, OBJECT OF WRITING, AND CONTENTS.

1. The occasion which prompted this Epistle evidently was, the enmity of the Jews to the gospel of Christ, which had brought a double danger on the church: on the one hand that of persecution, on the other that of apostasy. Between these lay another, that of mingling with a certain recognition of Jesus as the Christ, a leaning to Jewish practices and valuing of Jewish ordinances. But this latter does not so much appear in our Epistle, as in those others which were written by St. Paul to mixed churches; those to the Romans[5], the Galatians, the

[5] One remarkable trace we have of allusion to this form of error,—in its further development, as appears by the verdict of past experience which is appended, but otherwise singularly resembling a passage in the Epistle to the Romans (xiv. 17, *οὐ*

Colossians. The principal peril to which Jewish converts were exposed, especially after they had lost the guidance of the Apostles themselves in their various churches, was, that of falling back from the despised following of Jesus of Nazareth into the more compact and apparently safer system of their childhood, which moreover they saw tolerated as a *religio licita,* while their own was outcast and proscribed.

2. The object then of this Epistle is, to shew them the superiority of the gospel to the former covenant: and that mainly by exhibiting, from the Scriptures, and from the nature of the case, the superiority of Jesus Himself to both the messengers and the high-priests of that former covenant. This is the main argument of the Epistle, filled out and illustrated by various corollaries springing out of its different parts, and expanding in the directions of encouragement, warning, and illustration.

3. This argument is entered on at once without introduction in ch. i., where Christ's superiority to the angels, the mediators of the old covenant, is demonstrated from Scripture. Then, having interposed (ii. 1—4) a caution on the greater necessity of taking heed to the things which they had heard, the Writer shews (ii. 5—18) why He to whom, and not to the angels, the future world is subjected, yet was made lower than the angels: viz. that He might become our merciful and faithful High Priest, to deliver and to save us, Himself having undergone temptation like ourselves.

4. Having mentioned this title of Christ, he goes back, and prepares the way for its fuller treatment, by a comparison of Him with Moses (iii. 1—6), and a shewing that that antitypical rest of God, from which unbelief excludes, was not the rest of the seventh day, nor that of the possession of Canaan, but one yet reserved for the people of God (iii. 7—iv. 10), into which we must all the more strive to enter, because the word of our God is keen and searching in judgment, and nothing hidden from His sight, with whom we have to do (iv. 11—13).

5. He now resumes the main consideration of his great subject, the High-priesthood of Christ, with a hortatory note of passage (iv. 14—16). This subject he pursues through the whole middle portion of the Epistle (v. 1—x. 18), treating it in its various aspects and requirements. Of these we have (v. 1—10) the conditions of High-priesthood: (v. 11—vi. 20) a digression complaining, with reference to the difficult subject of the Melchisedek-priesthood, of their low state of spiritual attainment, warning them of the necessity of progress, but encouraging them by God's faithfulness: (vii. 1—x. 18) the

γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις κ. πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη κ. εἰρήνη κ. χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ), in our ch. xiii. 9, *καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες.*

priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchisedek, in its distinction from the Levitical priesthood (see the various steps set forth in the headings in the commentary), as perpetual,—as superior, in that Abraham acknowledged himself inferior to Melchisedek,—as having power of endless life,—as constituted with an oath,—as living for ever,—as without sin,—as belonging to the heavenly sanctuary, and to a covenant promised by God Himself:—as consisting in better ministrations, able to purify the conscience itself, and to put away sin by the one Sacrifice of the Son of God.

6. Having thus completed his main argument, he devotes the concluding portion (x. 19—xiii. 25) to a series of solemn exhortations to endurance in confidence and patience, and illustrations of that faith on which both must be founded. In x. 19—39, we have exhortation and warning deduced from the facts lately proved, our access to the heavenly place, and our having a great High-priest over the house of God: then by the Pauline citation ὁ δίκαιός (μου) ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, a transition note is struck to ch. xi. which entirely consists in a panegyric of faith and a recounting of its triumphs: on a review of which the exhortation to run the race set before us, and endure chastisement, is again taken up, ch. xii. And the same hortatory strain is pursued to the end of the Epistle; the glorious privileges of the Christian covenant being held forth, and the awful peril of forfeiting them by apostasy;—and those graces, and active virtues, and that stedfastness in suffering shame, being enjoined, which are necessary to the following and imitation of Jesus Christ. The valedictory prayer (xiii. 20, 21), and one or two personal notices and greetings, conclude the whole.

SECTION V.

LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

1. Something has already been said, in the previous enquiry into the authorship of our Epistle, respecting the question of its original language[6]. There also the principal passages of the Fathers will be found which bear on this subject. They may be thus briefly summed up:—

2. The idea of a Hebrew original is found in Clement of Alexandria (cited above, § i. 14), in Eusebius (ib. 48), Jerome (Catalog. Script. Eccl. 5, vol. ii., p. 839, "Scripserat (Paulus) ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraïce"). Theodoret (Argum. ad Hebr. fin. vol. iii. p. 544, γέγραφε δὲ αὐτὴν τῇ Ἑβραίων φωνῇ· ἑρμηνευθῆναι δὲ αὐτήν φασιν ὑπὸ Κλήμεντος), Euthalius

[6] See above, § i. 149.

(above, § i. 46; Argum., τῇ σφῶν διαλέκτῳ γραφεῖσα), Primasius (Præfat., "Fertur apostolus hanc Hebræis missam Hebræo sermone . . . conscripsisse"), John Damascenus (Opp. Paris 1712, p. 258 (vol. ii. p. 997, ed. Migne), Παύλου αὐτὴν Ἑβραίοις τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ συντάξαντος), Œcumenius (Argum. 2), Theophylact (Comm. on ch. i.), in the schol. on ms. 31,—in Cosmas Indicopleustes,—in Rhabanus Maurus,—in Thomas Aquinas; in some modern writers, especially Hallet, in an enquiry into the author and language of the Epistle, appended to Peirce's Commentary (1742), and to be found in Latin at the end of vol. iv. of Wolf's Curæ Philologicæ,—and Michaelis.

3. Still such an apparently formidable array of ancient testimony is not to be taken as such, without some consideration. Clement's assertion of a Hebrew original is not reproduced by his scholar Origen, but on the contrary a Greek original is presupposed by his very words (above, § i. 19). And this his divergence from Clement of Alexandria is not easy to explain, if he had regarded him as giving matter of history, and not rather a conjecture of his own. Indeed, the passage of Clement seems to bear this latter on the face of it: for it connects the similarity of style between this Epistle and the Acts with the notion of St. Luke being its translator. If we might venture to fill up the steps by which the inference came about, they would be nearly these: 'The Epistle must be St. Paul's. But St. Paul was a Hebrew, and was writing to Hebrews: how then do we find the Epistle in Greek, not unlike in style to that of the Acts of the Apostles? What, if the writer of the Greek of that book were also the writer of the Greek of this,—and St. Paul, as was to be supposed, wrote as a Hebrew to the Hebrews, *in Hebrew*, St. Luke translating into Greek?'

4. Again, Eusebius is not consistent in this matter with himself. In his Comm. on Ps. ii. 7, vol. v. p. 88 (cited above, § i. 48), he says—

> ὁ μέν τοιγε Ἑβραῖος ἐλέγετο κύριον εἶναι τῆς λέξεως ἔτεκον, ὅπερ καὶ Ἀκύλας πεποίηκεν· ὁ δὲ ἀπόστολος νομομαθὴς ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους (Heb. i. 5) τῇ τῶν ο´ ἐχρήσατο,

thus clearly implying that the Epistle was written in Greek. And such has been the opinion of almost all the moderns: of all, we may safely say, who have handled the subject impartially and intelligently. The reasons for this now generally received opinion are mainly found in the style of the Epistle, which is the most purely Greek of all the writings of the N. T.: so that it would be violating all probability to imagine it a translation from a language of entirely different rhetorical character. The construction of the periods is such, in distinction from the character, in this particular, of the Oriental languages, that if it is a translation, the whole argumentation of the original must have been broken up into its original elements of thought, and all its

connecting links recast; so that it would not be so much a translation, as a re-writing, of the Hebrew Epistle.

5. The paronomasiæ [7] again, and the citations from the LXX being made in entire independence of the Hebrew text, form collectively a presumptive proof, the weight of which it is very difficult to evade, that the present Greek text is the original. Such peculiarities belong to thought running free and selecting its own words, not to the constrained reproduction of the thoughts of another in another tongue. Examine our English version in any of those numerous places where St. Paul has indulged in paronomasiæ, and no such will be found in the translation. And yet English is much nearer to Greek than Greek to any dialect of the Hebrew.

6. The same inference has been deduced from the appearance, e. g., of the two senses of *covenant* and *testament* for the word *διαθήκη*, ch. ix. 15 ff. al. This is well stated by Calvin in the argument to his Commentary:—

> "Ut alios locos qui ex scriptura citantur, prætermittam: si Hebraice scripta fuisset epistola, nulla in nomine *testamenti* fuisset allusio, in qua scriptor immoratur. Non potuit, inquam, ex alio fonte hauriri quod de jure testamenti capite nono disputat, quam ex Græca voce. Nam *διαθήκη* ambiguam apud Græcos significationem habet: *berith* autem Hebræis nonnisi *fœdus* significat. Hæc una ratio sani judicii hominibus sufficiet ad probandum quod dixi, Græco sermone scriptam fuisse Epistolam [8]."

7. Again, the Epistle abounds with Greek expressions which could only have been expressed in the Hebrew by a circumlocution, and can therefore not be regarded as translations from it. The validity of this argument has been acknowledged even by those who deny that of the previous ones. We may instance such expressions as *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* (ch. i. 1), *ἀπαύγασμα* (i. 3), *εὐπερίστατος* (xii. 1), *μετριοπαθεῖν* (v. 2), the repetition of the idea in *ὑποτάσσω* in ii. 5—8, . . . *οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμ. τ. μέλλ.* . . . . . *ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα,*

[7] Lists of these have frequently been given. The following, from Bleek, comprises some of the most remarkable: ch. ii. 8, *ὑποτάξαι . . . ἀνυπότακτον*: v. 8, *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν* (this Michaelis endeavours to reconcile with a Hebrew original): v. 14, *καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ*: vii. 3, *ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ*: vii. 19, 22, *ἐγγίζομεν . . . ἔγγυος*: vii. 23, 24, *παραμένειν . . . μένειν*: viii. 7, 8, *ἄμεμπτος . . . μεμφόμενος*: ix. 10, *ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ. πόμασιν*: ix. 28, *προσενεχθεὶς . . . ἀνενεγκεῖν*: x. 29, *ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη*: x. 34, *τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων . . . προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείσσονα ὕπαρξιν*: x. 38, 39, *καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται . . . ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς*: xi. 27, *τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν*: xiii. 14, *μένουσαν . . . μέλλουσαν.*

[8] This argument has been met by denying that it is requisite to give the sense of *testament* to *διαθήκη* in that passage: but cf. my notes there. See Davidson, Introd. to N. T. vol. iii. p. 284. The same ground has been taken by Mr. Wratislaw, in his little volume of sermons and treatises.

οὐδὲν ἄφηκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον . . . . ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα, whereas in Hebrew *ὑποτάσσω* can only be expressed by a periphrasis, to place under the feet (שִׁית תַּחַת רַגְלַיִם)[9].

8. These considerations, coming in aid of the conviction which must be felt by every intelligent Greek scholar that he is reading an original composition and not a version, induce us to refuse the idea of a Hebrew original, and to believe the Epistle to have been first written in Greek.

9. The style of our Epistle has been already touched upon in our enquiry respecting the authorship, § i. 116 ff. From the earliest times, its diversity from that of the writings of St. Paul has been matter of remark[1]. It is *συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα* (Orig.). The main difference for us, which will also set forth its characteristic peculiarity, is, that whereas St. Paul is ever as it were struggling with the scantiness of human speech to pour forth his crowding thoughts, thereby falling into rhetorical and grammatical irregularities, the style of our Epistle flows regularly on, with no such suspended constructions. Even where the subject induces long parentheses, the Writer does not break the even flow and equilibrium of his style, but returns back to the point where he left it[2].

10. Again, the greatest pains are bestowed on a matter which does not seem to have engaged the attention of the other sacred writers, even including St. Paul himself: viz. rhetorical rhythm, and equilibrium of words and sentences. In St. Paul's most glorious outbursts of eloquence, he is not rhetorical. In those of the Writer of our Epistle, he is elaborately and faultlessly rhetorical. The *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* of the opening, are as it were a key-note of the rhythmical style of the whole. The particles and participles used are all weighed with a view to this effect. The simple expressions of the other sacred writers are expanded into longer words, or into sonorous and majestic clauses: the *μισθός* of St. Paul becomes *μισθαποδοσία*: the *αἷμα, αἱματεκχυσία*; the *ὅρκος, ὁρκωμοσία*: where St. Paul describes our ascended Lord as *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος* (Col. iii. 1: cf. Rom. viii. 34: Eph. i. 20), here we have *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* (ch. i. 3), *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (viii. 1), *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν* (xii. 2): where St. Paul describes Him as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ* (2 Cor. iv. 4), or as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (Col. i. 15), here we have *ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ* (i. 3).

[9] See Davidson, Introd. vol. iii. p. 287.

[1] See the citations above, from Clement of Alexandria, § i. 14, and from Origen, ib. 19.

[2] See e. g. ch. xii. 18—24.

SECTION VI.

CANONICITY.

1. This part of our introduction must obviously be treated quite irrespective of the hypothesis of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle. That being assumed, its canonicity follows. That being denied, our object must be to shew how the Epistle itself was regarded, even by those who were not persuaded of its apostolicity.

2. The earliest testimonies to it are found where we might expect them, in the church of Rome, and in the writings of one who never cites it as apostolic. It will be important for us to see, in what estimation Clement held it. He makes, as we have already seen, the most frequent and copious use of it, never citing it expressly, never appealing to it as Scripture, but adopting its words and expressions, just as he does those of other books of the New Testament. It is to be observed, that when in the course of thus incorporating it he refers to ἡ γραφή, or uses the expression γέγραπται, it is with regard to texts quoted not from it only, but also from the O. T.: e. g. in c. 36, p. 281, where he introduces, in the midst of a passage adopted from Heb. i., with γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως, the citation ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. (Ps. ciii. 4): in c. 23, p. 260, where we have συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς, ὅτι ταχὺ ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ (Heb. x. 37: Hab. ii. 3). By this procedure we cannot say that Clement casts any slight on this Epistle, for it is his constant practice. He frequently quotes Scripture as such, but it is always the O. T. Two or three times he adduces the sayings of our Lord, but never even this in the form of a citation from our existing Gospels, or in agreement with their exact words. All we can gather from Clement is, that, treating this as he does other Epistles [3], and appropriating largely as he does its words and expressions, he certainly did not rank it below those others: an inference which would lead us to believe that he recognized its canonical authority. But to found more than this on Clement's testimony [4], would be unwarranted by fair induction.

3. Justin Martyr, amidst a few allusions to our Epistle, makes what can hardly but be called canonical use of it in his first Apology, § 63, p. 81. There, in explaining that the λόγος of God is also His Son, he adds, καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος. Now it appears from the

[3] The only exception is in an express citation in c. 47 from 1 Corinthians, where, writing to the Corinthians, he is appealing to the authority of St. Paul.

[4] As e. g. Stuart, Comm. p. 73: but his expressions have become somewhat modified since Davidson quoted them, Introd. vol. iii. p. 264.

Dial. cont. Tryph. c. 57, p. 154, that the allusion in the καλεῖται ἄγγελος is to Gen. xviii. 2. It would seem, therefore, seeing that Heb. iii. 1 is the only place where our Lord is entitled ἀπόστολος, that the καλεῖται is meant to embrace under it that passage as a Scripture testimony equipollent with the other.

4. In Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the recognition of our Epistle as canonical depends on its recognition as the work of St. Paul. Where they both cite it as Scripture, it is as written by him: and where Origen mentions the doubt about its being his, he adduces other Scripture testimony, observing that it needs another kind of proof, not that the Epistle is canonical, but that it is St. Paul's[5].

5. And very similar was the proceeding of those parts of the church where the Pauline authorship was not held. Irenæus, as we have seen, makes no use of the Epistle. The fragment of Muratori, representing the view of the Roman church, probably does not contain it. Tertullian, who regards it as written by Barnabas, the *comes apostolorum*, cites it, not asauthoritative in itself, but 'ex redundantia,' as recording the sentiments of such a companion of the Apostles.

6. Our Epistle is, it is true, contained in the Syriac version (Peschito) made at the end of the second century: but it is entirely uncertain, whether this insertion in the canon accompanied a recognition of the Pauline authorship, or not. This recognition, which prevailed in that part of the church in after times, *may* have at first occasioned its insertion in the canon ; but we cannot say that it did.

7. But in the Alexandrine church the case was different. There, as we have seen, the assumption of Pauline authorship appears early and soon prevails universally: and in consequence we find the canonical authority there unquestioned, and the Epistle treated as the other parts of Scripture[6].

8. Throughout the Eastern churches, the canonicity and apostolicity were similarly regarded as inseparably connected. It is true that Eusebius[7], in numbering it among the Antilegomena, together with the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement and Jude, and the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, might seem to attribute to it another authorship, were it not evident from his constant use of it and his numbering it in his principal passage on the canon (H. E. iii. 25) among the Homologoumena, that the doubt must be resolved into that on the Pauline authorship.

9. In the Western church, where this was not recognized, neither do we find, even down to the middle of the fourth century, any use made of the Epistle as canonical. Even Novatian and Cyprian, who might

[5] See above, § i. 18.
[6] See the testimonies adduced § i. 10—24.
[7] H. E. vi. 13: see it quoted above, § i. 49.

well have thus used it, have not done so: nor in the controversies on the reception of the lapsed, and on the repetition of heretical baptism, do we ever find it adduced on either side, apposite as some passages are to the subjects in dispute. Only with the assumption, gradually imported from the East, of a Pauline origin, do we find here and there a Western writer citing it as of canonical authority.

10. It is in Jerome first that we find[8] any indication of a doubt whether canonicity and Pauline authorship are necessarily to stand and fall together. The same is found[9] now and then in the writings of Augustine. But soon after this time the general prevalence, and ultimately authoritative sanction, of the view of the Pauline authorship, closed up any chance of the canonicity of the Epistle being held on independent grounds: and it was not till the times of the Reformation, that the matter began to be again enquired into on its own merits.

11. The canonicity was doubted by Cardinal Cajetan[1], but upheld by Erasmus, in these remarkable words:—

> "Imo non opinor periclitari fidem, si tota ecclesia fallatur in titulo hujus epistolæ, modo constet Spiritum Sanctum fuisse principalem auctorem, id quod interim convenit[2]."

In the Roman Catholic church, however, the authoritative sanction given by the Council of Trent to the belief of the Pauline origin effectually stopped all intelligent enquiry.

12. Among reformed theologians, the canonicity of our Epistle was strongly upheld, even when the Pauline authorship was not recognized. Calvin says, in his prologue to the Epistle—

> "Ego vero eam inter apostolicas sine controversia amplector: nec dubito Satanæ artificio fuisse quondam factum ut illi auctoritatem quidam detraherent. Nullus enim est e sacris libris qui de Christi sacerdotio tam luculenter disserat, unici quod morte sua obtulit sacrificii vim dignitatemque tam magnifice extollat, de cærimoniarum tam usu quam abrogatione uberius tractet, qui denique plenius explicet Christum esse finem legis. Quare ne patiamur Dei Ecclesiam et nos ipsos tanto bono spoliari, sed ejus possessionem constanter nobis asseramus. Quis porro eam composuerit, non magnopere curandum est."

13. Beza speaks in the same strain:—

> "Verum quid attinet de scriptoris nomine contendere, quod scriptor ipse celatum voluit? Sufficiat hoc nosse, vere esse dictatum a Spiritu Sancto, quæ luculentissimam ac plane apos-

[8] See above, § i. 68—80: esp. parr. 74 ff.

[9] See § i. 81 ff.

[1] In his Comm. on the Epistle, referred to by Bl.; which I have not been able to see.

[2] Supportatio Errorum Natalis Beddæ, Opp. t. ix. pp. 594, 595.

tolicam veteris fœderis cum novo collationem, atque adeo novi fœderis veluti singularem quandam promulgationem ac sanctionem complectatur" (N. T. p. 335).

And again, ib. p. 382:—

"Non dubitavimus tamen passim eum apostolum vocare, quod spiritu vere apostolico præditus fuerit."

14. Similarly also the Confessio Gallicana, which, though it divides it off from the Pauline writings, yet includes it without remark among the canonical books. So also the Arminians, e. g. Limborch, who, believing it to have been written "ab aliquo e Pauli comitibus et quidem conscio Paulo," says—

"Interim divinam hujus epistolæ auctoritatem agnoscimus multisque aliis quas ab apostolis esse scriptas constat, ob argumenti quod tractat præstantiam præferendam judicamus."

15. Among the early Lutheran divines there were some differences of opinion respecting the place to be assigned to the Epistle; the general view being, that it was to be read, as Jerome first wrote (Præfat. in libr. Salomon. Opp. ed. Migne, vol. ix. p. 1243) of the Apocryphal O. T. books, "ad ædificationem plebis," but not "ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam[3]." In other words, it was set apart,—and in this relegation six other books shared, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, James, Jude, and the Apocalypse,—among the apocryphal writings appended to the N. T. And this order was usually followed in the German Bibles.

16. Soon however after the beginning of the 17th century, this distinction began to be obliterated, and the practice to be introduced[4] of calling these books "*deuterocanonici*" or "*canonici libri secundi ordinis*," and, although thus called, of citing them as of equal authority, and equally inspired, with the other books. Since that time, the controversies respecting the books of Scripture have taken a wider range, and it has not been so much respecting canonicity, as respecting origin, character, and doctrine, that the disputes of divines have been waged.

17. In our own country, at the time of the Reformation, while the question of authorship was left open, the canonical authority of the Epistle was never doubted. To establish this, it may be enough to cite some testimonies.

In Tyndale's prologue to the Epistle, he says, having mentioned the objection to the Pauline authorship from ch. ii. 3—

"Now whether it were Paul's or no, I say not, but permit it to

[3] See the long extract from Martin Chemnitz's Examen Consilii Tridentini, in Bleek, vol. i. p. 449 ff.: and the others which follow from the Wittenberg divines.

[4] By Gerhard: see the references in Bleek, pp. 466, 467.

other men's judgments: neither think I it to be an article of any man's faith, but that a man may doubt of the author."

Then, having met several objections against its canonicity urged from certain texts in it, as ch. vi. 4 ff., ch. x. 26 ff., ch. xii. 17, he concludes—

"Of this ye see that this Epistle ought no more to be refused for a holy, godly, and catholic, than the other authentic Scriptures."

And, speaking of the Writer, he says—

"It is easy to see that he was a faithful servant of Christ, and of the same doctrine that Timothy was of, yea and Paul himself was of, and that he was an Apostle, or in the Apostles' time, or near thereunto. And seeing the Epistle agreeth to all the rest of the Scripture, if it be indifferently looked on, why should it not be authority, and taken for holy Scripture[5]?"

18. Fulke, in his defence of Translations of the Bible[6], while defending the omission of the name of St. Paul in the title of the Epistle in the Geneva Bible of 1560, says—

"Which of us, I pray you, that thinketh that this Epistle was not written by St. Paul, once doubteth whether it be not of apostolical spirit and authority? Which is manifest by this, that both in preaching and writing we cite it thus, the Apostle to the Hebrews."

19. Bp. Jewel again, in his Defence of the Apology, p. 186, where he is speaking of the charge of anonymousness brought against it, says—

"The Epistle unto the Hebrews, some say, was written by St. Paul, some by Clemens, some by Barnabas, some by some other: and so are we uncertain of the author's name."

20. Whittaker (Disputatio de Sacr. Script. Controvers. i. quæst. i. c. 16[7]), says—

"Si Lutherus aut qui Lutherum sequuti sunt nonnulli aliter senserint aut scripserint de quibusdam libris N. T., ... ii pro se respondeant: nihil ista res ad nos pertinet, qui hac in re Lutherum nec sequimur nec defendimus, quique meliori ratione ducimur. . . . . De auctoritate nullius libri qui pertinet ad N. T. dubitamus, nec vero de auctore, præterquam Epistolæ ad Hebræos. Epistolam hanc esse omni modo canonicam concedimus: sed num a Paulo apostolo conscripta fuerit, non perinde liquet . . . . non valde de hac re contendamus: neque enim necesse est: et res in dubio relinqui potest, ut interim sua epistolæ auctoritas constet atque conservetur."

[5] Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises, &c. Parker Society's edn., pp. 521, 522.

[6] Parker Society's edn., pp. 32, 33.

[7] Cited in Bleek, p. 464. See the Eng. translation in the Parker Society's edn., p. 105 ff.

21. With regard to the question itself, in what light we are to look on our Epistle with respect to canonicity, it is one which it will be well to treat here on general grounds, as it will come before us again more than once, in writing of the remaining books of the N. T.

22. We might put this matter on the ground which Jerome takes in his Epistle to Dardanus, "*nihil interesse cujus sit, cum sit ecclesiastici viri*:" or on that which Erasmus takes, when he says that the "*auctor primarius*" is the "Spiritus Sanctus," and so puts by as indifferent the question of the "*auctor secundarius*:" thus in both cases resting the decision entirely on the character of the contents of the book itself.

23. But this would manifestly be a wrong method of proceeding. We do not thus in the case of other writings, whose unexceptionable evangelic character is universally acknowledged. To say nothing of later productions, no one ever reasoned thus respecting the Epistle of Barnabas, or that of Clement to the Corinthians, or any of the quasi-apostolic writings. None of the ancients ever dealt so before Jerome, nor did Jerome himself in other passages. More than intrinsic excellence and orthodoxy is wanting, to win for a book a place in the N. T. canon. Indeed any reasoning must be not only in itself insufficient, but logically unsound, which makes the authority of a book which is to set us our standard of doctrine, the result of a judgment of our own respecting the doctrine inculcated in it. Such judgment can be only subsidiary to the enquiry, not the primary line of its argument, which must of necessity be of an objective character.

24. And when we come to proofs of this latter kind, it may well be asked, which of them are we to accept as sufficient. It is clear, we cannot appeal to tradition alone. We must combine with such an appeal, the exercise of our own judgment on tradition. When, for example, the Church of England takes, in her sixth Article, the ground of pure tradition, and says,—

> "In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church,"

she would by implication, if consistent with herself, exclude from the canon at the least the Apocalypse, which was for some centuries not received by the Eastern and for the most part by the Greek church, and our Epistle, which was for some centuries not received by the whole Latin church. Nay, she would go even further than this: for even to the present day the Syrian church excludes the Apocalypse, the Epistles of St. Jude, 2 and 3 John, and 2 Peter, from the canon. It is fortunate that our Church did not leave this definition to be worked out for itself, but, giving a detailed list of O. T. books, has appended to it this far more definite sentence: "All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and

account them canonical:" thus adopting the list of N. T. books in common usage in the Western church at the time, about which there could be no difference.

25. If then tradition pure and simple will not suffice for our guide, how are we to combine our judgment with it, so as to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion? It is manifest, that the question of *origin* comes in here as most important. If the *genuineness* of a book be in dispute, as e. g. that of 2 Peter, it suffices, to make it reasonably probable that it was written by him whose name it bears. When this is received, all question of canonicity is at rest. In that case, the name of the Apostle is ample guarantee. And so with our Epistle, those who think they can prove it to be the work of St. Paul, are no longer troubled about its canonicity. This is secured, in shewing it to be of apostolic origin.

26. And so it ever was in the early church. Apostolicity and canonicity were bound together. And in the case of those historical books which were not written by Apostles themselves, there was ever an effort to connect their writers, St. Mark with St. Peter, St. Luke with St. Paul, so that at least apostolic sanction might not be wanting to them. What then must be our course with regard to a book, of which we believe neither that it was written by an Apostle, nor that it had apostolic sanction?

27. This question must necessarily lead to an answer not partaking of that rigid demonstrative character which some reasoners require for all inferences regarding the authority of Scripture. Our conclusion must be matter of moral evidence, and of degree: must be cumulative —made up of elements which are not, taken by themselves, decisive, but which, taken together, are sufficient to convince the reasonable mind.

28. First, we have reason to believe that our Epistle was written by one who lived and worked in close union with the Apostle Paul: of whom that Apostle says that "he planted, and Apollos watered, and God gave the increase:" of whom it is elsewhere in holy writ declared, that he was "an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures:" that he "helped much them which had believed through grace:" that he "mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ."

29. Secondly, having, as we believe, from his pen such an Epistle, we find it largely quoted by one who was himself a companion of the Apostles,—and almost without question appealed to as Scripture by another primitive Christian writer: and both these testimonies belong to that very early age of the Church, when controversies about canonicity had not yet begun.

30. Thirdly, in the subsequent history of the Church, we find the

reception of the Epistle into the canon becoming ever more and more a matter of common consent: mainly, no doubt, in connexion with the hypothesis of its Pauline authorship, but, as we have shewn above, not in all cases in that connexion.

31. Fourthly, we cannot refuse the conviction, that the contents of the Epistle itself are such as powerfully to come in aid of these other considerations. Unavailing as such a conviction would be of itself, as has been previously noticed, yet it is no small confirmation of the evidence which probable authorship, early recognition, and subsequent consent, furnish to the canonicity of our Epistle, when we find that no where are the main doctrines of the faith more purely or more majestically set forth; no where Holy Scripture urged with greater authority and cogency; no where those marks in short, which distinguish the first rank of primitive Christian writings from the second, more unequivocally and continuously present.

32. The result of this combination of evidence is, that though no considerations of expediency, nor consent of later centuries, can ever make us believe the Epistle to have been written by St. Paul, we yet conceive ourselves perfectly justified in accounting it a portion of the N. T. canon, and in regarding it with the same reverence as the rest of the Holy Scriptures.

There are other subjects of deep interest connected with our Epistle, such as its relation, in point of various aspects of Christian doctrine, to the teaching of St. Paul, of St. John, of St. James, and of St. Peter: its connexion with, and independence of, the system of Philo: to treat of which would extend these prolegomena, already long, to the size of a volume. They will be found discussed in the first part of Riehm's "Lehrbegriff des Hebraerbriefes," Ludwigsburg, 1858.

CHAPTER II.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. It has been very generally agreed, that among the apostolic persons bearing the name of James (Ἰάκωβος), the son of Zebedee, the brother of St. John, cannot well have written our Epistle. The state

of things and doctrines which we find in it can hardly have been reached as early as before the execution of that Apostle, related in Acts xii.

2. But when we have agreed on this, matter of controversy at once arises. It would appear from the simple superscription of our Epistle with the name Ἰάκωβος, that we are to recognize in its Writer the apostolic person known simply by this name in the Acts,—who was the president of the church at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13 ff.; xxi. 18), and is called by St. Paul the brother of our Lord (Gal. i. 19). This also being pretty generally granted, the question arising is: Was this James identical with, or was he distinct from, James the son of Alphæus, one of the Twelve Apostles (Matt. x. 3: Mark iii. 18: Luke vi. 15: Acts i. 13)?

3. I have partly anticipated the answer to this question in my note on Matt. xiii. 55, where I have maintained that, consistently with the straightforward acceptation of Scripture data, we cannot believe any of those who are called the brethren of our Lord to have been also of the number of the Twelve. I conceive John vii. 5, as compared with ib. vi. 67, 70 immediately preceding, to be decisive on this point; and since I first expressed myself thus, I have seen nothing in the least degree calculated to shake that conviction[8]. And, that conclusion still standing, I must of course believe this James to be excluded from the number of the Twelve, and if so, distinct from the son of Alphæus.

4. Still, it will be well to deal with the question on its own ground. And first, as to the notices in Scripture itself which bear on it. And these, it must be acknowledged, are not without difficulty. As e. g. those which occur in St. Luke, who must have been well aware of the state of matters in the church at Jerusalem. He names, up to Acts xii., but two persons as James: one, whom he always couples with John (Luke v. 10; vi. 14; viii. 51; ix. 28, 54 (Acts i. 13)), and in Acts xii. 2 relates, under the name of τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου, to have been slain with the sword by Herod: the other, whom he twice introduces as Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου (Luke vi. 15: Acts i. 13). Besides, the genitive of the name, Ἰακώβου, is thrice mentioned by him as designating by relation-

[8] Nothing can be lamer than the way in which Lange (in Herzog's Encycl. art Jacobus) endeavours to escape the conclusion. I subjoin it as the latest specimen of what ingenuity can do against plain matter of fact: "The kind of unbelief here predicated of our Lord's Brethren is parallel with that of Peter, Matt. xvi. 22, 23, and of Thomas, John xx. 25. John is evidently speaking, not of unbelief in the ordinary sense, which rejected the Messiahship of Jesus, but of that unbelief, or that want of trust which made it difficult for our Lord's disciples, His Apostles, and even His Mother, to reconcile themselves to His way of life, or to His concealment of Himself." Against this finessing I would simply set (1) the usage of πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν, John ii. 11; iv. 39; vii. 31, 39, 48; viii. 30; ix. 36; x. 42; xi. 45, 48; xii. 37 (with οὐκ), 42: and (2) the οὐδὲ γάρ, following on the unbelief of the Jews ver. 1, with which the οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν is introduced.

ship other persons: in Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13, we read of Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, and in Luke xxiv. 10, of Μαρία Ἰακώβου: interpreting which latter expression by Matt. xxvii. 56: Mark xv. 40, 47, and xvi. 1, and by John xix. 25, we shall infer that the Mary here mentioned being the wife of Alphæus (or Clopas), the ellipsis must be filled up by the word *mother*, and Ἰακώβου in this place designates James the son of Alphæus. And as regards Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, we may well suppose that the same person is designated by the genitive, however difficult it may be to fill in the ellipsis. We have a Judas, who designates himself ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου, Jude 1: but whether these are to be considered identical, must be determined by the result of our present investigation.

5. The question for us with regard to St. Luke, is the following: In Acts xii. 17, and in the subsequent parts of that book, we have a person mentioned simply as Ἰάκωβος, who is evidently of great authority in the church at Jerusalem. Are we to suppose that St. Luke, careful and accurate as his researches were, was likely to have introduced thus without previous notice, a new and third person bearing the same name? Does not this testify strongly for the identity of the two?

6. The best way to answer this question will be, to notice St. Luke's method of proceeding on an occasion somewhat analogous. In Acts i. 13, we find Φίλιππος among the Apostles. In ib. vi. 5, we find a Φίλιππος among the seven, appointed to relieve the Apostles from the daily ministration of alms. In ib. viii. 5, we read that Φίλιππος went down to a city of Samaria and preached. Now as there is nothing to identify this part of the narrative with what went before, or to imply that this was not a missionary journey of one of the Apostles, distinct from the διασπορά from which they were excepted above, ver. 1, it is not at the first moment obvious which Philip is meant. It is true, that intelligent comparison of the parts of the narrative makes it plain to us: but the case is one in point, as shewing that St. Luke is in the habit of *leaving it to such comparison to decide*, and not of inserting notices at the mention of names, to prevent mistake. This would be much more in the practice of St. John, who writes, xiv. 22, Ἰούδας οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης: cf. also xi. 2. It seems then that the practice of St. Luke will not decide for us, but our enquiry must still be founded on the merits of the question itself.

7. And in so doing, we will make first the hypothesis of the *identity* of James the son of Alphæus with James the Lord's brother. Then, besides the great, and to me insuperable difficulty in John vi. 70 and vii. 5, we shall have the following circumstances for our consideration: (1) In Matt. xxvii. 56, and Mark xv. 40, we read of Mary the mother of James and Joses: and in Mark, the epithet τοῦ μικροῦ is attached to Ἰακώβου. Now on the hypothesis of James, the brother of the Lord,

being identical with the son of Alphæus, there were *four such sons*, Matt. xiii. 55; James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas: and of these four, two, James and Judas, were Apostles. So that, leaving out of the question for the moment the confusion of the names Joses and Joseph, we should thus have Mary the wife of Clopas designated as the mother of James, who *was an Apostle*, and of Joses, who *was not* an Apostle, to the exclusion of her son Judas, who was also an Apostle. Is not this, to say the least, extremely improbable?

8. And besides this, let us review for a moment the epithet τοῦ μικροῦ, attached to Ἰακώβου by St. Mark. Beyond question, at the time when this Gospel was written, James the son of Zebedee had long ago fallen by the sword of Herod[9]. And as certainly, at this time James the Lord's brother was at the head of the mother church at Jerusalem, one of the three pillars (Gal. ii. 9) of the Christian body. Was it likely that at such a time (for the notice and epithet is one whose use must be sought at the time of the publication of the Gospel, not at that of the formation of the apostolic oral history, seeing that it does not occur in the parallel place in Matthew) the epithet *τοῦ μικροῦ* would be attached to this James by way of distinguishing him from that other, long since martyred? Is it not much more probable that the epithet, for whatever reason, was attached to James the son of Alphæus to distinguish him from this very James the brother of the Lord?

9. If James the son of Alphæus, the Apostle, were the head of the mother church at Jerusalem, and a man of such distinction among the Jewish Christians, how comes it, that when an Apostle of the circumcision is to be named, over against St. Paul, St. Peter, and not he, is dignified by that title?

10. There is another more general consideration, which, however much it may be disallowed by some, yet seems to me not without weight. It hardly consists with the mission of the Twelve, that any of them should be settled in a particular spot, as the president or Bishop of a local church. Even granting the exceptional character of the Jerusalem church, it does not seem likely that the *ἀρχιπρεσβύτερος* there would be one of those to whom it was said *πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*: and of whom all that we read in the Acts of the Apostles, and all that primitive tradition relates to us, assures us that they fulfilled this command.

11. If we compare this hypothesis with early tradition, its first notices present us with a difficulty. Speaking of James the brother of the Lord, Eusebius (H. E. ii. 23) says,—

> *ἀκριβέστατά γε μὴν τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡγήσιππος, ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ αὐτοῦ ὑπομνήματι τοῦτον*

[9] See Prolegg. Vol. I. ch. iii. § iv.

λέγων ἱστορεῖ τὸν τρόπον· Διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος, ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων δίκαιος ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου χρόνων μέχρι καὶ ἡμῶν. ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ Ἰάκωβοι ἐκαλοῦντο.

12. This passage seems most plainly to preclude all idea of James the Lord's brother being one of the Twelve. However we understand the not very perspicuous words μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων; whether we boldly suppose with Jerome, on account of the verb διαδέχεται, that they are a mistake for μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ("Suscepit ecclesiam Hierosolyma post apostolos frater domini Jacobus:" Catal. Script. Eccl. 2, vol. ii. p. 829), or take them as they stand, and as is most likely from comparison with St. Paul's narrative in Gal. ii.,—of joint superintendence with the Apostles; on either, or any view, they expressly exclude James from the number of the Apostles themselves[1].

13. And entirely consistent with this is the frequently misunderstood other testimony from Hegesippus, cited by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 22):—

καὶ μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θείου αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος· ὃν προέθεντο πάντες, ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ κυρίου δεύτερον.

The straightforward interpretation of which passage is, that "after James the Just had been martyred, as was the Lord also for the same cause, next was appointed bishop Symeon, the son of Clopas, the offspring of his (James's, not the Lord's, as Lange and others have most unfairly attempted to make it mean) uncle, whom all agreed in preferring, being, as he was, second of the cousins of the Lord." That is, Joseph and Clopas (Alphæus) being brothers, and one son of Alphæus, James, being an Apostle, his next brother Symeon (Joses may have been dead ere this) being thus ἀνεψιὸς κυρίου δεύτερος, and born ἐκ τοῦ θείου αὐτοῦ (Ἰακώβου), succeeded James the Just in the bishopric of Jerusalem. I submit that on the hypothesis of Symeon being James's *own brother*, such a sentence is simply unaccountable.

14. It is true that in this, as in so many other matters, ancient tradi-

[1] How Lange, in his article in Herzog's Encyclopædia, can cite these words in proof of the *identity*, I cannot imagine. This,—besides his suppression here of the following ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ Ἰάκωβοι ἐκαλοῦντο,—is one of the many tokens of unfairness which appear in that specious and clever article. I subjoin his own words: Hegesippus spricht offenbar für die Identität, διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος. Hieronymus übersetzte in seinem Katalog falsch, „nach den Aposteln;" Rufinus verbesserte, „mit den Aposteln." Er übernahm die Leitung der Kirche von Jerusalem mit den Aposteln. Das heißt, er wurde nicht ausschließlicher Bischof, sondern den übrigen Aposteln als Aposteln war die Mitwirkung der Natur der Sache nach vorbehalten. Als Bischof wird er von den Aposteln unterschieden, obschon er Apostel ist, so wie Petrus als Sprecher von den Aposteln unterschieden wird, obschon er zu ihnen gehört, Apg. v. 29 (ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι). Surely any one may see through the fallacy of this last citation, as compared with the expression in Hegesippus.

tion is not consistent with itself. For Euseb. (H. E. ii. 1) quotes from the Hypotyposeis of Clement of Alexandria—

> Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Πέτρῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν παρέδωκε τὴν γνῶσιν ὁ κύριος. οὗτοι τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις παρέδωκαν. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα, ὧν εἷς ἦν καὶ Βαρνάβας. δύο δὲ γεγόνασιν Ἰάκωβοι, εἷς ὁ δίκαιος, ὁ κατὰ τοῦ πτερυγίου βληθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ κναφέως ξύλῳ πληγεὶς εἰς θάνατον, ἕτερος δὲ ὁ καρατομηθείς.

And in the same chapter he speaks of Clement as reporting that Stephen was the first martyr πρὸς τῶν κυριοκτόνων,—

> τότε δῆτα καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ὠνόμαστο παῖς . . . . τοῦτον δὴ οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰάκωβον, ὃν καὶ δίκαιον ἐπίκλην οἱ πάλαι δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκάλουν προτερήματα, πρῶτον ἱστοροῦσι τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγχειρισθῆναι θρόνον.

15. Compare with this Euseb. H. E. i. 12:—

> ἔπειτα δὲ ὦφθαι αὐτὸν Ἰακώβῳ φησίν· εἷς δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων τοῦ σωτῆρος μαθητῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἦν:

and vii. 19: and the Apostolical Constitutions, ii. 55, and vi. 12, 14, where, after the enumeration of the Twelve Apostles, we have named—

> Ἰάκωβός τε ὁ τοῦ κυρίου ἀδελφὸς καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοπος καὶ Παῦλος ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν διδάσκαλος.

Thus it appears, that the assumption of the identity encounters several difficulties, both from Scripture itself (even supposing the crowning one of John vii. 5 got over), and from primitive tradition. It nevertheless became very prevalent, as soon as the setting in of asceticism suggested the hypothesis of the perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord. This is found from Jerome downwards; and all kinds of artificial explanations of the relationship of the brethren to our Lord have been given, to escape the inference from the simple testimony of Holy Scripture, that they were veritably children of Joseph and Mary, younger than our Lord.

16. Let us now follow the other hypothesis, that James the brother of the Lord and James the son of Alphæus were *different persons.* Against this, many objections have been brought, the principal of which seems to be, that thus we have so considerable a repetition of names among the family and disciples of our Lord. But this cannot on any hypothesis be got rid of. The undoubted facts of the Gospel history give us the following repetitions of names:—

(A) We have under the name SIMON, (1) Simon Peter: (2) Simon καναναῖος or ζηλωτής, the Apostle: (3) Simon, the brother of the Lord, Matt. xiii. 55: Mark vi. 3: (4) Simon, the father of Judas Iscariot, John vi. 71 al.: (5) Simon the leper, in Bethany, Matt. xxvi. 6: Mark xiv. 3: (6) Simon of Cyrene, who bore the cross after our Lord, Matt. xxvii. 32 ‖: (7) Simon Magus: (8) Simon the tanner: besides (9)

Simon the Pharisee, in whose house our Lord was anointed by the woman who was a sinner, Luke vii. 40.

(B) Under the name JUDAS, (1) Judas Lebbæus or Ἰακώβου, the Apostle: (2) (?) Judas, the brother of the Lord: (3) Judas Iscariot: (4) Judas Barsabas, Acts xv. 22: if not also (5) the Apostle Thomas, the twin (Θωμᾶς ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας, Eus. H. E. i. 13), so called by way of distinction from the two other Judases among the Twelve.

(C) Under the name MARY, (1) the Mother of our Lord: (2) the mother of James and Joses, Matt. xxvii. 56: (3) Mary Magdalene: (4) Mary, the sister of Lazarus: (5) Mary, the mother of John Mark.

17. Besides these, we have (D) at least four under the name JOSEPH, viz. (1) the reputed father of our Lord, (2) Joseph of Arimathea: (3) Joseph Barnabas, Acts iv. 36: (4) Joseph Barsabas, Acts i. 23: if not two more, a brother of our Lord, Matt. xiii. 55, and according to some MSS., a son of Mary and brother of James, Matt. xxvii. 56.

This being so, it really is somewhat out of place to cry out upon the supposed multiplication of persons bearing the same name in the N. T.

18. The improbability of there being in each family, that of Joseph and that of Alphæus (Clopas), two sets of four brothers bearing the same names, is created by assuming the supplement of Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13, to be ἀδελφός, which, to say the least, is not necessary. The sons of Alphæus (except Levi (Matthew) who appears to have been the son of another Alphæus, but has been most unaccountably omitted from all consideration by those who object to the multiplication of those bearing the same name) are but two, James the less the Apostle, and Joses. We have not the least trace in Scripture, or even in tradition rightly understood, indicating that Simon Zelotes was a son of Alphæus. What is the improbability, in two brethren of our Lord bearing the same names as two of their cousins? Cannot almost every widely-spread family even among ourselves, where names are not so frequently repeated, furnish examples of the same and like coincidences?

19. No safe objection can be brought against the present hypothesis from St. Paul's ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, Gal. i. 19. For (1) the usage of the word ἀπόστολος by St. Paul is not confined to the Twelve, and Christian antiquity recognized in Paul himself and this very James, two supplementary Apostles besides the Twelve[1]: and (2) it has been shewn by Fritzsche, Neander, and Winer, and must be evident to any one accustomed to the usage of εἰ μή in the N. T., that it need not necessarily qualify ἕτερον here, but may just as well refer to the whole preceding clause[2].

[1] See the citation from the Apostolic Constt. above, par. 15.

[2] If we want an example of even a wider use of εἰ μή, we have it in the same chapter, ver. 7.

20. The objection of Lange (Herzog's Encyclop. ut supra) that it is impossible to imagine the growth of an apocryphal Apostleship, by the side of that founded by our Lord, entirely vanishes under a right view of the circumstances of the case. There would be no possibility, on Lange's postulates, of including St. Paul himself among the Apostles. There was nothing in the divine proceeding towards him, which indicated that he was to bear that name: still less was there any thing designating Barnabas as another Apostle, properly so called. These two, on account of their importance and usefulness in the apostolic work, were received among the Apostles as of apostolic dignity. Why may the same not have been the case, with a person so universally noted for holiness and justice as James the brother of the Lord?

21. Again, Lange (ut supra) objects, that "real Apostles thus altogether vanish from the field of action, and are superseded by other Apostles introduced afterwards." I would simply ask, what can be a more accurate description, than these words furnish, of the character of the history of the book which is entitled the *Acts of the Apostles?* Is it not, in the main, the record of the journeyings and acts of a later introduced Apostle, before whom the work of the other Apostles is cast into the shade? Besides, what do we know of the actions of any of the Apostles, except (taking even Lange's hypothesis) of Peter, James, John, and James the son of Alphæus? Where shall we seek any record of the doings of St. Matthew, St. Thomas, St. Philip, St. Jude, St. Bartholomew, St. Andrew, St. Simon, St. Matthias? In Acts xv. 22, an Ἰούδας appears as an ἀνὴρ ἡγούμενος ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς: but he is not St. Jude the Apostle. In Acts viii. we hear much of the missionary work of Φίλιππος: but he is not St. Philip the Apostle.

22. It seems to me from the above considerations, far the more probable inference from Scriptural and traditional data, that James the brother of the Lord, the Bishop of Jerusalem, the presumed Author of our Epistle, was distinct from James the son of Alphæus, one of the Twelve Apostles. And assuming this, I shall now gather up the notices which we find of this remarkable person.

23. It is certain, from John vii. 3—5, that he was not a believer in the Messiahship of Jesus at the period of His ministry there indicated. And from our Lord, when on the Cross, commending His mother to the care of St. John, the son of Zebedee, and probably His cousin after the flesh, we may infer that neither then did His brethren believe on Him. It would appear however, from our finding them expressly mentioned in Acts i. 13, as assembled in the upper room with the Apostles and with the Mother of our Lord, and the believing women, that they were then believers, having probably been, from a half-persuaded and

wavering faith, fixed, by the great events of the Passion and Resurrection, in a conviction of the divine mission of Jesus.

24. And of these the Lord's brethren, let us now fix our attention on JAMES, who seems, from his being placed first in the enumeration, Matt. xiii. 55 and ‖ Mark, to have been the eldest among them.

25. The character which we have of him, as a just and holy man, must in all probability be dated from before his conversion. And those who believe him to have been not by adoption only, but by actual birth a son of our Lord's parents, will trace in the appellation of him as δίκαιος, the character of his father (Matt. i. 19), and the humble faith and obedience of his mother (Luke i. 38). That the members of such a family should have grown up just and holy men, is the result which might be hoped from the teaching of such parents, and above all from the presence ever among them of the spotless and bright example of Him, of whom his cousin according to the flesh, yet not *knowing* Him to be the Messiah, could say, "I have need to be baptized of Thee" (Matt. iii. 14).

26. The absence in the Holy Family of that pseudo-asceticism which has so much confused the traditions respecting them, is strikingly proved by the notice, furnished by St. Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 5, that "the brethren of the Lord" were married men. At the same time there can be no doubt from the general character of St. James's Epistle, and from the notices of tradition, confirmed as they are by the narrative in the Acts, ch. xxi. 17 ff., and by Gal. ii. 11 ff., that he was in other matters a strong ascetic, and a rigid observer of the ceremonial Jewish customs. In the testimony of Hegesippus, quoted by Eus. H. E. ii. 23, we read, οὗτος ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ἅγιος ἦν. οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἔπιεν, οὐδὲ ἔμψυχον ἔφαγε. ξυρὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἔλαιον οὐκ ἠλείψατο, καὶ βαλανείῳ οὐκ ἐχρήσατο. τούτῳ μόνῳ ἐξῆν εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσιέναι. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐρεοῦν ἐφόρει ἀλλὰ σινδόνας. καὶ μόνος εἰσήρχετο εἰς τὸν ναόν, ηὑρίσκετό τε κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι καὶ αἰτούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἄφεσιν, ὡς ἀπεσκληκέναι τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ δίκην καμήλου, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ κάμπτειν ἐπὶ γόνυ προσκυνοῦντα τῷ θεῷ καὶ αἰτεῖσθαι ἄφεσιν τῷ λαῷ διὰ γέτοι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐκαλεῖτο δίκαιος καὶ ὠβλίας[4]. And without taking all this as literal fact, it at least shews us the character which he bore, and the estimation in which he was held.

27. That such a person, when converted to the faith of Jesus, should have very soon been placed in high dignity in the Jerusalem church, is not to be wondered at. The very fact of that church being in some measure a continuation of the apostolic company, would, in the absence of Him who had been its centre beforetime, naturally incline their thoughts towards one who was the most eminent of His nearest relatives

[4] On the interpretation of this word, which is quite uncertain, see Suicer, sub voce, vol. ii. p. 1593.

according to the flesh: and the strong Judaistic tendencies of that church would naturally group it around one who was so zealous a fautor of the Law.

28. This his pre-eminence seems to have been fully established as early as the imprisonment of St. Peter, Acts xii.[5]: i. e. about A.D. 44: which would allow ample time for the reasonable growth in estimation and authority of one whose career as a disciple did not begin till the Ascension of our Lord, i. e. 14 years before[6].

29. From this time onward, James is introduced, and simply by this name, as the president, or bishop, of the church at Jerusalem. In the apostolic council in Acts xv. (A.D. 50), we find him speaking last, after the rest had done, and delivering, with his ἐγὼ κρίνω (ver. 19), that opinion, on which the act of the assembly was grounded. On St. Paul reaching Jerusalem in Acts xxi. (A.D. 58), we find him, on the day after his arrival, entering in πρὸς Ἰάκωβον: and it is added πάντες τε παρεγένοντο οἱ πρεσβύτεροι: shewing that the visit was a formal one, to a man in authority.

30. Thenceforward we have no more mention of James in the Acts. In Gal. i. 19, St. Paul relates, that at his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion he saw Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου: but without any mark, unless the title ἀπόστολος, there given him, is to be taken as such, that he had then the pre-eminence which he afterwards enjoyed. The date of this visit I have set down elsewhere as A.D. 40[7].

31. In the same apologetic narrative in the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul recounts the events, as far as they were germane to his purpose, of the apostolic council in Acts xv. And here we find James ranked with Cephas and John, as στύλοι of the church. At some shortly subsequent time, probably in the end of A.D. 50 or the beginning of 51, we find, from the same narrative of St. Paul, that τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου came down to Antioch, of whose Judaistic strictness Peter being afraid, prevaricated, and shrunk back from asserting his Christian liberty. This speaks for the influence of James, as it does also for its tendency.

32. At the time when we lose sight of James in the Acts of the Apostles, he would be, supposing him to have been next in the Holy Family to our Blessed Lord, and proceeding on the necessarily some-

[5] Thus—for we can hardly suppose it to have been a sudden thing,—we should have it already subsisting during the lifetime of the greater James, the son of Zebedee: one additional argument for distinguishing this James from James the less, the son of Alphæus.

[6] For these dates, see the Chronological Table in the Prolegg. to the Acts, Vol. II. It has been objected, that it would be unlikely that one who at the Ascension was not a believer, should so soon after be found in the dignity of an Apostle. But the objectors forget, that less than half the time sufficed to raise one, who long after the Ascension was "a persecutor and injurious," to the same dignity.

[7] See the Chronological Table, ut supra.

what uncertain [8] inference deducible from the plain sense of Matt. i. 25, about sixty years of age.

33. From this time we are left to seek his history in tradition. We possess an account in Josephus of his character and martyrdom. In Antt. xx. 9. 1, we read, ὁ Ἄνανος, νομίσας ἔχειν καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον, διὰ τὸ τεθνᾶναι τὸν Φῆστον, Ἀλβῖνον δὲ ἔτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν· καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ του λεγομένου χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καί τινας ἑτέρους, ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος, παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους.

34. Further particulars of his death are given us from Hegesippus, by Eusebius, ut supra, H. E. ii. 23: but they do not seem to tally with the above account in Josephus. According to Hegesippus, whose narrative is full of strange expressions, and savours largely of the fabulous, some of the seven sects of the people (see Eus. H. E. iv. 22) asked James, τίς ἡ θύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [9]. And by his preaching to them Jesus as the Christ, so many of them believed on Him, that πολλῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων πιστευόντων, ἦν θόρυβος τῶν Ἰουδαίων κ. γραμματέων κ. Φαρισαίων λεγόντων ὅτι κινδυνεύει πᾶς ὁ λαὸς Ἰησοῦν τὸν χριστὸν προσδοκᾷν. On this they invited James to deter the people from being thus deceived, standing on the πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ at the Passover, that he might be seen and heard by all. But, the story proceeds, when he was set there, and appealed to by them to undeceive the people, he ἀπεκρίνατο φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Τί με ἐπερωτᾶτε περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; καὶ αὐτὸς κάθηται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, καὶ μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. On this, many were confirmed in their belief, and glorified God for his testimony, and cried Hosanna to the son of David. Whereat the Scribes and Pharisees said to one another, κακῶς ἐποιήσαμεν τοιαύτην μαρτυρίαν παρασχόντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ· ἀλλὰ ἀναβάντες καταβάλωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα φοβηθέντες μὴ πιστεύσωσιν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες Ὢ ὤ, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος ἐπλανήθη. So they went up, and cast him down: and said to one another, λιθάσωμεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον. καὶ ἤρξαντο λιθάζειν αὐτόν, ἐπεὶ καταβληθεὶς οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ στραφεὶς ἔθηκε τὰ γόνατα λέγων Παρακαλῶ κύριε θεὲ πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσιν. And while they were stoning him, a priest, one of the sons of Rechab, cried out, τί ποιεῖτε; εὔχεται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὁ δίκαιος. καὶ λαβών τις ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἷς τῶν κναφέων τὸ ξύλον ἐν ᾧ ἀπεπίεζε τὰ ἱμάτια, ἤνεγκε κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ δικαίου. καὶ οὕτως ἐμαρτύρησεν. καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ ἡ στήλη μένει παρὰ τῷ ναῷ.

[8] Because there were also *sisters* of our Lord, and more than two, or the word πᾶσαι could not have been used of them, Matt. xiii. 55.

[9] On this expression, Valesius says, "Ostium hoc loco est introductio seu institutio atque initiatio. Ostium igitur Christi nihil est aliud quam fides in Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum:" &c. But this seems doubtful, and the expression enigmatical.

35. This last sentence seems wholly inexplicable, considering that long before it was written both city and temple were destroyed. And the more so, as Hegesippus proceeds to say, that immediately upon St. James's martyrdom, Vespasian formed the siege of the city. He adds, οὕτω δὲ ἄρα θαυμάσιός τις ἦν, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ βεβόητο ὁ Ἰάκωβος, ὡς καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίων ἔμφρονας δοξάζειν ταύτην εἶναι τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς παραχρῆμα μετὰ τὸ μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ πολιορκίας τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣν δι' οὐδὲν ἕτερον αὐτοῖς συμβῆναι, ἢ διὰ τὸ κατ' αὐτοῦ τολμηθὲν ἄγος. And he quotes from Josephus, ταῦτα δὲ συμβέβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τοῦ δικαίου, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου χριστοῦ· ἐπειδήπερ δικαιότατον αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπέκτειναν: but no such passage as this latter is now found in Josephus.

36. The character of St. James is sufficiently indicated in the foregoing notices. He appears to have been a strong observer of the law, moral and ceremonial: and though willing to recognize the hand of God in the Gentile ministry of Paul and Barnabas, to have remained himself attached to the purely Judaistic form of Christianity. "Had not," observes Schaff (Kirchengesch. i. p. 314), "a Peter, and above all a Paul, arisen as supplementary to James, Christianity would perhaps never have become entirely emancipated from the veil of Judaism and asserted its own independence. Still there was a necessity for the ministry of James. If any could win over the ancient covenant people, it was he. It pleased God to set so high an example of O. T. piety in its purest form among the Jews, to make conversion to the gospel, even at the eleventh hour, as easy as possible for them. But when they would not listen to the voice of this last messenger of peace, then was the measure of the divine patience exhausted, and the fearful and long-threatened judgment broke forth. And thus was the mission of James fulfilled. He was not to outlive the destruction of the holy city and the temple. According to Hegesippus, he was martyred in the year before that event, viz. A.D. 69."

37. According to the above hypothetical calculation (par. 32), he would be, at the date of his martyrdom, about 71 years of age. The various particulars of his connexion with our present Epistle will be found in the following sections.

38. The literature of the subject treated in this section is very extensive. I may refer the reader to the Einleitungen of De Wette, Huther, and Wiesinger: to Lange's art. in Herzog's Encyclopädie: to Gieseler's Kirchengeschichte, i. p. 89 ff.: to Schaff's do. vol. i. §§ 79, 80: to Neander's Pflanzung u. Leitung, p. 553 ff. and note: to Schneckenburger, Annotatio ad Epist. Jacobi, p. 144: and Davidson, Introd. to N. T., vol. iii. p. 302 ff.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS THE EPISTLE WAS WRITTEN.

1. It is evident from the contents of the Epistle, that it was written for *Christian* readers. The Writer calls himself *κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δοῦλος*, and addresses the readers throughout as his *ἀδελφοί*. In ch. i. 18 he says that God has begotten *us* (*ἡμᾶς*) by the word of truth: in ch. ii. 1 he addresses them as having the faith of Jesus Christ the Lord of glory: in id. ver. 7, he speaks of the *καλὸν ὄνομα* by which they were called: and in ch. v. 7, he exhorts them to patience on the ground that the coming of the Lord was near. Besides which, the whole passage, ch. ii. 14, proceeds on the manifest supposition that writer and readers had one and the same faith.

2. At the same time, the address of the Epistle, *ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*, which will not bear a spiritual meaning, but only the strictly national one, quite forbids us from supposing that Christians *in general* were in the Writer's view. Believing Jews, and they only, were the recipients of the Epistle. Not the words of the address, but the circumstances of the case, and the language of the Epistle, exclude those who did not believe.

3. This Judaistic direction of the letter is evident from ch. ii. 2, where *συναγωγή* is the place of assembly: from ib. 19, where monotheism is brought forward as the central point of faith: from ch. v. 12, where, in the prohibition of swearing, the formulæ common among the Jews are introduced: from ib. ver. 14, where anointing with oil is mentioned. And not only so, but all the ethical errors which St. James combats, are of that kind which may be referred to carnal Judaism as their root.

4. Huther, from whom I have taken the foregoing paragraphs of this section, remarks, that the argument against faith alone without works is no objection to the last-mentioned view, but is rather in refutation of this same Jewish error, which was but the successor of the Pharisaical confidence in the fact of possessing the law, without a holy life: see Rom. ii. 17 ff.: and compare Justin Mart. Dial. § 141, p. 231, who says of the Jews, *οἱ λέγουσιν ὅτι κἂν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὦσι, θεὸν δὲ γινώσκωσιν, οὐ μὴ λογίσηται αὐτοῖς ἁμαρτίαν.* There is indeed no trace in the Epistle of an anxious and scrupulous observance of the Mosaic ritual on the part of the readers: but this may be because in the main on this point the Writer and his readers were agreed. And we do find in it traces of an erroneous estimate of the value of mere *θρησκεία* (ch. i. 22 ff.): and a trace of fanatical zeal venting itself by *ὀργή*.

5. The situation of these Judæo-Christian churches or congregations, as discernible in the Epistle, was this. They were tried by manifold trials, ch. i. 2. We are hardly justified in assuming that they were entirely made up of poor, on account of ch. ii. 6, 7: indeed the former verses of that chapter seem to shew, that rich men were also found among them. However, this probably was so for the most part, and they were oppressed and dragged before the judgment-seats by the rich, which trials they did not bear with that patience and humility which might have been expected of them as Christians, nor did they in faith seek wisdom from God concerning them: but regarded Him as their tempter, and their lowliness as shame, paying carnal court to the rich, and despising the poor.

6. As might have been expected, such worldliness of spirit gave rise to strifes and dissensions among them, and to a neglect of self-preservation from the evil in the world, imagining that their Christian faith would suffice to save them, without a holy life.

7. There is some little difficulty in assigning a proper place to the rich men who are addressed in ch. v. 1 ff. They can hardly have been altogether out of the pale of the Christian body, or the denunciations would never have reached them at all: but it is fair to suppose that they were unworthy professing members of the churches.

8. It must be owned that the general state of the churches addressed, as indicated by this Epistle, is not such as any Christian teacher could look on with satisfaction. And it is extremely interesting to enquire, how far this unsatisfactory state furnishes us with any clue to the date of our Epistle: an enquiry which we shall follow out in our next section.

9. The designation ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ need not necessarily limit the readers to the Jewish churches *out of* Palestine: but the greater circumference may include the lesser: the διασπορά may be vaguely used, regarding Jerusalem as the centre; and as in Acts viii. 1, where we read πάντες τε διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας,—the exception being the Apostles, who remained in Jerusalem,—may comprehend Palestine itself.

SECTION III.

THE PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

1. As regards the place of writing, if the general opinion as to the author be assumed, there can be but one view. His fixed residence, and

centre of influence, was JERUSALEM. There we find him, at every date in the apostolic period. If he wrote the Epistle, it was written from the holy city.

2. And with this the character of the Epistle very well agrees. Most of the Judæo-Christians addressed in it would be in the habit of coming up to Jerusalem from time to time to the feasts. There St. James, though at a distance, might become well acquainted with their state and temptations, and exercise superintendence over them.

3. It has been pointed out also[1], that the physical notices inserted in the Epistle are very suitable to this supposition. The Writer appears to have written not far from the sea (ch. i. 6; iii. 4): it was a land blessed with figs, oil, and wine (iii. 12). Wide as these notices may be, we have others which seem to come nearer to Palestine. Salt and bitter springs are familiar to him (iii. 11, 12): the land was exposed to drought, and was under anxiety for fear of failure of crops for want of rain (v. 17, 18): it was burnt up quickly by a hot wind (καύσων, i. 11), which is a name not only belonging to West Asia, but especially known in Palestine. "Another phænomenon," says Hug, "which was found where the Writer was, decides for that locality: it is, the former and latter rain, which he names πρώϊμος and ὄψιμος, ch. v. 7, as they were known in Palestine."

4. With regard to the date of the Epistle, opinions are more divided. That it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, will follow as matter of course from what has already been said. But there are two other termini, with reference to which it is important that its place should be assigned. These are (1) the publication of the doctrine of St. Paul respecting justification by faith only: and (2) the Apostolic council in Jerusalem of Acts xv.

5. A superficial view will suggest, that it cannot be till after the doctrine of justification by faith had been spread abroad, that ch. ii. 14 ff. can have been written. And this has been held even by some, whose treatment of the Epistle has been far from superficial[2]. But I believe that a thorough and unbiassed weighing of probabilities will lead us to an opposite conclusion. It seems most improbable that, supposing ch. ii. 14 ff. to have been written after St. Paul's teaching on the point was known, St. James should have made no allusion either to St. Paul rightly understood, or to St. Paul wrongly understood. Surely such a method of proceeding, considering what strong words he uses, would be, to say the least, very ill-judged, or very careless: the former, if he only wished to prevent an erroneous conception of the great Apostle's doctrine,—the latter, if he wished to put himself into direct antagonism with it.

[1] By Hug, Einleitung, edn. 4, p. 438 f.

[2] e. g. Wiesinger.

6. It is much more probable, that all which St. James says respecting works and faith has respect to a former and different state and period of the controversy: when, as was explained above[3], the Jewish Pharisaic notions were being carried into the adopted belief in Christianity, and the danger was not, as afterwards, of a Jewish law-righteousness being set up, antagonistic to the righteousness which is by the faith of Christ, but of a Jewish reliance on exclusive purity of faith superseding the necessity of a holy life, which is inseparably bound up with any worthy holding of the Christian faith.

7. The objection brought against this view is, that the examples adduced by St. James are identical with those which we find in the Epistles of St. Paul, and even in that to the Hebrews: and that they presuppose acquaintance with those writings. But we may well answer, what right have we to make this, any more than the converse assumption? Or rather, for I do not believe the converse to be any more probable, why should not the occurrence of these common examples have been due in both cases to their having been the ordinary ones cited on the subject? What more certain, than that Abraham, the father of the faithful, would be cited in any dispute on the validity of faith? What more probable than that Rahab, a Canaanite, and a woman of loose life, who became sharer of the security of God's people simply because she believed God's threatenings, should be exalted into an instance on the one hand that even a contact with Israel's faith sufficed to save, and that the Apostle on the other should shew that such faith was not mere assent, but fruitful in practical consequences?

8. Again it is urged that, owing to several expressions and passages in our Epistle, we are obliged to believe that St. James had read and used the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. Wiesinger says that any unbiassed reader will see in ch. i. 3 and iv. 1, 12, allusions to Rom. v. 3; vi. 13; vii. 23; viii. 7; xiv. 4. Of these certainly the first is a close resemblance: but that in the others is faint, and the connecting of them together is quite fanciful. And even where close resemblance exists, if the nature of the expressions be considered, we shall see how little ground there is for ascribing to the one writer any necessary knowledge of the other. The expressions are, τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν, James i. 3: ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, Rom. v. 3. Now what could be more likely than that a πιστὸς λόγος like this, tending to console the primitive believers under afflictions which were coeval with their first profession of the Gospel, should have been a common-place in the mouths of their teachers? And accordingly we find a portion of St. James's expression, viz. τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς

[3] § ii. 4.

πίστεως, again occurring in 1 Pet. i. 7: a circumstance which may or may not indicate an acquaintance with the contents of our Epistle.

9. A similar inference has been drawn from the use by St. James of such terms as δικαιοῦσθαι, ἐκ πίστεως, ἐξ ἔργων: which, it is urged, no N. T. writer except St. Paul, or, in the case of the verb, St. Luke under influence of St. Paul, has used. But here again it is manifest that the inference will not hold. The subject, as argued by St. Paul, was no new one, but had long been in the thoughts and disputes of the primitive believers[4].

10. With regard to the other question, as to whether our Epistle must be dated before or after the council in Acts xv., one consideration is, to my mind, decisive. We have no mention in it of any controversy respecting the ceremonial observance of the Jewish law, nor any allusion to the duties of the Judæo-Christian believers in this respect. Now this certainly could not have been, after the dispute of Acts xv. 1 ff. If we compare what St. Paul relates in Gal. ii. 11 ff. (see the last note) of the influence of certain from James, and the narrative of Acts xxi. 18—25, with the entire absence in this Epistle of all notice of the subjects in question, we must, I think, determine that, at the time of writing the Epistle, no such question had arisen. The obligation of observing the Jewish ceremonial law was as yet confessed among Jewish Christians, and therefore needed no enforcing.

11. But here again various objections are brought against assigning so early a date to our Epistle as before the Jerusalem council, principally derived from the supposed difficulty of imagining so much development at that time in the Judæo-Christian congregations. We find, it is alleged, πρεσβύτεροι of an ἐκκλησία, which is not the mere Jewish synagogue used in common by both, but a regularly organized congregation.

12. Now we may fairly say, that this objection is unfounded. The Christian ἐκκλησία is mentioned by our Lord Himself in Matt. xviii. 17, and was so easy and matter-of-course a successor of the synagogue, that it would be sure to be established, wherever there was a Christian community. We find that the different varieties of Jews had their separate synagogues, Acts vi. 9: and the establishment of a separate organization and place of worship would be the obvious and immediate consequence of the recognition of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. In such a congregation, πρεσβύτεροι would be a matter of course.

13. It is also objected, that in the Epistle the readers are treated as mature in the belief and doctrines of the Gospel: that it exhorts, but does not teach[5]. Witness, it is said, the allusions to their knowledge,

[4] As a proof of this, see Gal. ii. 16, a speech which was made certainly a very short time after the council in A.D. 50, and in consequence of a message from James.

[5] Wiesinger, p. 38.

and exhortations to perfection, ch. i. 3; iii. 1; iv. 1. But in those passages there is nothing which might not well apply to the primitive Jewish believers: nothing which, from their knowledge of the O. T., and of the moral teaching of our Lord, they might not well have been aware of.

14. Yet again it is said, that the character of the faults here stigmatized in the Christian congregations is such as to require a considerable period for their development[6]: that they are those which arise from relaxation of the moral energy with which we must suppose the first Jewish converts to have received the Gospel. In answer to this, we may point to the length of time which may well be allowed as having elapsed between the first Pentecost sermon and the time of writing the Epistle, and to the rapidity of the dissemination of practical error, and the progress of moral deterioration, when once set in. We may also remind the reader of the state of the Jewish church and the heathen world around, as shewing that it must not be supposed that all these evils sprung up within the Christian communities themselves: rather we may say, that the seed fell on soil in which these thorns were already sown,—and that, even conceding the position above assumed, § i. 1, a very short time,—less than the 20 years which elapsed between the first Pentecost and the Jerusalem council,—would have sufficed for the growth of any such errors as we find stigmatized in this Epistle.

15. "Where," asks Wiesinger, "shall we look for the Judæo-Christian churches out of Palestine, which will satisfy the postulates of the Epistle?" I answer, in the notice of Acts ii. 5—11, in following out which, we must believe that Christian churches of the dispersion were very widely founded at a date immediately following the great outpouring of the Spirit. Such a persuasion does not compel us to believe that our Epistle was addressed principally to the church at Antioch, or to those in Syria and Cilicia, but leaves the address of it in all the extent of its own words, ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ.

16. The notice of Acts xi. 19 ff., will amply provide for such Christian congregations, consisting mainly or entirely of Jewish believers, as the purposes of this Epistle require. And that notice may surely be regarded as a record of that taking place with increased energy nearer home, which must have been long going on far and wide owing to the agency of the first Pentecostal believers. We find traces of this in the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, where in several cases we have, besides the new converts made, an implied background of μαθηταί, naturally consisting mainly of Jews; and it appears to have been at and by this visit chiefly that the enmity of the Jews every

[6] Wiesinger, ut supra.

where against the Gentile converts, and against the Gospel as admitting them, was first stirred up.

17. These things being considered, I cannot agree with Wiesinger and Schmid in placing our Epistle late in the first age of the church; but should, with the majority of recent Commentators, and historians, including Schneckenburger, Theile, Neander, Thiersch, Hofmann, and Schaff, place it before, perhaps not long before, the Jerusalem council: somewhere, it may be, about the year 45 A.D.

SECTION IV.

OBJECT, CONTENTS, AND STYLE.

1. The object of the Epistle has been already partially indicated, in treating of its readers. It was ethical, rather than didactic. They had fallen into many faults incident to their character and position. Their outward trials were not producing in them that confirmation of faith, and that stedfastness, for which they were sent, but they were deteriorating, instead of improving, under them. St. James therefore wrote this hortatory and minatory Epistle, to bring them to a sense of their Christian state under the Father of wisdom and the Lord of glory, subjects as they were of the perfect law of liberty, new-begotten by the divine word, married unto Christ, and waiting in patience for His advent to judgment.

2. The letter is full of earnestness, plain speaking, holy severity. The brother of Him who opened His teaching with the Sermon on the Mount, seems to have deeply imbibed the words and maxims of it, as the law of Christian morals. The characteristic of his readers was the lack of living faith: the falling asunder, as it has been well callod[7], of knowledge and action, of head and heart. And no portion of the divine teaching could be better calculated to sound the depths of the treacherous and disloyal heart, than this first exposition by our Lord, who knew the heart, of the difference between the old law, in its externality, and the searching spiritual law of the gospel[8].

[7] Wiesinger, Einleitung, p. 42.

[8] The connexion between our Epistle and the Sermon on the Mount has often been noticed: and the principal parallels will be found pointed out in the reff. and commentary. I subjoin a list of them: ch. i. 2, Matt. v. 10—12; ch. i. 4, Matt. v. 48; ch. i. 5 and v. 15, Matt. vii. 7 ff.; ch. i. 9, Matt. v. 3; ch. i. 20, Matt. v. 22; ch. ii. 13, Matt. vi. 14, 15 and v. 7; ch. ii. 14 ff, Matt. vii. 21 ff.; ch. iii. 17, 18, Matt. v. 9; ch. iv. 4, Matt. vi. 24; ch. iv. 10, Matt. v. 3, 4; ch. iv. 11, Matt. vii. 1 f.; ch. v. 2,

3. The main theme of the Epistle may be described as being the ἀνὴρ τέλειος, in the perfection of the Christian life: the ποιητὴς τοῦ νόμου τελείου: and his state and duties are described and enforced, not in the abstract, but in a multitude of living connexions and circumstances of actual life, as might suit the temptations and necessities of the readers.

4. St. James begins by a reference to their πειρασμοί, exhorting them to consider them matter of joy, as sent for the trial of their faith and accomplishment of their perfection, which must be carried on in faith, and prayer to God for wisdom, without doubt and wavering. The worldly rich are in fact not the happy, but the subject of God's judgment: the humble and enduring is he to whom the crown of life is promised (ch. i. 1—12).

5. Then he comes to treat of a πειράζεσθαι which is not from God, but from their own lusts. God on the contrary is the Author of every good and perfect gift, as especially of their new birth by the word of His truth. The inference from this is that, seeing they have their evil from themselves, but their good from Him, they should be eager to hear, but slow to speak and slow to wrath, receiving the word in meekness, being thoroughly penetrated with its influence, in deed and word, not paying to God the vain θρησκεία of outward conformity only, but that of acts of holy charity and a spotless life.

6. The second chapter introduces the mention of their special faults: and as intimately connected with ch. i. 27, first that of respect of persons in regard of worldly wealth (ii. 1—13); and then that of supposing a bare assensive faith sufficient for salvation without its living fruits in a holy life (ii. 14—26). Next, the exhortation of ch. i. 19, "slow to speak, slow to wrath," is again taken up, and in ch. iii. 1—18, these two particulars are treated, in the duties of curbing the tongue and the contentious temper.

7. This last leads naturally on in ch. iv. 1—12 to the detection of the real source of all contention and strife, viz. in their lusts, inflamed by the solicitations of the devil. These solicitations they are to resist, by penitence before God, and by curbing their proud and uncharitable judgments. Then he turns (iv. 13—v. 6) to those who live in their pride and worldliness, in assumed independence on God, and severely reproves the rich for their oppression and defrauding of the poor, warning them of a day of retribution at hand.

8. Then, after an earnest exhortation to patient endurance (ch. v. 7—11) and to abstain from words of hasty profanity (v. 12), he takes occa-

Matt. vi. 19; ch. v. 10, Matt. v. 12; ch. v. 12, Matt. v. 33 ff.; and from other discourses of our Lord, ch. i. 14, Matt. xv. 19; ch. iv. 12, Matt. x. 28. Compare also the places where the rich are denounced with Luke vi. 24 ff.

sion in prescribing to them what to do in adversity, prosperity, and sickness, and as to mutual confession of sin, to extol the efficacy of prayer (v. 13—18), and ends with pronouncing the blessedness of turning a sinner from the error of his way.

9. The character of the Epistle is thus a mixed one: consolatory and hortatory for the believing brethren; earnest, minatory, and polemical, against those who disgraced their Christian profession by practical error. Even in ch. ii. 14—26, where alone the Writer seems to be combating doctrinal error, all his contention is rather in the realm of practice: he is more anxious to shew that justification cannot be brought about by a kind of faith which is destitute of the practical fruits of a Christian life, than to trace the *ultimate ground*, theologically speaking, of justification in the sight of God.

10. As regards the style and diction of our Epistle, Huther has well described it as being "not only fresh and vivid, the immediate outflowing of a deep and earnest spirit, but at the same time sententious, and rich in graphic figure. Gnome follows after gnome, and the discourse hastens from one similitude to another: so that the diction often passes into the poetical, and in some parts is like that of the O. T. prophets. We do not find logical connexion, like that in St. Paul: but the thoughts arrange themselves in single groups, which are strongly marked off from one another. We every where see that the author has his object clearly in sight, and puts it forth with graphic concreteness. Strong feelings, as Kern remarks, produce strong diction: and the style acquires emphasis and majesty by the climax of thoughts and words ever regularly and rhetorically arrived at, and by the constantly occurring antithesis."

11. The introduction and putting forth of the thoughts also is peculiar. "The Writer ever goes at once *in res medias;* and with the first sentence which begins a section,—usually an interrogative or imperative one,—says out at once fully and entirely that which he has in his heart: so that in almost every case the first words of each section might serve as a title for it. The further development of the thought then is regressive, explaining and grounding the preceding sentence, and concludes with a comprehensive sentence, recapitulating that with which he began[9]."

12. The Greek of our Epistle is peculiar. It is comparatively free from Hebraisms; the words are weighty and expressive: the constructions for the most part those found in the purer Greek. It does not sound, in reading, like the rest of the N. T. There is only a slight link or two, connecting the speech of James in Acts xv. with it, which serves somewhat to identify its language with that. Such is ἀκούσατε,

[9] Wiesinger, Einl. p. 44.

Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, ἥ τε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολή, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι, εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνῳ.

And again in H. E. ii. 23, after relating the death of St. James, he says—

τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται· ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μέν· οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν. ὅμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησίαις.

In this passage it can hardly be that νοθεύεται expresses Eusebius's own opinion as to the fact—"it is spurious:" but it simply announces the fact, that "*it is accounted spurious.*"

8. In H. E. vi. 14, Eusebius says of Clement of Alexandria—

ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγομένας παρελθών, τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τήν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν.

But it is manifest, that even were we to take this as fact, its testimony, when taken with the last clause, is very feeble as regards the canonicity of our Epistle.

9. Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus near Rome, quotes our Epistle apparently as Scripture, but not by name (ed. Lagarde, p. 122, l. 8):—

αἱ λαμπάδες ὑμῶν σκοτειναί εἰσιν ἐκ τῆς ἀσπλαγχνίας· ἀπέλθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνίλεως ἐστι τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος (James ii. 13).

10. Jerome, in his Catalog. Scriptorum Eccles. 2, vol. ii. p. 829, says—

"Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quæ de septem catholicis est, quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paullatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem."

11. Against these somewhat equivocal testimonies of the early Fathers, may be set the fact, that the Peschito, or primitive Syriac version, contained our Epistle from the first, although it omitted the second and third of John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. And this fact has the more weight because the Syrian church lay so near to the country whence the Epistle originated, and to those to which it was, in all probability, principally addressed. And, as might be expected, we find it received and cited by the Syrian church as the Epistle of James the Lord's brother. So Ephrem Syrus, and other writers of that church.

12. In the Western church also it soon, though gradually, rose into general acceptation and canonical authority. It was recognized by the council of Carthage in 397. From that time onward, we find it univer-

sally received: and indeed the great company of illustrious Greek Fathers of the fourth century all quote it as canonical Scripture: Athanasius, both the Cyrils, Gregory of Nazianzum, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Chrysostom, the author of the Synopsis, &c.

13. Various reasons might be assigned for the delay in receiving the Epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty about the personal identity and standing of its Writer: the fact, that it was addressed entirely to Jewish believers: the omission in it of most of the particulars of distinctively Christian doctrine: its seeming opposition to the doctrine of justification as laid down by St. Paul: all these would naturally work together to indispose the minds of Gentile Christians towards it. But as Thiersch and Wiesinger have rightly remarked, so much the more valuable are those recognitions of its genuineness and canonicity which we do meet with.

14. At the time of the Reformation, the doubts which once prevailed concerning the Epistle, were again revived. Erasmus, Cardinal Cajetan, Luther, Grotius, Wetstein, shared more or less in these doubts: and their example has been followed by several of the modern Commentators, e. g. Schleiermacher, De Wette, Reuss, Baur, Schwegler, Ritschl. The opinions of all these and their grounds will be found fairly set forth in Huther's Einleitung, pp. 24—35: and in Davidson's Introduction to the N. T., vol. iii. pp. 339—345.

15. On the whole, on any intelligible principles of canonical reception of early writings, we cannot refuse this Epistle a place in the canon. That that place was given it from the first in some part of the church; that, in spite of many adverse circumstances, it gradually won that place in other parts; that when thoroughly considered, it is so consistent with and worthy of his character and standing whose name it bears; that it is marked off by so strong a line of distinction from the writings and Epistles which have not attained a place in the canon: all these are considerations which, though they do not in this, any more than in other cases, amount to demonstration, yet furnish when combined a proof hardly to be resisted, that the place where we now find it in the N. T. canon is that which it ought to have, and which God in His Providence has guided His Church to assign to it.

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

SECTION I.

ITS GENUINENESS.

1. THE First Epistle of St. Peter was universally acknowledged by the ancient church as a part of the Christian Scriptures. The earliest testimony in its favour is found in the Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 1), a document which, even if we were to concede its spuriousness as an Apostolic Epistle, yet cannot be removed far in date from the *age* of the Apostles.

2. The second witness is POLYCARP: of whom Eusebius writes (H. E. iv. 14)—

> ὁ μέν τοι Πολυκαρπος ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους (pp. 1005 ff. ed. Migne) αὐτοῦ γραφῇ φερομένῃ εἰς δεῦρο κέχρηταί τισι μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς.

These *μαρτυρίαι* are too numerous to be cited at length. In ch. ii., he cites 1 Pet. i. 13, 21 and iii.9 : in ch. v., 1 Pet. ii. 11; in ch. vi., 1 Pet. iv. 7; in ch. viii., 1 Pet. ii. 21—24; in ch. x., 1 Pet. ii. 17, 12. Eusebius also says of PAPIAS (H. E. iii. 39)—

> κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.

3. None of the above testimonies from Polycarp mention the Epistle expressly; but IRENÆUS does so, more than once: e. g. Hær. iv. 9. 2, p. 238:—

> "Et Petrus ait in Epistola sua, Quem non videntes diligitis, inquit, in quem nunc non videntes credidistis, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili (1 Pet. i. 8)."

And again, ib. iv. 16. 5, p. 247:—

> "Et propter hoc Petrus ait, Non velamentum malitiæ habere nos libertatem, sed ad probationem et manifestationem fidei (1 Pet. ii. 16)."

4. CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA also quotes it expressly, Strom. iii. 11 [75], p. 544 Potter:—

> διὸ καὶ ὁ θαυμάσιος Πέτρος φησίν, Αγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. ii. 11 f., 15 f.).

And again, ib. 18 [110], p. 562:—

καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τὰ ὅμοια λέγει, Ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. i. 21 f. : and 14—16).

And iv. 7 [47], p. 584 :—

ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιμεν διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι, φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος· τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iii. 14—17).

And again [ib. 48], p. 585 :—

μὴ ξενίζεσθε τοίνυν, ὁ Πέτρος λέγει, κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iv. 12—14).

And ib. 20 [131], p. 622 :—

ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ φησίν, Ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. i. 6—9).

Also in his Pædag. i. 6 [44], p. 124 :—

διὰ τοῦτο φησὶ καὶ Πέτρος, Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. ii. 1—3).

And ib. iii. 11 [74], p. 296, with φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος, he quotes 1 Pet. ii. 18; iii. 8 ff. ; and ib. 12 [85], p. 303, with the same formula, 1 Pet. i. 17—19 ; iv. 3 ; iii. 13.

5. Besides these express citations, he several times quotes without mentioning the name, as 1 Pet. iv. 8 in Strom. i. [27 (173)] p. 423 ; 1 Pet. i. 32 in Quis Div. Serv. [23] p. 948 ; 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10 in Protrept. 4 [59], p. 52 ; 1 Pet. ii. 12, as τοῦτο τὸ εἰρημένον ἁγίως, in Pæd. iii. [11 (53)] p. 285.

6. It is to be noted likewise that the heretic Theodotus, in the tract commonly printed among the works of Clement of Alexandria, twice expressly quotes our Epistle (§ 12, p. 961) : εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι, ὁ Πέτρος φησίν (1 Pet. i. 12), and ib., κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον τιμίῳ καὶ ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἀσπίλῳ αἵματι ἐλυτρώθημεν (1 Pet. i. 19).

7. Origen bears, expressly and often, the same testimony. In the passage on the canon, reported by Eusebius H. E. vi. 25, he says—

Πέτρος δέ, ἐφ' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία ἧς πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι, μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπεν· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν· ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ.

Again in Homil. 7 in Josuam, vol. ii. p. 412 :—

"Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum suarum personabat tubis."

And in his Comm. on Ps. iii., vol. ii. p. 553 :—

κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ· ἐν ᾧ δὲ τοῖς κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iii. 19).

And in his Comm. on John, tom. vi. 18, vol. iv. p. 135 :—

καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν φυλακῇ πορείας μετὰ πνεύματος παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ· θανατωθεὶς γάρ φησι σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iii. 18—21).

Many other places have been collected by Mayerhoff and others, in which Origen quotes our Epistle.

8. Tertullian testifies to the same point. Thus, Scorp. c. 12, vol. ii. p. 146 :—

"Petrus quidem ad Ponticos quanta enim inquit gloria, si non ut delinquentes puniamini, sustinetis! Hæc enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis" &c. (1 Pet. ii. 20 f.).

And ib. c. 14, p. 150:—

"Condixerat scilicet Petrus, regem quidem honorandum" (1 Pet. ii. 17).

9. The opinion of Eusebius, as gathered from those before him, is given in his H. E. iii. 3—

Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα, ἀνωμολόγηται· ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηνται συγγράμμασι.

10. This Epistle is also found in the Peschito version, which contains three only of the Catholic Epistles. It is true, it is not mentioned in the fragment on the canon known by the name of Muratori. But the passage is one not easily understood:—

"Epistola sane Judæ et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur. Et sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta. Apocalypsis etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt."

The simplest interpretation of which latter sentence is, "We receive also only the Apocalypses of John and Peter, which (latter) some of our brethren refuse to have read in the church[6]."

11. It is inferred from a passage of Leontius of Byzantium (+ cir. 610) that Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected the Epistle: but the inference is not a safe one, the words being too general to warrant it: "ob quam causam, ut arbitror, ipsam epistolam Jacobi et alias deinceps catholicas abrogat et antiquat."

12. It is said, in a passage of Petrus Siculus, that the Paulicians rejected it: "Binas vero catholicas . . . . Petri principis apostolorum, pessime adversus illum affecti, ... non admittunt."

13. So that, with these one or two insignificant exceptions, we have the united testimony of antiquity in its favour. It would be superfluous to go on citing later testimonies on the same side.

14. The first doubt in modern times was thrown on its authenticity by Cludius, in his Uransichten des Christenthums, on the ground that its thoughts and expressions are too like those of St. Paul, to have been written by the Apostle whose name it bears.

15. This was taken up by Eichhorn and expanded into the hypothesis, that some one wrote the Epistle who had been long with St. Paul, and had adopted his ideas and phrases: and as this will not fit St. Peter, he

[6] Wieseler proposes an ingenious way of taking the words: We receive also (i.e. besides the two Epistles) the Apocalypse of John, and as much of Peter; i.e. two Epistles and an Apocalypse. Then he refers "quam" to "Apocalypsin." This rendering might perhaps stand, were it not for this latter, which is quite beyond all probability.

supposes that St. Peter found the material, but it was worked up by John Mark. This hypothesis is rejected by Bertholdt, but taken up in another form: viz. by adopting the idea hinted at by Jerome and formally announced by Baronius, that the Epistle was originally written in Hebrew (so Baronius), or Aramaic, and rendered into Greek by Mark (so Baronius) or Silvanus. But, as Huther well remarks, this hypothesis is as arbitrary as the other: and the whole diction of the Epistle and its modes of citation protest against its being thought a translation.

16. De Wette finds reason to doubt the genuineness, but on grounds entirely derived from the Epistle itself. He thinks it too deficient in originality, and too much made up of reminiscences from other Epistles. This ground of objection will be examined, and found untenable, in treating of the character and style of the Epistle.

17. It was to be supposed, that the Tübingen school, as represented by Baur and Schwegler, would repudiate this, as they have done so many other Epistles. The arguments on which the latter of these founds his rejection are worth enumerating, admitting as most of them do, of a ready and satisfactory answer. They are[7]—

(1) *The want of any definite external occasion, and the generality of the contents and purpose.* But it may be replied, it is surely too much to expect that an Apostle should be confined to writing to those churches with which he has been externally connected, and in which an assignable cause for his writing has arisen: and besides, it will be found below, in treating on the occasion and object of the Epistle, that these, though of a general nature, are perfectly and satisfactorily assignable.

(2) *The want of a marked individual character both in composition and in theology.* But on the one hand this is not conceded *in toto*, and on the other it is manifestly unreasonable to require that in one man's writing it should be so plainly notable as in that of another: in St. Peter, as in St. Paul and St. John.

(3) *The want of close connexion and evolution of thought.* But, it may be answered, the purpose and character of the Epistle itself forbids us to require such a connexion: and we may notice that even in St. Paul's Epistles Schwegler professes not to be able to find it[8].

(4) *The impossibility that St. Peter, labouring in the far East, could have become acquainted with the later Epistles of St. Paul so soon* (assuming their genuineness) *after their composition.* But, it is replied, there is no trace in our Epistle of acquaintance with the latest, viz. that to Titus and 2 Timotheus. The only possible difficulty is the ap-

[7] I have taken this statement mainly from Huther, Einl. pp. 28—32.

[8] See on this below, § vi. 9.

parent (?) acquaintance with 1 Timotheus: but this may have come to St. Peter through John Mark.

(5) *The impossibility, on the assumption of the Epistle being written in Babylon* (see below, § iv., on the time and place of writing), *of bringing together the Neronian persecution which is alluded to in it, and the death of St. Peter by martyrdom, during that very persecution.* But it is a pure assumption that the persecution alluded to in the Epistle is that under Nero; and another, that the Apostle suffered martyrdom under Nero at that time.

18. It is also not without interest, to discuss the reasons which Schwegler adduces for believing the Epistle to be a production of the post-apostolic age under Trajan. They are (1) the tranquil unimpassioned tone of the Epistle, contrasted with the effect on the Christians of the Neronian persecution: (2) the circumstance that under the Neronian persecution the Christians were involved in a charge of a definite crime, viz. the setting fire to the city, whereas in our Epistle they suffer as χριστιανοί, on account of the general suspicion of a bad life (ὡς κακοποιοί): (3) the improbability that the Neronian persecution extended beyond Rome: (4) the assumption in the Epistle of regular legal processes, whereas the persecution under Nero was more of a tumultuary act: (5) the state of Christianity in Asia Minor as depicted by the Epistle, answering to that which we find in the letter of Pliny to Trajan.

19. But to these reasons it has been well replied by Huther (1) that the tranquillity of tone is no less remarkable as under the later persecution than under the earlier, and that any other tone would have been unworthy of an Apostle: (2) the suffering of Christians, *as Christians*, did not begin in Trajan's persecution, but was common to the earlier ones likewise: (3) even if the Neronian persecution did not extend beyond Rome, the Christians in the provinces were always liable to be persecuted owing to the same popular hatred: (4) there is in reality no trace of judicial proceedings in our Epistle: (5) the features of persecution in the Epistle *do not* agree with those in Pliny's letter: there, the Christians are formally put to death as such: here, we have no trace of such a sentence being carried out against them.

20. The hypothesis of Schwegler, that the purpose of the Epistle is to be detected in ch. v. 12, as one of reconciliation of the teachings of St. Peter and St. Paul by some disciple of the former who was inclined also to the latter, is well treated by Huther as entirely destitute of foundation.

21. So that, whether we consider external evidence, or the futility of internal objections, we can have no hesitation in accepting the Epistle as the undoubted work of the Apostle whose name it bears.

SECTION II.

ITS AUTHOR.

1. The Apostle Peter, properly called Simon or Simeon (Acts xv. 14: 2 Pet. i. 1), was born at Bethsaida on the sea of Galilee (John i. 45), the son of one Jonas (Matt. xvi. 17) or John (John i. 43 ; xxi. 15), with whom, and with his brother Andrew, he carried on the trade of a fisherman at Capernaum, where he afterwards lived (Matt. viii. 14 ; iv. 18 ‖ : Luke v. 3), with his wife's mother, being a married man[9] (1 Cor. ix. 5).

2. He became very early a disciple of our Lord, being brought to Him by his brother Andrew, who was a disciple of John the Baptist, and had followed Jesus on hearing him designated by his master as the Lamb of God (John i. 35—43). It was on this occasion that Jesus, looking on him and foreseeing his disposition and worth in the work of His Kingdom, gave him the name Κηφᾶς (Aram. כֵּיפָא), in Greek Πέτρος, a stone or Rock (John i. 43 &c. : Mark iii. 16). He does not however appear to have attached himself finally to our Lord till after two, or perhaps more, summons to do so (cf. John, l. c.: Matt. iv. 18 ‖ Mark : Luke v. 1 ff. and notes), but to have carried on his fishing trade at intervals.

3. It would be beside the present purpose to follow St. Peter through the well-known incidents of his apostolic life. His forwardness in reply and profession of warm affection, his thorough appreciation of our Lord's high Office and Person, the glorious promise made to him as the Rock of the Church on that account (Matt. xvi. 16 and note), his rashness, and over-confidence in himself, issuing in his triple denial of Christ and his bitter repentance, his reassurance by the gentle but searching words of his risen Master (John xxi. 15 ff.),—these are familiar to every Christian child : nor is there any one of the leading characters in the gospel history which makes so deep an impression on the heart and affections of the young and susceptible. The weakness, and the strength, of our human love for Christ, are both mercifully provided for in the character of the greatest of the Twelve.

[9] His wife is variously named Concordia or Perpetua by the legends: the Commentators refer to J. F. Meyer de Petri Conjugio (Wittenburg, 1684). Clem. Alex. (Strom. vii. 11 [63], p. 869 P.) relates, φασὶ γοῦν τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον, θεασάμενον τὴν αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ἀγομένην τὴν ἐπὶ θάνατον ἡσθῆναι μὲν τῆς κλήσεως χάριν καὶ τῆς εἰς οἶκον ἀνακομιδῆς, ἐπιφωνῆσαι δὲ εὖ μάλα προτρεπτικῶς τε καὶ παρακλητικῶς ἐξ ὀνόματος προσειπόντα· μεμνήσθω αὐτὴ τοῦ κυρίου (qu. μέμνησο, ὦ αὕτη, τ. κ.). And in Strom. iii. 6 [52], p. 535 P., he says, Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο. On the question whether Mark was his son, see note on 1 Pet. v. 13.

4. After the Ascension, we find St. Peter at once taking the lead in the Christian body (Acts i. 15 ff.), and on the descent of the Holy Spirit, he, to whom were given the keys of Christ's kingdom,—who was to be the stone on which the church was to be built, first receives into the door of the church, and builds up on his own holy faith, three thousand of Israel (Acts ii. 14—41): and on another occasion soon following, some thousands more (Acts iv. 4).

5. This prominence of St. Peter in the church continues, till by his specially directed ministry the door into the privileges of the gospel covenant is opened also to the Gentiles, by the baptism of Cornelius and his party (Acts x.). But he was not to be the Apostle of the Gentiles: and by this very procedure, the way was being made plain for the ministry of another who was now ripening for the work in the retirement of his home at Tarsus.

6. From this time onward, the prominence of St. Peter wanes behind that of St. Paul. The "first to the Jew" was rapidly coming to its conclusion: and the great spreading of the feast to the Gentile world was henceforward to occupy the earnest attention of the apostolic missionaries, as it has done the pages of the inspired record. Only once or twice, besides the notices to be gathered from this Epistle itself, do we gain a glimpse of St. Peter after this time. In the apostolic council in Acts xv. we find him consistently carrying out the part which had been divinely assigned him in the admission of the Gentiles into the church; and earnestly supporting the freedom of the Gentile converts from the observance of the Mosaic law.

7. This is the last notice which we have of him, or indeed of any of the Twelve, in the Acts. But from Gal. ii. 11, we learn a circumstance which is singularly in keeping with St. Peter's former character: that when at Antioch, in all probability not long after the apostolic council, he was practising the freedom which he had defended there, but being afraid of certain who came from James, he withdrew himself and separated from the Gentile converts, thereby incurring a severe rebuke from St. Paul (ib. vv. 14—21).

8. From this time, we depend on such scanty hints as the Epistles furnish, and upon ecclesiastical tradition, for further notices of St. Peter. We may indeed, from 1 Cor. ix. 5, infer that he travelled about on the missionary work, and took his wife with him: but in what part of the Roman empire, we know not. If the Babylon of ch. v. 13 is to be taken literally, he passed the boundaries of that empire into Parthia.

9. The best text, and starting-point, for treating of the traditions respecting St. Peter, is the account given by Jerome, after others, De Scriptor. Eccl. 1, vol. ii. p. 827:—

> "Simon Petrus . . . . princeps Apostolorum, post episcopatum Antiochensis ecclesiæ et prædicationem dispersionis eorum qui de

circumcisione crediderant, in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia et Bithynia, secundo Claudii anno ad expugnandum Simonem Magum Romam pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est, decimum quartum. A quo et affixus cruci martyrio coronatus est, capite ad terram verso et in sublime pedibus elevatis, asserens se indignum qui sic crucifigeretur ut dominus suus. Sepultus Romæ in Vaticano juxta viam triumphalem totius urbis veneratione celebratur."

10. In this account, according to Huther, we have the following doubtful particulars :—

(1) The episcopate of St. Peter at Antioch. This is reported also by Euseb. (Chron. A.D. 40), who makes St. Peter *found* the church at Antioch, in contradiction to Acts xi. 19—22.

(2) His personal work among the churches of Asia Minor, which seems to be a mere assertion founded on Origen's conjecture (Eus. H. E. iii. 1), Πέτρος ἐν Πόντῳ κ.τ.λ. κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰουδαίοις ἔοικεν, grounded upon 1 Pet. i. 1[1].

(3) His journey to Rome to oppose Simon Magus: which, as Eus. (Chron.) appeals to Justin Martyr for it, appears to be founded on Justin's story of the statue found at Rome, see note on Acts viii. 10: which is now known to have been a statue of the Sabine god Semo Sancus.

(4) The twenty-five years' bishopric of St. Peter at Rome. This has been minutely examined by Wieseler, and shewn on chronological grounds to have been impossible, and to be inconsistent with Gal. ii. 7—9, according to which Peter, who by this hypothesis had been then for many years bishop of Rome, and continued so for many years after, was to go to the circumcision as their Apostle.

(5) The peculiar manner of his crucifixion, which seems to have been an idea arising from Origen's expression (Eus. H. E. iii. 1), ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς. This expression, it has been suggested, might import no more than *capital punishment*. But surely this cannot be, in connexion with ἀνεσκολοπίσθη; the words must be taken literally, as qualifying the verb, which is already sufficiently definite of itself. Besides which, the words following in Origen are entirely against such a supposition; οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν: for it would deprive them of all meaning.

11. The residuum from this passage, which is worth our consideration and elucidation, is, the death of the Apostle by martyrdom, and that in Rome. This seems to be the concurrent testimony of Christian antiquity. I subjoin the principal testimonies.

12. First we have John xxi. 19, which, whether a notice inserted

[1] This is granted even by the R.-Cath. Windischmann (Vindiciæ Petrinæ, p. 112 f.).

after the fact, and referring to it, or an authoritative exposition of our Lord's words to Peter, equally point to the fact as having been, or about to be accomplished.

13. Clement of Rome, Ep. i. ad Corinth. c. 5, p. 217, says—

(. . . ὁ Πέτρ)ος διὰ ζῆλον ἄδικον οὐχ (ἕνα οὐ)δὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείους ἤνεγκεν πόνους, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρ(ήσας) ἐπορεύθη εἰς ὀφειλ(όμενον) τόπον τῆς δόξης.

Here indeed there is no mention of Rome: but the close juxta-position of the celebrated passage about St. Paul (cited in Vol. III. Prolegg., ch. vii. § ii. 20) seems to point to that city as the place of Peter's martyrdom. Besides, I would suggest that these words, ἐπορεύθη εἰς . . . . τόπον τ. δ., are a reminiscence of Acts xii. 17, καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον, which by the advocates of the twenty-five years' Roman bishopric was interpreted to mean Rome.

14. Dionysius of Corinth is cited by Eusebius, H. E. ii. 25, as saying in an Epistle to the Romans—

ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης νουθεσίας τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου κ. Παύλου φυτείαν γενηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε κ. Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε. καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες[2] ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν.

15. Tertullian, Contra Marcion. iv. 5, vol. ii. p. 366, says—

"Romani . . . quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt."

And, Præscript. Hær. c. 36, ib. p. 49—

"Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est. Ista quam felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur, ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur."

16. Caius the presbyter of Rome, in Eus. H. E. ii. 25, is reported as saying—

ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι· ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσῃς ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικανὸν ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὠστίαν, εὑρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἱδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

This passage can mean nothing else than that Peter and Paul suffered at Rome, and that either their graves or some memorials of their martyrdom were to be seen on the spot.

17. To these testimonies we may add that of Eusebius himself, who says (H. E. ii. 25)—

[2] These three words, ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν, are omitted, apparently by a misprint, in Heinichen's edition, which I use. See Wieseler, Chron. der Apost. Zeitalters, p. 534, note 2.

ταύτῃ γοῦν οὗτος θεόμαχος (Nero) ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα πρῶτος ἀνακηρυχθείς, ἐπὶ τὰς κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπήρθη σφαγάς. Παῦλος δὴ οὖν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθῆναι, καὶ Πέτρος ὡσαύτως ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι κατ' αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦνται.

And in his Demonstratio Evang. iii. 5, vol. iv. p. 116—

καὶ Πέτρος δὲ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατὰ κεφαλῆς σταυροῦται, Παῦλος δὲ ἀποτέμνεται.

18. And that of Lactantius (De Mortibus Persecutorum, c. 2, vol. ii. p. 195 f., ed Migne):—

"Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit, et editis quibusdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipsius Dei data sibi ab eo potestate faciebat, convertit multos ad justitiam, Deoque templum fidele et stabile collocavit. Qua re ad Neronem delata, quum animadverteret non modo Romæ sed ubique quotidie magnam multitudinem deficere a cultu idolorum, et ad religionem novam damnata vetustate transire, ut erat exsecrabilis ac nocens tyrannus, prosilivit ad excidendum cœleste templum, delendamque justitiam: et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit."

19. In this report later testimonies concur.

In forming an estimate of its trustworthiness, some discrimination is necessary. The whole of that which relates to the earlier visits under Claudius, and the controversy with Simon Magus, fails us, as inconsistent with what we know, or are obliged to infer, from Scripture itself. This being so, is the rest, including the martyrdom at Rome, so connected with this fabulous matter, that it stands or falls with it? When we find in this, as in other matters, that the very earliest Christian writers might and did fall into historical errors which we can now plainly detect and put aside,—when we find so prevalent a tendency even in early times to concentrate events and memorials of interest at Rome, how much are we to adopt, how much to reject, of this testimony to St. Peter's martyrdom there?

20. These are questions which it would far exceed the limits of these Prolegomena to discuss, and which moreover do not immediately belong even to collateral considerations regarding our Epistle. They have been very copiously treated, and it seems almost impossible to arrive at even reasonable probability in our ultimate decision upon them. Their own data are perplexing, and still more perplexing matters have been mixed up with them. On the one hand, ancient tradition is almost unanimous: on the other, it witnesses to particulars in which even its earliest and most considerable testimonies must be put aside as inconsistent with known fact. Then again we have on the one hand the patent and unscrupulous perversion of fact to serve a purpose, which has ever been the characteristic of the church of Rome, in her desperate

shifts to establish a succession to the fabulous primacy of St. Peter, and on the other the exaggerated partisanship of Protestant writers, with whom the shortest way to save a fact or an interpretation from abuse has been to demolish it.

21. So that on the whole it seems safest to suspend the judgment with regard to the question of St. Peter's presence and martyrdom at Rome. That he was not there before the date of the Epistle to the Romans (cir. A.D. 58), we are sure: that he was not there during any part of St. Paul's imprisonment there, we may with certainty infer: that the two apostles did not together found the churches of Corinth and Rome, we may venture safely to affirm: that St. Peter ever was, in any sense like that usually given to the word, Bishop of Rome, is we believe an idea abhorrent from Scripture and from the facts of primitive apostolic history. But that St. Peter travelled to Rome during the persecution under Nero, and there suffered martyrdom with, or nearly at the same time with, St. Paul, is a tradition which does not interfere with any known facts of Scripture or early history, and one which we have no means of disproving, as we have no interest in disproving it.

22. It may be permitted us on this point, until the day when all shall be known, to follow the cherished associations of all Christendom —to trace still in the Mamertine prison and the Vatican the last days on earth of him to whom was committed especially the feeding of the flock of God: to "witness beside the Appian way the scene of the most beautiful of ecclesiastical legends[3], which records his last vision of his crucified Lord: to overlook from the supposed spot of his death[4] the city of the seven hills: to believe that his last remains repose under the glory of St. Peter's dome[5]."

23. The matters relating to the above questions will be found in Winer, Realwörterbuch, art. Petrus: in Wieseler, Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters, pp. 553—593: Neander, Pflanzung u. Leitung u.s.w., ii. p. 514 ff.: Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte, i. 1, p. 101 ff.: David-

[3] Stanley, Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, p. 96. The legend referred to is that related by Ambrose, Sermo de Basil., appended to Ep. 21 (33, ed. Paris 1586), vol. iii. p. 867, that St. Peter not long before his death, being overcome by the solicitations of the faithful to save himself, was flying from Rome, when he was met by our Lord, and on asking, "Lord, whither goest thou?" received the answer, "I go to be crucified afresh." On this the Apostle returned and joyfully went to martyrdom. The memory of this legend is yet preserved in Rome by the Church called "Domine, quo vadis?" on the Appian way.

[4] "The eminence of S. Pietro in Montorio on the Janiculum" (Stanley, note ib.).

[5] "The remains of St. Peter, as is well known, are supposed to be buried immediately under the great altar in the centre of the famous basilica which bears his name" (Stanley, ib.). See in the same work an interesting account of the Judaizing party which gathered round the person of Peter, p. 96 ff.

son, Introd. to N. T. vol. iii. pp. 357 ff. The Roman Catholic side is stated and defended by Baronius, Annals, on A.D. 44—46, 56, 69: and of late by Windischmann, Vindiciæ Petrinæ, Ratisb. 1836.

SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The inscription of the letter itself has on this point an apparent precision: ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας. This would seem to include the Christians dwelling in those very provinces where St. Paul and his companions had founded churches.

2. But it has been attempted, both in ancient days and in modern, to limit this address to the Jewish Christians resident in those provinces. This has been done by Eusebius, Didymus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Œcumenius, Theophylact: and by Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Augusti, Hug, Bertholdt, Pott, Weiss, al.

3. Still, there is nothing in the words to warrant such a limitation. The παρεπιδήμοις is sufficiently explained in the Epistle itself, in ch. ii. 11, as used in a spiritual sense, strangers and pilgrims on earth: and the διασπορᾶς following may well designate the ingrafting of Gentile converts into, and their forming a part of, God's covenant people, who already, according to the flesh, were thus dispersed.

4. With this view well-known facts, both external to the Epistle and belonging to it, agree. Those churches, as we learn from the Acts, were composed mainly of Gentile converts: and it would be unreasonable to suppose that St. Peter, with his views on the Christian relation of Jew and Gentile, as shewn in Acts xi. and xv., should have selected out only the Jewish portion of those churches to address in his Epistle. Rather, if one object of the letter were that which I have endeavoured to establish in § v., would he be anxious to mingle together Jew and Gentile in the blessings and obligations of their common faith, and though himself the Apostle of the circumcision, to help on the work and doctrines of the great Apostle of the uncircumcision.

5. And this is further evident from many passages in the Epistle itself. Such is the μὴ συνσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις (ch. i. 14), words which would hardly be addressed to Jews exclusively, cf. Eph. ii. 1 ff., where the Jews are indeed included in ἡμεῖς πάντες, but Gentiles are mainly addressed: such the οἵ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ (ii. 10)[6], as compared with ver. 9, τοῦ ἐκ σκότους

[6] It has been argued (see amongst others Weiss, Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff, p. 119) that this passage, being originally written by Hosea of the rejected people of God, must

ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, and with Rom. ix. 25: such the ἧς (Σάῤῥας) ἐγενήθητε τέκνα (iii. 6), implying adoption into the (spiritual) family of Abraham: such the ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι πεπορευμένους ἐν . . . . ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις (iv. 3), which words are addressed to the readers, and not to be supplied with ἡμῖν: and seem decisive as to Gentiles in the main, and not Jews, being designated. The expression of ch. i. 18, οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, may seem ambiguous, and has in fact been quoted on both sides: but it seems to me to point the same way as those others: the Apostle would hardly have characterized all that the Jew left to become a Christian by such a name[7].

6. Steiger, in his Einleitung, § 6, has given a list of such churches as would be comprehended under the address in ch. i. 1, Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας. The provinces here named proceed in order from N.E. to S. and W.: a circumstance which will be of some interest in our enquiry as to the place of writing[8]. ⌈The first of them, PONTUS, stretched from Colchis and Lesser Armenia to the mouth of the river Halys, and was rich both in soil and in commercial towns. It was the country of the Christian Jew Aquila.⌋ Next comes GALATIA, to which St. Paul paid two visits (Acts xvi. 6 and Gal. iv. 13 ff.: Acts xviii. 23 and xix. 1 ff.), founding and confirming churches. After him, his companion Crescens went on a mission there (2 Tim. iv. 10). Its ecclesiastical metropolis was in after time Ancyra. Further particulars respecting it will be found in the Prolegg. to Vol. III. ch. i. § ii.

7. Next in order comes CAPPADOCIA, south but returning somewhat to the E., where in after times the towns of Nyssa and Cæsarea gave the church a Gregory and a Basil, and whence (see Acts ii. 9, and

be so understood here. But this is mere arbitrary assertion. The context here must determine in what sense the Apostle adopts the words of the Prophet: and I have no hesitation in saying with Augustine and Bede, "Hoc testimonium quondam per Hoseam antiquo Dei populo datum est, quod nunc recte gentibus dat Petrus." The express citation of the same passage by St. Paul in Rom. ix. 25, as applying to Gentiles, should have prevented Weiss at all events from speaking here with his usual overweening positiveness.

[7] Weiss, in his treatise quoted in the last note, has taken very strongly the side of Judæo-Christian readers only being addressed. He has laid great stress, p. 108 ff., on the O. T allusions in the Epistle, as shewing this. But either his instances prove nothing, or they prove too much. In the same way we might argue of the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, which abound much more with O. T. allusions. I may remark here generally, that Weiss's treatise, conclusive as he would represent his results, and strongly as he states them, is very deficient in thoroughness and fairness of investigation; being rather an attempt to justify a preconceived view, than an impartial dealing with the phænomena of the Epistle. See this further illustrated, when we come to speak of the date of the Epistle, below, § iv.

[8] See below, § iv. 17.

Josephus, Ant. xvi. 6) Jews came up to the feasts in Jerusalem, who might well have carried back the knowledge of Christianity, and have founded churches. Next, going southward and westward, we have proconsular ASIA, including Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Phrygia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia,—containing the churches of Iconium where Paul and Barnabas preached (Acts xiv. 1 ff.), Lystra, the birthplace of Timotheus, where St. Paul was stoned by the Jews (Acts xiv. 8—19; xvi. 1, 2: 2 Tim. iii. 11),—Derbe, the birthplace of Caius, where many were made disciples (Acts xiv. 20 f.; xx. 4),—Antioch in Pisidia, where St. Paul converted many Gentiles, but was driven out by the Jews (Acts xiii. 14 ff., 48 ff.): returned however, and confirmed the churches (ib. xiv. 21—23),—then Miletus, on the Carian coast, where from Acts xx. 17 and 2 Tim. iv. 20, there must have been Christian brethren,—Phrygia, where St. Paul preached on both his journeys to Galatia (Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23),—then along the banks of the Lycus, Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colossæ, celebrated Christian churches, to which he wrote his Colossian Epistle, whose leaders Archippus and Epaphras, whose member Onesimus, are well known to us (Col. i. 7; iv. 9, 12 f., 17: Philem. 2, 10),—where erroneous doctrines and lukewarmness in the faith soon became prevalent (Col. ii.: Rev. iii. 14—22).

8. Then passing westward, we find in Lydia at the foot of the Tmolus, Philadelphia, known to us favourably from Rev. iii. 7 ff., and Sardis the capital (Rev. iii. 1 ff.), and Thyatira, blamed in Rev. ii. 18 ff. as too favourably inclined towards false teachers: then on the coast the famous Ephesus, where first St. Paul (Acts xviii. 19), then perhaps Aquila and Priscilla, then Apollos (Acts xviii. 24—28), taught, then St. Paul returned and remained *τριετίαν ὅλην* building up the church with such success (Acts xx. 17; xix. 1 ff., 8—10, 17), a church well known and loved by every Christian reader of the Epistle to the Ephesians, but grieved over when we read (Rev. ii. 4) that it had deserted its first love. Then northwards we have Smyrna, known favourably to us from Rev. ii. 8 ff., and in Mysia, Pergamus (Rev. ii. 12 ff.); and lastly Alexandria Troas, whence St. Paul was summoned over by a vision to preach in Europe, where afterwards he preached, and raised Eutychus to life (Acts xx. 6 ff.: 2 Cor. ii. 12), and where he was on a subsequent occasion entertained by Carpus (2 Tim. iv. 13).

This closes the list of churches known to us, BITHYNIA containing none whose names are handed down in Scripture.

9. The enquiry as to the then state of these Christian congregations is one which must be here conducted simply on grounds furnished by the Epistle itself. Its effect on the conclusion to which we must come as to the date of the Epistle will be dealt with in a subsequent section.

10. From the Epistle itself then we gather, that in external form and government they were much in the same state as when St. Paul exhorted

the Ephesian elders at Miletus in Acts xx. Here (ch. v. 1 ff.), as there, the elders (πρεσβύτεροι) are exhorted to tend (ποιμαίνειν) the church or flock of God: and no other officers in either place appear.

11. It was manifestly during a time of persecution that the Apostle thus addressed them. His expressions, especially those in ch. iii. 17 and iv. 12—19, can hardly be interpreted of the general liability of Christians to persecutions, but must necessarily be understood of some trial of that kind then pressing on them[9].

12. It would seem by ch. iv. 4, 5, that some of these trials had befallen the Christians on account of their separating themselves from the licentious shows and amusements of the heathen. And the same passage will shew that it was from heathens, rather than from unbelieving Jews, that the trials came.

13. We may gather, from hints dropped in the course of the Epistle, that there were in the internal state of the churches some tendencies which required repression, as e.g. the disposition to become identified with the heathen way of living (ch. ii. 11, 12, 16 al.),—that to greed and ambition and self-exaltation on the part of the presbyters (v. 2, 3),—that to evil thoughts and evil words towards one another (ii. 1; iii. 8—12; iv. 9).

SECTION IV.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. The former of these enquiries is very closely connected with that of the last section. Many Commentators have fancied that the state of the readers implied in the Epistle, points at the persecution under Nero as the time when it was written[1]: others that the persecution under Trajan is rather indicated[2]. But to both of these it has been sufficiently replied[3], that the passages relied on do not warrant either inference: that the ἀπολογία to be rendered (ch. iii. 15), is not necessarily, nor indeed well can be at all, a public defence in court, seeing that they are to be ready to make it παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι κ.τ.λ.: that the suffering as κακοποιοί cannot well be connected with the *malefici* of Tacitus, because in the Epistle the readers are exhorted to *live down* the ill repute, which, had it consisted in the mere name of Christian,

[9] The bearing of this consideration on the date of the Epistle is treated below, § iv. 1.

[1] So Hug, Einl. ii. p. 469 ff.: Neander, Pflanz. u. Leit. p. 590: De Wette, Einl. p. 1700: Thiersch, Apost. Kirche, pp. 205—208: Mayerhoff: Greswell, al.

[2] So Schwegler, Nachapost. Zeit. ii. 10 ff.

[3] By Credner, Steiger, Wieseler, Davidson, al.

they could not have been. Again it is answered that we have no proof of the Neronian persecution having extended itself into the Asiatic provinces.

2. On the whole it seems to me that we are not justified in connecting the Epistle with either of these persecutions, but are rather to take its notices as pointing to a time when a general dislike of the Christians was beginning to pass into active tyranny, and in some cases into infliction of capital punishment. As Davidson remarks (vol. iii. p. 375), "the trials were not yet excessive. They were alarming in the future. A severe time was *approaching*. Judgment was soon to begin at the house of God. The terrible persecutions and sufferings which the Christians were about to endure, were impending."

3. These remarks are favoured by the tone in which suffering is spoken of, as by no means a matter of course: not sure, nor even likely, to follow upon a harmless Christian life: cf. ch. iii. 13, 14, where, by *τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε;* it seems as if the good liver was in general likely to be let alone; and by what follows, *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι,* it is implied that in some exceptional cases, Christians might be hunted out by zealous enemies and made to suffer *quoad* Christians.

4. So that I should be disposed, judging from the internal notices given of the state of the readers, to place the writing of the Epistle during the latter years of Nero, but before the persecution related by Tacitus, Ann. xiv., broke out. The "odium generis humani" which justified that victimizing of the Christians, was gathering, and producing its anticipatory fruits here and there, wherever circumstances were favourable.

5. And with this agree the personal notices in our Epistle, and inferences to be gathered from it. We must conclude from passages in it that St. Peter was acquainted with the Epistles of St. Paul; not only with his earlier ones, but with those written during his first Roman imprisonment[4]. If now St. Paul was set free from that imprisonment in the year 63 (see Prolegg. to the Pastoral Epistles, Vol. III. § ii. 24), this Epistle cannot well have been written before the end of that year.

6. Another personal notice also agrees with this date. By ch. v. 13 we find that Mark was, at the time of its writing, with the Apostle in Babylon, which I here by anticipation assume to be the well-known city in Chaldea. Now from Coloss. iv. 10, we learn that Mark was at the time of writing that Epistle (61—63) with St. Paul in Rome, but intending to journey into Asia Minor: and from 2 Tim. iv. 11 (67 or 68), we find that he was in Asia Minor, and was to be brought with

[4] See this shewn below, § vi. 2 note.

Timotheus to Rome. Now one of two contingencies is possible. Mark may either have spent some of the interval between these two notices with St. Peter in Babylon, or have betaken himself to that Apostle after the death of St. Paul.

7. Of these two alternatives, it is urged by the advocates of the usual view taken of our Epistle, the latter is the more probable. This Epistle is addressed to churches mostly founded by St. Paul: is it probable that St. Peter would have thus addressed them during the great Apostle's lifetime? When we consider St. Paul's own rule, of not encroaching on other men's labours (Rom. xv. 20), and put together with it the fact of the compact made between the two Apostles as related in Gal. ii. 9, it seems difficult to imagine that such an Epistle should have been written before St. Paul was withdrawn from his labours; which latter took place only at his death. That event, and the strengthening of the influences adverse to St. Paul's doctrine consequent on it, might well agree with the testimony to that doctrine which we find in this Epistle, and especially in ch. v. 12.

8. According to this view, we must place the Epistle late in the second apostolic period. We have seen in the Prolegomena to the Pastoral Epistles, that it is not easy to assign a date for the death of St. Paul before the last year of Nero, i. e. 67 to 68. If we suffer ourselves to be guided by these considerations, we should say, that in the latter part of that year, or the beginning of the next, our Epistle may have been written.

9. But these considerations, forcible as they seem, bring us into a greater difficulty than that of believing the Epistle to have been written during St. Paul's lifetime. They leave absolutely no room for the journey of St. Peter to, and martyrdom at, Rome: none for the writing of the second Epistle, which clearly must not be rejected on such grounds alone. We must therefore adopt the other alternative, and suppose the writing to have taken place during a temporary withdrawal of the great Apostle to some other and distant scene of missionary action between the year 63 and 67.

10. Next as to the place, whence it was written. If words are to be taken literally, this is pointed out with sufficient plainness in the Epistle itself (ch. v. 13), where we read *ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή*, as being BABYLON.

And there does not appear to be any reason to depart from the *prima facie* impression given by this notice, that St. Peter was at that time dwelling and working at the renowned Babylon on the Euphrates.

11. It is true, that from very early times the name has suggested other interpretations. Eusebius (H. E. ii. 15) quotes with a *φασίν*, and alleges for it generally the authority of Papias and Clement of Alexandria in the Hypotyposeis, *τοῦ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ*

προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, ἥν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης, σημαίνειν τε τοῦτ' αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα προσειπόντα, κ.τ.λ. And so also Œc. in loc., assigning however a very insufficient reason: Βαβυλῶνα τὴν Ῥώμην διὰ τὸ περιφανὲς καλεῖ, ὃ καὶ Βαβυλὼν πολλῷ χρόνῳ ἔσχηκε. And Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccles. 8, vol. ii. p. 843: "Meminit hujus Marci et Petrus in Epistola prima, sub nomine Babylonis figuraliter Romam significans." And on Isa. xlvii., vol. iv. p. 549: "Licet ex eo quod juxta LXX scriptum est, θύγατερ Βαβυλῶνος, ... non ipsam Babylonem quidam, sed Romanam urbem interpretentur, quæ in Apocalypsi Joannis et in Epistola Petri Babylon specialiter appellatur." So also Isidore of Seville, as alleged by Davidson, p. 362. And this has been a very general opinion among not only Roman Catholic but also other Commentators. It is held by Grotius, Lardner, Cave, Whitby, Macknight, Hales, Cludius, Mynster, Windischmann, al.: and recently Wiesinger.

12. But there seems to be no other defence for this interpretation than that of prescription. And it is now pretty generally recognized among Commentators that we are not to find an allegorical meaning in a proper name thus simply used in the midst of simple and matter-of-fact sayings. The personal notice too, conveyed in ἡ συνεκλεκτή, will hardly bear the violence which many have attempted to put upon it, in supplying ἐκκλησία (see digest in loc.). No such word has been mentioned: nor is the Epistle addressed ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς διασπορᾶς, κ.τ.λ., but ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς, κ.τ.λ. And as those are individual Christians, so it is but reasonable to believe that ἡ συνεκλεκτή is an individual also, the term being strictly correlative with that other: and if an individual, then that ἀδελφὴ γυνή whom, as we know from 1 Cor. ix. 5, St. Peter περιῆγεν in his missionary journeys.

13. And this being so, I can see no objection arising from the ἐν Βαβυλῶνι[s] being inserted. The Apostle, in ch. i. 1, had seen fit to *localize* the Christians whom he was addressing: and he now sends them greeting from one whom indeed he does not name, but designates by an expression also local. To the elect Christians of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, he sends greeting from their sister, an elect Christian woman in Babylon. There might obviously be a reason why he should thus designate her, rather than by her name and relation to himself: but no reason whatever why he should go out of his way to make an enigma for all future readers, if he meant the Church at Rome by these words.

14. But even when we have taken the words literally, we have not yet got their full solution. Some contend, that an insignificant fort in

[s] So Weiss, p. 184 note, "Es unbegreiflich bleibt, warum Petrus den Aufenthalt seiner Gattin angiebt und seinen eigenen nicht."

Egypt, called Babylon[6], is intended. This appears to be the tradition of the Coptic church, and it is supported by Le Clerc, Mill, Pearson, Calov., Pott, Burton, and Greswell. The ground seems mainly to be this; that as it is believed that St. Mark preached, after St. Peter's death, in Alexandria and the parts adjacent, so it is likely that those same parts should have been the scene of his former labours with the Apostle.

15. Others again have supposed it to be Ctesiphon on the Tigris, the winter residence of the Parthian kings; or Seleucia, both of which seem to have borne the name of Babylon after the declension of the older and more famous city. So (as regards Seleucia) Michaelis, who however adduces no proof that it was thus called in the apostolic age.

16. With regard to the probability, or otherwise, of St. Peter having laboured in the Assyrian Babylon at this time, we may notice, that that city in its decayed state, and its neighbourhood, were inhabited by Jews, long after other inhabitants had deserted it: that, which is sufficient for us, Josephus and Philo describe it as thus inhabited in their time[7]. It is true that in the last years of Caligula, who died in A.D. 41, there was a persecution of the Jews there[8], in consequence of which very many of them migrated to the new and rising Seleucia; and five years after, a plague further diminished their number. But this does not preclude their increase or return during the twenty years, at least, which intervened between that plague and the writing of our Epistle.

17. It is some corroboration of the view that our Epistle was written from the Assyrian Babylon to find, that the countries mentioned in the address are enumerated, not as a person in Rome or in Egypt would enumerate them, but in an order proceeding, as has already been noticed, from East to West and South: and also to find that Cosmas Indico-pleustes, in the sixth century, quotes the conclusion of our Epistle "as a proof of the early progress of the Christian religion without the bounds of the Roman Empire: by which therefore we perceive that by Babylon he did not understand Rome[9]."

[6] Thus described by Strabo, xvii. 1, p. 807: *ἀναπλεύσαντι δ' ἐστὶ Βαβυλών, φρούριον ἐρυμνόν, ἀποστάντων ἐνταῦθα Βαβυλωνίων τινῶν, εἶτα διαπραξαμένων ἐνταῦθα κατοικίαν παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων· νυνὶ δ' ἐστὶ στρατόπεδον ἑνὸς τῶν τριῶν ταγμάτων τῶν φρουρούντων τὴν Αἴγυπτον.*

[7] Jos. Antt. xv. 3. 1, *οὐ γὰρ ὀλίγαι μυριάδες τοῦδε τοῦ λαοῦ περὶ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἀπῳκίσθησαν*: Philo de leg. ad Caium 36, vol. ii. p. 587, *πᾶσα γὰρ ἔξω μέρους βραχέος Βαβυλών, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σατραπειῶν αἳ ἀρετῶσαν ἔχουσι τὴν ἐν κύκλῳ γῆν, Ἰουδαίους ἔχουσιν οἰκήτορας.*

[8] See Jos. Antt. xviii. 9. 8.

[9] Lardner, Works, vol. v. p. 269: citing Cosmas, ii. p. 147.

18. With regard to any *journey* of St. Peter to Babylon, as recorded or implied by antiquity, we are quite unfurnished with any other evidence than that deduced from the passage under consideration. And the difficulties which beset the conjunction of the various notices respecting our Apostle remain much the same in amount, whichever way we attempt their solution: whether by forcing the ἐν Βαβυλῶνι to some far-fetched and improbable sense, as has been very generally done, or with Weiss and others assigning an early date to our Epistle, contrary to the plain sense of his own words and the common-sense inferences from the indications furnished by it. That St. Peter wrote this Epistle to churches in Asia Minor mainly consisting of Gentile converts: that those churches had been previously the scene of the labours of St. Paul and his companions: that he wrote from Babylon in Assyria, and at a time subsequent to St. Paul's missionary agency: these are points which can hardly be controverted, consistently with the plain acceptation of language in its obvious and ordinary meaning. That the same Apostle visited Rome and suffered martyrdom there, we would fain believe as the testimony of Christian antiquity. It is difficult to believe it: difficult to assign the time so as to satisfy its requisitions: but in the uncertainty which rests over all the later movements of the great Apostles, it would be presumption for us to pronounce it impossible. There may be means of reconciling the two beliefs, of which we are not aware. And since this may be so, we are not unreasonable in retaining both, both being reasonably attested.

19. One personal notice has not been mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, viz. that of Silvanus having been the bearer of the Epistle (ch. v. 12). And the reason for its omission has been, that it is far too uncertain to found any argument on as to date or locality. Even assuming him to be the same person as the Silas of Acts xv. 22, 32, 40; xvi. 19, 25; xvii. 4, 10, 14; xviii. 5, or the Silvanus of 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 19,—we know absolutely nothing of his history subsequently to that period of his companionship with St. Paul, and all that is founded on any filling up of the gap in his history can only tend to mislead, by giving to baseless conjecture the value of real fact.

SECTION V.

ITS OBJECT AND CONTENTS.

1. The object of the Epistle is plainly enough announced by the Apostle himself at its conclusion:

> Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ . . . . δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα, παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἣν στῆτε.

2. But this apparently simple declaration is not easy to track to its meaning in detail. The παρακαλῶν portion of it involves no difficulty. The frequent exhortations in the Epistle, arising out of present circumstances, are too evident to be missed as being referred to by this word. And when we come to the ἐπιμαρτυρῶν portion, our difficulty is not indeed to find matter in the Epistle to which this may refer, but to identify the ταύτην, to which, as being the ἀληθὴς χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, the Apostle's testimony is given. The ἐπιμαρτυρίαι in the Epistle are plainly those constant references of practice to Christian doctrine, with which every exhortation terminates: being sometimes O. T. citations, sometimes remindings of facts in the evangelic history, sometimes assertions of the great hope which is reserved for God's elect.

3. Here there can be but little doubt: παράκλησις and ἐπιμαρτυρία alternate with and interpenetrate one another throughout the whole [1]. It is only when we come to assign a meaning to the ταύτην, further specified as it is by the εἰς ἣν στῆτε, that the real definition of the object of the Epistle comes before us, and with it, all its uncertainty and difficulty. What is this grace of God in which the readers were to stand—or rather, on account of the εἰς ἣν στ., into which they had been introduced as their safe standing-ground? Obviously in the answer to this question is contained the Apostle's motive for writing.

4. And as obviously, this answer is not to be found within the limits of the Epistle itself. For no such complete setting forth of Christian doctrine is found in it, as might be referred to in such terms: only a continual reminding, an ἐπιμαρτυρία, a bearing testimony to something previously known, received, and stood in, with such expressions as εἰδότες ὅτι, and such assertions as ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, and frequent repetitions of ὅτι, and γάρ, as falling back on previously known truths.

5. And this is further shewn by the εἰς ἣν στῆτε, referring to a body of doctrinal teaching in which the readers had been grounded. Compare the parallel, which surely is not fortuitous, in 1 Cor. xv. 1: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἑστήκατε,—and our assurance that such a reference is intended will be further confirmed.

6. But to what body of doctrine does the Apostle refer? Clearly not to one imparted by himself. There is not the remotest hint in the Epistle of his ever having been among the ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι whom he addresses. As clearly again, not to one fortuitously picked up here and there: the allusions are too marked, the terms used throughout the Epistle too definite for this to be the case. It was not merely the

[1] See this ably elucidated by Brückner, in his portion of the Einleitung to De Wette's Handbuch, edn. 2, pp. 2 ff.

Pentecostal message in its simplicity which these readers had received, nor are they to be sought in the earlier and less definite times of Christian teaching,—nor was the object of writing only general edification: there had been a previous building of them up, a general type of Christian doctrine delivered to them: and it was to confirm this mainly that the Apostle writes to them, exhorting them to holy practice, and "stirring up their pure minds by way of remembrance."

7. It is hardly needful, after what has been already said respecting the churches addressed, to repeat, that this body of Christian teaching I believe to have been that delivered to them by St. Paul and his companions, and still taught among them after his decease by those who had heard him and were watering where he had planted. All the acuteness of such writers as Weiss, who maintain the negative to this, has only the more convinced me that the view is the right and only tenable one.

8. That St. Peter follows out the object not in a spirit dependent on St. Paul's teaching; that he uses, not the expressions and thoughts of that Apostle, but his own, is no more than we should expect from his standing, and personal characteristics; and is not for a moment to be adduced as against the view here maintained, that his object was to build up and establish those churches which had been founded and fostered under the Apostle of the Gentiles. This will be further elucidated in the next section.

9. The contents of the Epistle are summarily but lucidly given by Steiger, Einleitung, p. 27; which he prefaces by this remark: "It is not easy to give a logically arranged table of the contents, in a case where the Writer himself does not lay down an abstract division of his subject with a main and subordinate plan, but goes from one idea to another, not indeed with violent transitions, but still not according to logical connexion, only according to that of the subjects themselves. Besides, the changes are in general so imperceptibly made, that we can hardly tell when we are approaching them."

10. He then gives the following table:

	ch. ver.
Address to the elect of the triune God . .	i. 1, 2.
Preciousness of that mercy of God which has thus chosen them to salvation	3—5;
manifested even in their temporal trials . .	6—9.
Salvation of which prophets spoke, and which angels desire to look into	10—12.
Therefore, the duty of enduring hope, and of holiness in the fear of God	13—17:
(considering the precious blood paid as the price of their ransom)	18—21;

	ch. ver.
and of self-purification (as begotten of God's eternal word)	i. 22—25;
and of growth in the Truth	ii. 1—3;
and of building up on Christ as a spiritual priesthood	4, 5:
Who is to the faithful precious, but to the disobedient a stone of stumbling	6—10.
The duty of pure conversation among the heathen	11, 12;
. . . . . . of obedience to authorities	13—17;
. . . . to masters, even when innocently suffering at their hands	18—20
(for such is the calling of those, for whom Christ suffered innocently)	21—25
. . . . to husbands	iii. 1—6.
(reciprocal duty of husbands)	7
. . . . . . of all, to one another, being kind and gentle; and even to enemies	8—17:
for Christ so suffered and so lives, for the living and the dead	18—20:
and through His Resurrection and exaltation saves us by Baptism	20—22.
Thus then die to sin and live to God, for Christ is ready to judge all	iv. 1—7:
watching, edifying one another, and glorifying God	8—11:
submitting to trial as the proof of your participaion in Christ's sufferings	12—19.
Elders, tend His flock, for His sake	v. 1—4:
younger, be subject: all, be humble	5, 6:
full of trust: watchful: resisting the devil . .	7—9:
and may He who has graciously called you, after short suffering, strengthen and bless you . .	10, 11.
The bearer and aim of the Epistle: salutations; concluding blessing	12—14.

SECTION VI.

CHARACTER AND STYLE.

1. Some Commentators[2] who have impugned the genuineness of our

[2] e. g., Schwegler and De Wette.

Epistle, have objected to it a want of distinctive character, and have alleged that it is less the work of an individual mind than a series of compilations from the work of others, mainly St. Paul and St. James.

2. This however has been distinctly, and as it seems to me successfully denied by others, and especially by Weiss in his work on the Epistle. It is hardly possible for an unprejudiced person to help tracing in the character of it marks of individuality, and a peculiar type of apprehension of Christian doctrine. That St. Peter was well acquainted with St. Paul's teaching is certain, not from this Epistle only, but from the latter Apostle's own declaration in Gal. ii. 2, where he says, *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*, of whom St. Peter certainly was one. That he had seen, and was familiar with, many of St. Paul's Epistles, is equally undeniable[s]. The coincidences in peculiar expression and sequence of thoughts are too marked to be accounted for by any participation in common forms of teaching and thinking, even had this latter been the case, which it was not. The coincidences now before us are of an entirely different nature from those in the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the exception perhaps of that one where an O. T. citation is apparently taken from the Epistle to the Romans.

3. If we seek for tokens of individual character and independence, we shall find them at every turn. Such are, for instance, the designation of the whole Christian revelation as *χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ*, and treatment of it as such, which prevails throughout the Epistle. Cf. ch. i. 3, where it is described as the power of regeneration : i. 10, where it is the salvation promised by the prophets : ii. 19, where it breaks forth even in sufferings : iv. 10, where it is distributed in spiritual gifts : v. 10, where it is the pledge of continued divine help : iii. 7, where it is itself the inheritance of life : i. 13, where it is the material of the revelation of Christ at His coming. And connected with this same, is the way in which 1) *God's acts of grace* are ever brought forward : e. g. i. 20, His fore-ordination of Christ : v. 10, i. 15, ii. 9, His call of His people : i. 3, 23, His new-begetting of them by His word through Christ's Resurrection : iv. 14, the resting of His Spirit on them : iv. 11,

[s] Tables of parallel passages will be found in Huther and Davidson. Brückner also, in his edition of De Wette, has discussed the usually alleged instances of dependency on St. Paul: and Weiss, in his fifth part, "Petrus und Paulus." The following are a few of the most remarkable: The address, as compared with that of Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., &c.: ch. i. 5, with Gal. iii. 23 : i. 21, with Rom. iv. 24 : ii. 1, with Col. iii. 8 (James i. 21): ii. 6, with Rom. ix. 33 (x. 11): ii. 13, 14, with Rom. xiii. 1—4: ii. 16, with Gal. v. 13 : ii. 18, with Eph. vi. 5, Col. iii. 22 : ii. 21, with Rom. vi. 18 : iii. 1 ff., with Eph. v. 22, 1 Tim. ii. 9, 1 Thess. iv. 4 : iii. 8, 9, with Rom. xii. 10 ff.: iii. 22, with Rom. viii. 34, Eph. i. 21, 22 : iv. 1, 2, with Rom. vi. 7 : iv. 10, 11, with Rom. xii. 6—8 : v. 1, with Rom. viii. 18 : v. 8, with 1 Thess. v. 6 : v. 10, 11, with (Heb. xiii. 20, 21) Phil. iv. 19, 20 : v. 14, with Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 1 Thess. v. 26.

i. 5, v. 6, 10, His care for them in ministering strength to them, and guarding them by His power to salvation : and 2) *the connexion between God and His people* insisted on : e. g., ii. 9, 10 : iv. 17, v. 2, generally : iii. 21, where Baptism is ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν : ii. 19, where συνείδησις θεοῦ, an expression no where else found, is a motive for enduring sufferings : iv. 11, where His glory is the ultimate motive of Christian action.

4. And in accordance with this constant setting forth of the reciprocal relation of God and His people, we find our Blessed Lord ever introduced as the *Mediator :* e. g. of things objective, as i. 3, of Regeneration ; iii. 21, of Baptism ; of things subjective, as i. 21, of faith and hope ; ii. 5, of acceptable works for God ; iv. 11, of the power to glorify God. The central point of this mediatorial work is His Resurrection, i. 3, iii. 21 ; in subordination to which the other facts of Redemption are introduced, even where they occur without any necessary reference to it, as e. g., i. 11, 19—21 ; iii. 18 ; ii. 24, 25. And those particulars of Christ's agency are principally brought forward, which are connected with the Resurrection : e. g., His preaching to the imprisoned spirits, iii. 19 ff. ; His Ascension, iii. 22 ; His lordship over His people, ii. 25 ; His future Revelation, i. 7, 13, and that with judgment, iv. 5. Every where it is less the historical Christ, than the exalted Christ of the present and of the future, that is before the Apostle ; the Eternal One, i. 11 ; ii. 25. Even where His sufferings are mentioned, it is ever χριστός or ὁ χριστός : not so much the humiliated One, as the glorified and anointed One of God, ii. 21 ; iii. 18 f. ; iv. 1, 13. And this, partly because their present belief on Him, not their past experience or knowledge of Him, is that which is emphasized, i. 8 ; partly for the reason next to be noticed.

5. Another original and peculiar feature of our Epistle is, its constant reference and forward look to the *future*. This has been indeed by some exaggerated : as, e. g., Mayerhoff. Huther and Luthardt (Das Johan. Evang. p. 110) have considered *hope* as the central idea and subject of the Epistle : and Weiss adopts for St. Peter the title of *the Apostle of hope*. But the fact itself is not to be denied. Wherever we consult the Epistle, it is always the future to which the exhortations point : whether we regard the sufferings of Christ Himself, as pointing on to future glory, i. 11 ; iv. 13 ; or those of His followers, i. 6, 7, 9. Salvation itself is τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως, i. 9 ; is the object of living (i. 3) and certain (i. 13) hope, i. 3, 13, 21 ; iii. 15. The same expectation appears as expressed in τιμή, ii. 7 ; ζωή, iii. 10 (cf. i. 3) ; δόξα, v. 4, 10 : and as a constantly present motive, ii. 2 ; v. 4. The nearness of this future blessedness throws the present life into the background, so that God's people are πάροικοι and παρεπίδημοι, i. 1, 17 ; ii. 11. This

is ever before the Apostle; both in reference to his readers, iv. 13, and to himself, v. 1.

6. Brückner, from whom in the main the foregoing remarks have been adopted, and who goes much further into detail in following out the same, lays stress on several interesting points of individual peculiarity, even where the modes of speech of St. Paul appear to be adopted by St. Peter; e. g., in the comparison of our ch. ii. 24 with Rom. vi. 8—14, where St. Paul's *ζῆν τῷ θεῷ* would have been equally available for St. Peter, who uses *ζῆν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*, which on account of the close comparison with Christ in St. Paul, would not have been so apposite for him: where again the *ἀποθνήσκειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* of St. Paul is not adopted by St. Peter, though quite as well adapted to his purpose as *ἀπογίνεσθαι τῇ ἁμ.*, which he has used. In St. Paul, the death to sin is more a consequence of our union with Christ: in St. Peter, of Christ's having done away sin. The latter, as in other places, approaches nearer to St. John's form of thought and diction.

7. He shews the same with regard to the idea of the Christian *calling of God:* to that of *ἐλπίς*; of *ὑπακοή*; of Christian liberty, as in the one Apostle (Gal. v. 13) the *ἀφορμή*, in the other the *ἐπικάλυμμα* of sin (ch. ii. 16), and besides found in James i. 25, ii. 12, and in John viii. 36: to that of the *χαρίσματα*; of the Christian reward; and several other cases which at first sight seem alike. In all these there is reason to believe that our Apostle, though speaking sometimes exceedingly like St. Paul and possibly from reminiscence of his Epistles, yet drew from another fountain within himself, and had a treasure of spiritual knowledge and holy inspiration distinct from that of St. Paul, incorporated with his own individual habits of thought.

8. And this is confirmed by observing, that it is not with St. Paul only that such affinities are found, but as before observed, with St. John, and with other of the N. T. writers[4]: and by seeing, that in many expressions St. Peter stands quite alone[5]. Add to which, that in several glimpses, which in the course of treatment of other subjects he gives us, of things mysterious and unknown, we evidently see that such

[4] Compare ch. i. 23 with 1 John iii. 9: i. 22 (ii. 2) with 1 John iii. 3: ii. 24 with 1 John iii. 7: iii. 13 with 3 John 11: v. 2 with John x. 16: iii. 18 with 1 John ii. 1, iii. 7: i. 19 with John i. 29: iv. 2 with 1 John ii. 16 f.: ii. 24 with Heb. ix. 28, 1 John iii. 5: i. 2 with Heb. xii. 24: v. 4 with Heb. xiii. 20: iii. 18 (*ἅπαξ*) with Heb. ix. 28: ii. 5 with Heb. xiii. 15. In almost all of the supposed imitations of St. James, O. T. citations are the material which forms ground common to both Apostles. This is the case with i. 6 f. compared with James i. 2: i. 24 with James i. 10: v. 5 with James iv. 6, 10: iv. 8 with James v. 20.

[5] As, e. g., *πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρ.* ch. iii. 22: *φίλημα ἀγάπης*, v. 14: *συνείδησις θεοῦ*, ii. 19: *ἐλπὶς ζῶσα*, i. 3: *κληρονομία ἄφθαρτος ἀμίαντος ἀμάραντος*, ib. 4. See a copious list given in Davidson, p. 386.

revelations come from a storehouse of divine knowledge, which could reveal much more, had it seemed good to Him by whom the hand and thoughts of the Apostle were guided [6].

9. As regards the *style* of our Epistle it has an unmistakeable and distinctive character of its own [7], arising very much from the mixed nature of the contents, and the fervid and at the same time practical rather than dialectical spirit of its Writer. There is in it no logical inference, properly so called: no evolving of one thought from another. The word οὖν occurs only in connexion with imperatives introducing practical inference: ὅτι and διότι only as substantiating motives to Christian practice by Scripture citation or by sacred facts: γάρ mostly in similar connexions. The link between one idea and another is found not in any progress of unfolding thought or argument, but in the last word of the foregoing sentence, which is taken up and followed out in the new one [8].

10. It has been noticed that the same thought is often repeated again and in nearly the same words [9]. This is consistent with the fervid and earnest spirit of the Apostle: which however, as might be expected from what we know of him, was chastened by a sense of his own weakness and need of divine upholding grace. There is no Epistle in the sacred Canon, the language and spirit of which come more directly home to the personal trials and wants and weaknesses of the Christian life. Its affectionate warnings and strong consolation have ever been treasured up close to the hearts of the weary and heavy-laden but onward-pressing servants of God. The mind of our Father towards us, the aspect of our Blessed Lord as presented to us, the preparation by sufferings for our heavenly inheritance, all these as here set forth, are peculiarly lovely and encouraging.

[6] See ch. i. 10, 11; iii. 19, 21; iv. 6, 17; v. 1, 8.

[7] The similarity between the diction of the Epistle and St. Peter's recorded speeches in the Acts, has been often noticed. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 7 with Acts iv. 11: i. 12 with Acts v. 32: ii. 24 with Acts v. 30, x. 39: v. 1 with Acts ii. 32, iii. 15: i. 10 with Acts iii. 18, x. 43: i. 21 with Acts iii. 15, x. 40: iv. 5 with Acts x. 42: i. 21 with Acts iii. 16: ii. 24 with Acts iii. 19, 26. In connexion of sentence with sentence also (see below, par. 10) there is great similarity: cf. Acts iii. 21, χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν δεῖ . . . . πάντων, ὧν ἐλάλησεν . . . . besides the same spirit, and view of the Gospel facts and announcements, being manifest throughout. Compare e. g. the summary of that part of his first speech which is not recorded,—σώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης, Acts ii. 40, with the frequent exhortations in our Epistle to separation from the heathen world.

[8] See, e. g., ch. i. ver. 4, ὑμᾶς . . . , ver. 5, τοὺς . . . : ver. 5, καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ . . . , ver. 6, ἐν ᾧ . . . : ver. 7, Ἰησ. χριστοῦ . . . , ver. 8, ὃν . . . : ver. 9, σωτηρίαν . . . , ver. 10, περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας . . . : ver. 10, προφῆται . . . , ver. 12, οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη: &c., &c. And so we might proceed through the Epistle.

[9] Compare ch. iii. 1 with iii. 16, and with ii. 12: iv. 8 with i. 14 and ii. 11: iv. 12 with i. 6—9: iv. 14 with iii. 14, 17, and with ii. 20: v. 8, with iv. 7, and with i. 13.

And the motives to holy purity spring direct out of the simple and childlike recognition of the will of our Heavenly Father to bring us to His glory.

11. All who have worthily commented on the Epistle have spoken in similar strains of its character and style. "Mirabilis est gravitas et alacritas Petrini sermonis, lectorem suavissime retinens," says Bengel. "Habet hæc Epistola τὸ σφοδρόν conveniens ingenio principis Apostolorum," says Grotius. And Erasmus calls it "Epistolam profecto dignam Apostolorum principe, plenam auctoritatis et dignitatis apostolicæ, verbis parcam, sententiis differtam, &c." And recently Wiesinger sums up thus his characteristic of the Epistle: "Certainly, it entirely agrees in tone and feeling with what we have before said of the character of the Apostle. His warm self-devotion to the Lord, his practical piety and his active disposition, are all reflected in it. How full is his heart of the hope of the revelation of the Lord! With what earnestness does he exhort his readers to lift their eyes above the sufferings of the present to this future glory, and in hope of it to stand firm against all temptation! He who in loving impatience cast himself into the sea to meet the Lord, is also the man who most earnestly testifies to the hope of His return:—he who dated his own faith from the sufferings of his Master, is never weary in holding up the suffering form of the Lord before the eyes of his readers to comfort and stimulate them:—he before whom the death of a martyr is in assured expectation, is the man who most thoroughly, and in the greatest variety of aspects, sets forth the duty and the power, as well as the consolation, of suffering for Christ. If we had not known from whom the Epistle comes, we must have said, It must be a Rock of the church (ein Felsenmann) who thus writes: a man whose own soul rests on the living Rock, and who here, with the strength of his testimony, takes in hand to secure the souls of others, and against the harassing storm of present tribulation to ground them on the true Rock of ages[1]." The whole may be summed up by saying, that the entire Epistle is the following out of our Lord's command to its Writer, καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου[2].

---

[1] Einl. p. 18.

[2] I cannot forbear, as caring above all for the spiritual life in God of the students of His holy word, recommending to them most strongly the commentary of our own Archbishop Leighton, as a devotional subsidiary to their critical and exegetical studies of this Epistle. To the mere scholar, it may not present much matter of interest; but to one who wishes that the mind of God's Spirit, speaking in the Apostle, may live and grow within his own breast, no writer on Scripture that I know furnishes a more valuable help than Leighton.

It will be observed that I have throughout this chapter abstained from introducing considerations and comparisons of the Second Epistle of St. Peter. I have done this, because I wished to keep the first Epistle clear of all the doubt and difficulty which surround the treatment of the other, which I have reserved entire for the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

SECTION I.

OBJECT, CONTENTS, AND OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

1. I THINK it best to approach the difficult question of the genuineness of this Epistle, by a consideration of the internal characteristics of the writing itself.

2. Its general object is no where so distinctly declared, as that of 1 Pet. in v. 12 (ch. iii. 1, 2 being *special*). But the two concluding verses contain in them the double aim which has been apparent through the whole. In iii. 17 we read, *προγινώσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ*, and in iii. 18, *αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.* These two, the prohibitory and the hortatory, are the objects of the Epistle. The former is the introduction to the latter, which, as might be expected, is the main and ultimate aim.

3. And this ultimate aim is apparent from the very beginning. Ch. i. 1—11 is devoted to fervent enforcing of it. Then i. 12—21, laying down the grounds on which the *γνῶσις* rests, viz. apostolic testimony and prophetic announcement, forms a transition to the description, ch. ii., of the false prophets and teachers who were even then coming in, and should wax onward in activity and influence. Then in ch. iii., the further error of false teachers in scorning and disbelieving the promise of the coming of the Lord is stigmatized and refuted, and the Epistle concludes with a general reference to the Epistles of St. Paul, as teaching these same truths, and as being perverted like the other Scriptures by the ignorant and unstable.

Throughout all, one purpose and one spirit is manifest. The *ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησ. χρ.* is ever the condition of salvation (ch. i. 8; ii. 20; iii. 18). Sometimes we have it on the side of know-

ledge of the Father who hath called us (i. 2, 3), sometimes on that of knowledge of the gospel as the way of righteousness (ii. 21 : cf. ii. 2). This ἐπίγνωσις is the central point of the Christian life, both theoretically and practically considered : it is the vehicle of the divine agency in us, and so of our highest participation of God (i. 3, 4) : it is the means of escape from the pollutions of the world (ii. 20),—the crowning point of Christian virtues (i. 8),—the means of access into Christ's kingdom (i. 11).

And the side of our Lord's own Person and Office on which attention is fixed is not so much His historical life, as His δύναμις and ἐξουσία in His exalted state of triumph (i. 16). The promises which are introduced refer to His second coming and kingdom (i. 4 ; iii. 4, 13).

4. And in this peculiar setting forth of the Christian life must we look for the necessary bringing out of the dangers of seduction by false teachers, and the placing of this knowledge and these promises over against it. The ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι (ii. 1; ἄθεσμοι, iii. 17) are described partly theoretically, as denying the lordship of our glorified Saviour which He has won by Redemption (ii. 1, contrasted with δύναμις, i. 16), and His promise of coming again (iii. 1 ff., contrasted with παρουσία, i. 16),—partly practically,—as slandering God's way of righteousness (ii. 2) and His majesty (ii. 10 ff.),—as disgracing their profession of Christian freedom (ii. 19),—as degraded by a vicious life (ii. 13),—full of lust and covetousness (ii. 14),—speaking swelling words (ii. 18), deserters of the right way (ii. 15 f.), traitors (ii. 17), seducing the unstable (ii. 14, 18),—the objects of God's inevitable judgment (ii. 3—9, 17),—preparing destruction for themselves (ii. 12, 19), and the more so, because their guilt is increased by the sin of apostasy (ii. 20—22).

5. In strong contrast and counterpoise against both sides of this heretical error stands their ἐπίγνωσις : against the former of them, in its theoretical aspect, as the right knowledge of the power and coming of Christ (i. 16 : see above) : against the latter, in its practical, as insight into the ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης. This latter contrast is ever brought up in the description of the false teachers in ch. ii. Noah, as δικαιοσύνης κήρυξ, is excepted from the judgment of the Flood (ii. 5): Lot, as δίκαιος, from that on Sodom (ii. 7, 8) : God knows how to punish the ἀδίκους, and rescue the εὐσεβεῖς (ii. 9) : the heretics are described as having left the εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν (ii. 15), and the example of Balaam applied to them (ii. 15, 16). And accordingly it is the ἐπίγνωσις Ἰησοῦ χρ. which is to preserve the readers from φθορά (i. 4 ; cf. ii. 12), and from falling away (i. 10).

6. This main subject of the Epistle, which not only occasions the minute depiction of the adversaries, but also keeps together the whole, is, notwithstanding the parenthetical allusions and polemical digres-

sions, in close coherence. The later portions are all based on the earlier. Thus ch. i. 16 ff. is the foundation of ii. 1 ff., iii. 1 ff.: thus the conclusion is in intimate connexion with the opening, the same union of (ἐπί)γνωσις, χάρις, and εἰρήνη being found in both (i. 2 ; iii. 14, 18): thus the ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, iii. 17, refers back to i. 10, 12: thus the conditioning clause, ἀποφυγόντες . . . φθορᾶς, i. 4, is remembered in the warning φυλάσσεσθε . . . . . συναπαχθέντες, iii. 17 ; and the more detailed exhortation of i. 5—8 is compressed together in the shorter αὐξάνετε δὲ κ.τ.λ. of iii. 18. Thus also the qualifying ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ of ch. i. 1 is borne in mind in ii. 21 and iii. 13. So again, iii. 1 takes up again i. 13, and the ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν of iii. 2 refers back to i. 19. In fact, the contents of this short Epistle are bound together by the closest and most intimate connexion and coherence.

7. The above notices will make sufficiently plain the occasion of the Epistle. It was, the prompting of a holy desire to build up and confirm the readers, in especial reference to certain destructive forms of error in doctrine and practice which were then appearing and would continue to wax onward.

8. If we seek to fix historically the heretics here marked out, we find the same difficulty as ever besets similar enquiries in the apostolic Epistles. They are rather the germs of heresies that are described, than the heresies themselves as known to us in their ripeness afterwards. These germs ever found their first expansion in the denial of those distinctive doctrines of the Gospel which most closely involve Christian practice and ensure Christian watchfulness. First came the loosening of the bands which constrained man by the love of Christ and waiting for Him; then, when true liberty was lost, followed the bondage of fanciful theological systems and self-imposed creeds. The living God-man vanished first out of the field of love and hope and obedience, and then His place was taken by the great Tempter and leader captive of souls.

9. So that when we enquire to which known class of subsequent heretics the description in our Epistle applies,—whether to the Carpocratians as Grotius believed, or to the Sadducees, as Bertholdt, or to the Gnostics, or Nicolaitans, as others, the reply in each case must be, that we cannot identify any of these precisely with those here described: that the delineation is both too wide and too narrow for each in succession: but that (and it is an important result for the question of the date of our Epistle) we are here standing at a point higher up than any of these definite names of sects: during the great moral ferment of the first fatal apostasy, which afterwards distributed itself into various divisions and sects.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The readers are no where expressly defined. By ch. iii. 1, it would appear that they are identical with at all events a portion of those to whom the first Epistle was addressed. And to this the ἑκάστοτε of ch. i. 15, "on each occasion which offers," seems also to point: besides appearing to refer to some previous personal connexion of the Writer with his readers. This latter has frequently been assumed from ch. i. 16: but without necessity; see note there. All that is there assumed is that which is also stated in ch. i. 1, the delivery of the truths and faith of the Gospel to them by competent eye-witnesses, of whom the Writer (in office, but not necessarily in connexion with themselves) had been one.

2. The address, ch. i. 1, is more general than that of the first Epistle: the words of warning and exhortation are for all who bore the Christian name. The dangers described were imminent throughout the then Christian world. And the expressions, whether of praise and encouragement, or of caution, must be taken as generally applicable to all believers in Christ, rather than as descriptive of the peculiar situation of any circle of churches at any one time.

3. Of necessity, the same general view must not be taken of the enemies of the faith here depicted. The city of God, with its bulwarks and towers, is ever the same: this was a special attack beginning to be made on it by a body of foes of a special character. The firmness and watchfulness which seem to be predicated of the readers (ch. i. 12, iii. 17, i. 19) are rather assumptions, certain to be true of true believers, than statements of objective matter of fact: whereas the depravities and errors of the heretics, as far as spoken of in the present, were things actually occurring under the Apostle's notice. This must be borne in mind, or we shall be liable to go wrong in our inference respecting those addressed.

4. On the other hand it must be borne in mind, that the Apostle's field of view, as he looked over the church, would naturally be bounded by the lines which marked out the cycle of his own observation: that those to whom he had before written would be on this second occasion nearest to his thoughts: and by consequence, that when he seems to address these readers as in the main identical with those, this inference must not be carried too far, but allowance made for the margin which may fairly be granted to each Epistle: for expanding the apparent limited character of the former address towards that more general reference which was sure to have been in the Apostle's mind: and for

contracting the very wide address of this one merely by believing that in writing he would fix his thoughts on those whom he knew and especially cared for.

5. If it be said, as it has been, that we find no trace in the former Epistle of the peculiar kind of adversaries of the faith of whom so much is here said, and on the other hand nothing in this Epistle of the persecutions, which bore so considerable a part in the matters treated in the former one: the answer to both these is exceedingly easy. A very short time would suffice for the springing up, or for the becoming formidable, of these deadly forms of error. As the Apostles were one by one removed by death, on the one hand their personal influence in checking evil tendencies was withdrawn, on the other that coming of Christ, of which they had once confidently spoken as to be in their own time, became in danger of being disbelieved. This would be a sufficient reason for the one supposed difficulty: and as regards the other, it is quite answer enough to say, that this second Epistle being written on a special occasion and for a special object, is, as we have seen, coherently and consistently devoted to that object, and does not, in its course, travel out of its way to speak of things with which the first Epistle was concerned. It is obvious that, supposing the two to have been written by the same person, he is not likely to have dwelt again in his second letter on things already brought forward in his first.

6. Besides, it has been not unjustly thought that we *can* discover traces in our Epistle of the same characteristics as those which marked the readers of the former one, or of others which would be probably subsequent to them. We have there the caution to take care that none of them suffer as an evil doer, φονεύς, κλέπτης, κακοποιός, ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος (iv. 15); which seems to contain in it the seed of that further development of evil among Christians, which we find actual in this Epistle. Again, the neglect of the caution there, ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες, τελείως ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰ. χ. (i. 13), would lead exactly to the dissolute lives here described of those who had ceased to hope for His coming. There is close connexion between 1 Pet. ii. 16, ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν . . . and 2 Pet. ii. 19, ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς: between the cautions there given against pride (v. 5—7), and the ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι of our ch. ii. 18. And the same analogies might be carried yet further, shewing that from the circumstances of the readers which respectively underlie the one and the other Epistle, this may well have been a sequel to, and consequent on, the former.

SECTION III.

ON THE RELATION BETWEEN THIS EPISTLE AND THAT OF JUDE.

1. It is well known that, besides various scattered resemblances, a long passage occurs, included in the limits Jude vv. 3—19, 2 Peter ii. 1—19, describing in both cases the heretical enemies of the Gospel, couched in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence. If considerations of human probability are here as every where else to be introduced into our estimate of the Sacred Writings, then either one saw and used the text of the other, or both drew from a common document or a common source of oral apostolic teaching.

2. Setting aside the supposition of a common documentary source, as not answering to the curious phænomena of concurrence and divergence, no one can say that the latter alternative *may not* have been the case: that a portion of oral teaching spoken originally in the power of the Spirit, may not, in its reproduction, have become deflected as we here see. Were the case in strict analogy with that of the three Gospels, we should have no hesitation in adopting this hypothesis. But the cases are not similar. For we have first to add to the phænomena of this passage the remarkable coincidences elsewhere, where no such common portion of teaching could have been concerned: and then to observe, that the coincidences and divergences in the passage itself do not entirely bear out the hypothesis. There is an intent and consistent purpose plainly visible in them, which is altogether absent, unless the wildest fancies be allowed to come into play, from the common text of passages in the three Gospels.

3. We have then to fall back on the supposition, that one of the Sacred Writers saw and used the text of the other. And if this is to be so, there can be but little hesitation in answering the enquiry, on which side the preference lies as to priority and originality. The grounds of that answer have indeed been amplified and exaggerated, beyond what we can fairly concede: but still in the main they are irrefragable. We cannot see, with De Wette and others, that St. Peter is less fresh or individual in his expressions and turns of thought than St. Jude: but, conceding to both Writers originality and individuality of thought, it is then for us to ascertain by inspection, which text bears the air of being the free outflow of the first thought, which the working up of the other for a purpose slightly differing.

4. The portion of the common matter which will best serve us for this purpose is that in which the traditional and historical examples are adduced, 2 Pet. ii. 1—16, Jude 4—11. In this passage, the object of St. Jude is to set forth the ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ. χ. ἀρνούμενοι.

The persons described by St. Peter are not the same, in however many common points the characters coincide. With him they are ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, answering to the ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ of old: like the others, they are described as τὸν (ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς) δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, with the two words in brackets characteristically inserted. In Peter (ii. 1) we have merely a reminiscence of the first historical notice in Jude (ver. 5), consisting in his specifying the false *teachers* as answering to the false *prophets* ἐν τῷ λαῷ, as contrasted with the true ones of whom he has been speaking (i. 19—21). It was not to his purpose to mention the destruction of the *unbelieving* (Jude 5), and therefore he slightly passes this example with a mere allusion. I submit that this will not bear the converse hypothesis: that the weighty and pregnant sentence in St. Jude could not be the result of the passing hint ἐν τῷ λαῷ of St. Peter, nor can that hint be accounted for except as a reminiscence of St. Jude.

5. Passing to the next example, that of the sinning angels, we find the same even more strikingly exemplified. St. Jude is writing of apostates, and sets forth their fate by that of the angels, τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον: in allusion (see note there) to Gen. vi. 2, their going after strange flesh, a sin after the manner of which (τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις) Sodom and Gomorrha also sinned in after time (Jude 6, note). This special notice, so apposite to St. Jude's subject, is contracted in St. Peter into the mere mention of ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων. Here it is most natural to suppose, that the special notice preceded the general.

6. The next example in St. Peter is one exactly to the point for which he is adducing the whole series, viz., to shew God's power both to punish and to deliver, but, on one side at least, inapposite to St. Jude's purpose. It is found in St. Peter alone. But the reason why I adduce it here is, to remark, that, had St. Peter's been the original, St. Jude would have hardly failed to insert in his examples that portion of this one which so exactly tallied with his purpose, ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, . . . κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας.

7. The next example, that of Sodom and Gomorrha, is found in St. Jude in strict connexion and analogy with that which has immediately preceded it, viz. that of the angels. This connexion is broken in St. Peter, no such particular as that on which it depends being found in his mention of the angels' sin. These cities are adduced only as an example to the μέλλοντες ἀσεβεῖν, and, which is again noteworthy, the mention of the rescue of Lot is appended, conformably with that which we remarked in the preceding paragraph.

8. It is further to be noticed with respect to this same example, that St. Jude describes the cities as δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι, whereas St. Peter has resolved this, which might seem to imply the

eternity of the fire which consumed those cities, into a fuller and historical account, retaining the feature of their being a warning to the impious: τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν τεθεικώς. Here again I submit that the converse hypothesis is inconceivable.

9. Again, in the description which follows in St. Peter (ver. 9), we have a characteristic continuation of his main subject, the rescue of the righteous united with the punishment of the wicked, and then, with a μάλιστα δέ, he returns to the particular characters here under description, and takes up the two traits which form the main subject in St. Jude, ver. 8; so that we have the original ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν replaced by μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταί, αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες: where again I submit that none can doubt for a moment which sacred Writer preceded the other.

10. The next example even more strikingly shews the same. St. Jude cites at length from some apocryphal book, probably that called the ἀνάληψις or ἀνάβασις Μωυσέως (see Origen de Principiis iii. 2. 1, vol. i. p. 138), an instance of the different conduct of mighty angels in contending with God's adversaries. St. Peter (ver. 11) merely asserts generally that such is the conduct of mighty angels, but gives no hint of an allusion to the fact on which the general assertion is based; nor does the great Adversary appear in his sentence, but in his stead are substituted these heretics themselves; ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν. This, standing as it does thus by itself, would constitute, were it not for the original in St. Jude being extant, the most enigmatical sentence in the N. T.

11. I shall not treat at length every separate verse, but shall only remark, that as we pass on through 2 Pet. ii. 12 ff., while this view of the priority of St. Jude is at every step confirmed, we derive some interesting notices of the way in which the passage in our Epistle has been composed: viz. by the Apostle having in his thoughts the passage in St. Jude, and adapting such portions of it as the Spirit guided him to see fit, taking sometimes the mere sound of St. Jude's words to express a different thought, sometimes, as we saw above, contracting and omitting, sometimes expanding and inserting, as suited his purpose. Thus while in St. Jude we have the comparison ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα simply introduced with reference to certain things which the persons under description know naturally (φυσικῶς) and use corruptly, in St. Peter it is the heretics themselves who are ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα, the additional point of comparison is introduced, that they are γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν κ. φθοράν, and the φθείρονται of St. Jude is made to serve a very different purpose,—ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται. So in 2 Pet. ii. 13, in the reminiscence of the passage, σπιλάδες of Jude 12 becomes σπίλοι κ.

μῶμοι,—ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν of St. Jude becomes ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν. So in 2 Pet. ii. 17, we have somewhat similar figures to those in Jude 13, but whereas originally it was "waves of the sea foaming out their own shame," and ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται, in the latter text it becomes, more suitably to St. Peter's purpose of depicting false *teachers*, "wells without water," and ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται.

12. In ver. 11, St. Jude, fervidly borne along in his impassioned invective, collects together three instances of O. T. transgressors, to all of whom he compares those whom he is stigmatizing. They were murderers like Cain, covetous like Balaam, rebellious like Korah. But out of these St. Peter, dealing with *false teachers*, whom he is comparing with the *false prophets* of old, selects Balaam only, and goes at length (vv. 15, 16) into his sin and his rebuke. Can any one persuade us that in the impetuous whirlwind of St. Jude's invective he adopted and abridged the example furnished by St. Peter, prefixing and adding those of Cain and Korah?

13. I shall carry the comparison no further, but refer the student to some sources where he will find it elaborately treated. Of these the best worth consulting is Brückner's Excursus on 2 Pet. ii. in his Edition of De Wette's Handbook, vol. i. pt. 3, pp. 163—170. There he impartially, and in a critical and scholarly manner, examines the whole question, and while he successfully maintains the priority of St. Jude, and St. Peter's acquaintance with his Epistle, he sets in a very striking light the independence of our Apostle, and his coherence of purpose and language. The same is done, but less completely, and, unless the fault is in myself, with some little confusion, by Davidson, vol. iii. pp. 399—408. The same again is done very fairly by Huther, in the Anhang to his Commentary on the Epistle. I am sorry I cannot speak with praise of the work of Dietlein, Der zweite Brief Petri, Berlin, 1851, either as regards this, or other parts of the great question regarding our Epistle. It is a book with which I have been much disappointed both in point of scholarship and of logic, and the reader will find many notices of its mistakes scattered through my notes. On this part of the subject he is an unflinching advocate for the priority of St. Peter to St. Jude. The same side is taken by Schmid, Michaelis, Storr, Hengstenberg, Thiersch, Hofmann, and Stier.

SECTION IV.

AUTHENTICITY.

1. As regards the external grounds for or against the authenticity of

this Epistle, we have very various opinions. Dietlein finds traces of its use in the earliest apostolic Fathers; in Polycarp, in Ignatius, in the Epistle of Barnabas, in Clement of Rome. Most of these however are very shadowy and fanciful: some of them even absurd [3]. The explanation of the coincidence in these cases is generally to be sought in the fact that these writers had the same sources to draw from, in the main, as the Apostle, viz. O. T. prophecy, and the common-places of Christian teaching: and this being so, it would be strange indeed if we did not find such coincidence in insulated words and occasional phrases.

2. A few however of the instances adduced from the Apostolic Fathers are worth notice: not as by any means proving the use by them of this Epistle, but as remarkable in connexion with the question before us. Such are 1) Hermas, iii. *simil.* vi. 4, p. 968, *ἄκουε ἀμφοτέρων τὴν δύναμιν, τῆς τρυφῆς κ. τοῦ βασάνου. τῆς τρυφῆς κ. τῆς ἀπάτης ὁ χρόνος ὥρα ἐστὶ μία· τῆς δὲ βασάνου ὧραι τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν δύναμιν ἔχουσαι. ἐὰν οὖν μίαν ἡμέραν τις τρυφήσῃ καὶ ἀπατηθῇ, μίαν δὲ ἡμέραν βασανισθῇ κ.τ.λ.*, as compared with a) *ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν* and b) *τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν*, 2 Pet. ii. 13, where see note: 2) Clement of Rome, *ad Cor.* c. 7, p. 225, *Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν*, and c. 9, p. 228, *Νῶε πιστὸς εὑρεθεὶς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν* .....: *ib.* c. 11, p. 232, in speaking of Lot's deliverance out of Sodom, *πρόδηλον ποιήσας ὁ δεσπότης, ὅτι τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει, τοὺς δὲ ἑτεροκλινεῖς ὑπάρχοντας εἰς κόλασιν καὶ αἰκισμὸν τίθησιν: .... εἰς τὸ γνωστὸν εἶναι πᾶσιν ὅτι οἱ δίψυχοι καὶ οἱ διστάζοντες περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως εἰς κρίμα κ. σημείωσιν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς γίνονται*, as compared with 2 Pet. ii. 5, 9.

3. Neither the Epistle of Barnabas, nor Justin Martyr, nor Theophilus of Antioch, nor Irenæus, can be fairly adduced as citing or alluding to our Epistle. This assertion may surprise the reader who is acquainted with the strong assertions and easy assumptions of Dietlein. But let him take them one by one and examine them strictly and impartially, and he will find them all in succession prove worthless, except as shewing that primitive Christianity had a Greek vocabulary of its own to express its doctrines and convey its exhortations, which the Apostles and their immediate successors used in common. Neither does the ancient fragment known as the canon of Muratori make any mention of our Epistle [4]. Neither does Tertullian, nor Cyprian, nor Clement of Alexandria in any of his extant works.

4. There is a passage in Hippolytus de Antichristo, c. 2, p. 729, which seems to be an amplification of 2 Pet. i. 21;—speaking of *οἱ προφῆται*, he says, *οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἅπερ αὐτοὶ*

[3] See Brückner, Einleit. pp. 131 ff.

[4] See the amusing special-pleading by which Dietlein endeavours to convert even this omission to his purpose, Einl. pp. 41—50.

ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐσοφίζοντο ὀρθῶς, ἔπειτα δι' ὁραμάτων προεδιδάσκοντο τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς, εἶθ' οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον ταῦτα, ἅπερ αὐτοῖς ἦν μόνοις ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (ἀποκεκαλυμμένα, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς) ἀποκεκρυμμένα. Still, striking as the similarity is, we cannot venture to affirm that the inference is really a sound one, any more than in the case of that place in Theophilus *ad Autolycum*, l. ii. p. 87, οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες κ. σοφισθέντες ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι.

5. Eusebius, H. E. vi. 14, reports of Clement of Alexandria, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς, ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις. μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγομένας παρελθών, τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τήν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν. And Cassiodorus, in his *de Instit. divin.* præf., vol. ii. p. 538, says, "Ferunt itaque scripturas divinas veteris novique Testamenti ab ipso principio usque ad finem Græco sermone declarasse Clementem Alexandrinum." But this testimony seems to be contradicted by another from Cassiodorus, *ib.* c. 8, p. 543;—"In epistolis autem canonicis, Clemens Alexandrinus presbyter, qui et Stromateus dicitur, id est in epistola S. Petri prima, S. Joannis prima et secunda, et Jacobi, quædam Attico sermone declaravit. Ubi multa quidem subtiliter, sed aliqua incaute locutus est, quæ nos ita transferri fecimus in Latinum, ut exclusis quibusdam offendiculis purificata doctrina ejus securior potuisset hauriri. . . . . Sed cum de reliquis canonicis epistolis magna nos cogitatio fatigaret, subito nobis codex Didymi Græco stilo conscriptus in expositionem septem canonicarum epistolarum . . . . concessus est."

6. The judgment between these conflicting testimonies must apparently be given on the side of Eusebius, and Cassiodorus's first assertion taken literally. For Eusebius mentions expressly the Epistle of Jude, as one of those on which Clement commented, whereas by the last-cited statement of Cassiodorus it is excluded. Still even thus we have no express mention of our Epistle, but can only include it by inference among the ἀντιλεγόμεναι of which Eusebius speaks.

7. The testimony of Origen appears somewhat ambiguous.

Eusebius, H. E. vi. 25, reports it thus : Πέτρος δέ, ἐφ' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία, ἧς πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι, μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπεν· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν, ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ [5].

On the other hand, in those works which are extant only in the Latin version of Rufinus, Origen again and again quotes our Epistle as Scripture : e. g. Hom. vii., on Joshua (cited above, ch. iii. § i. 7),

[5] Dietlein has made the unscholarlike attempt to infer from this ἔστω δέ an opinion of Origen as to the genuineness. I need hardly remind the student that the words mean simply nothing more than "and if you will, a second also."

"Petrus enim duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis:" Hom. iv. on Leviticus (vol. ii. p. 200), "Et iterum Petrus dicit, Consortes, inquit, facti estis divinæ naturæ" [2 Pet. i. 4]: Hom. xiii. on Numbers (vol. ii. p. 321), "Ut ait quodam in loco Scriptura: mutum animal humana voce respondens arguit prophetæ dementiam" [2 Pet. ii. 16].

8. Perhaps the solution of this is to be found, not by supposing that Rufinus interpolated the passages[6], but by remembering the loose way in which both Origen himself and others were found to cite the Epistle to the Hebrews[7]: ordinarily, and *currente calamo*, speaking of it as St. Paul's, but whenever they wrote deliberately, giving expression to their doubts respecting its authorship. We have only to believe that Origen acted similarly with regard to 2 Peter, and the mystery is at once solved.

In Origen's extant Greek works, it is true, we no where find the Epistle quoted. Nay, it is more than once by implication excluded from the number of the Catholic Epistles. Thus in his Comm. on John (tom. vi. 18, vol. iv. p. 135) cited above, ch. iii. § i. 7, he cites 1 Pet. iii. 18—21, as being *ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ*: and in his passage on the Canon, Eus. H. E. vi. 25, *δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ· ὃ καὶ υἱὸν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ . . . . ὡμολόγησε*[8].

9. Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, a disciple of Origen (+ 270), certainly alludes to our Epistle, if his words are rightly given in the Latin version in which only we now have them:

> "Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos, ... qui in epistolis suis hæreticos execrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt." *Ep. ad Cyprian.* § 6 (Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. iii. p. 1159, usually in Cypr. opp. ep. 75).

Nothing is proved here by "*epistolis suis*" as to two Epistles of St. Peter being meant: but by the fact mentioned, this second Epistle must be intended, seeing that it is in this only that heretics are inveighed against by St. Peter.

10. The testimony of Didymus, whose commentary on the Epistle is extant in a Latin version only, is given at the end of his remarks on this Epistle (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. xxxix. p. 1774):

> "Non igitur est ignorandum, hanc Epistolam esse falsatam, quæ, licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est."

[6] So Davidson, Introd. iii. p. 413 f.

[7] See above, ch. i. § i. parr. 17 ff.

[8] As a specimen of the fairness and scholarship of Dietlein's book, take the following: ". . . Der nächstliegende Sinn der Worte des Origines ist also: der unter den sogenannten katholischen Briefen befindliche Brief des Petrus. Ein eigentlicher Gegensatz gegen den Zweiten als nicht katholischen, liegt gar nicht darin: höchstens kann man sagen, er blicke daraus das hervor, daß es nicht ganz ebenso gelaüfig und unangefochten war, den zweiten Brief unter den sog. katholischen aufzuführen, wie dies beim ersten Statt hatte."—p. 62.

Here the Latin expressions cause some little uncertainty, and can only be interpreted by conjecturing what they represent in the original Greek. Undue stress has been laid on the "igitur," as if it were a ratiocinative conclusion from something preceding. But in all probability the sentence was a mere concluding notice, and ran thus, τοῦτο μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀγνωστέον, ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστολὴ νενόθευται . . . . : the latter word meaning, "is accounted spurious."

11. Euseb. H. E. iii. 3, says, Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἡ λεγομένη προτέρα ἀνωμολόγηται· ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κέχρηνται συγγράμμασιν· τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν, ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν: and afterwards, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρου, ὧν μίαν μόνην γνησίαν ἔγνων ἐπιστολήν, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι πρεσβυτέροις ὁμολογουμένην, τοσαῦτα.

And in iii. 25, τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, ἥ τε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολή[a].

12. Jerome, *Script. eccl.* i., vol. ii. p. 827, says of St. Peter, "scripsit duas epistolas quæ catholicæ nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam."

But this dissonance he elsewhere accounts for: "Habebat ergo (Paulus) Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cujus evangelium Petro narrante et eo scribente compositum est. Denique et duæ epistolæ quæ feruntur Petri stilo inter se et charactere discrepant, structuraque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus."

13. After the time of Eusebius the Epistle appears to have been very generally received as canonical. We have however the statement of Gregory of Nazianzum, *Carm.* ii. 8, ver. 310, καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν | τινὲς μὲν ἑπτά φασιν, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς μόνας | χρῆναι δέχεσθαι:—and of Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topogr. christ.* lib. vii. (Migne, vol. lxxxviii. p. 292), παρὰ Σύροις δὲ εἰ μὴ αἱ τρεῖς μόναι αἱ προγεγραμμέναι οὐχ εὑρίσκονται, λέγω δή, Ἰακώβου καὶ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου. It confirms this notice to find, that this Epistle is not contained in the Peschito version. Ephrem Syrus notwithstanding received the whole seven catholic Epistles, and so the Philoxenian, or later Syriac version. Leontius of Byzantium[1] says that Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected our Epistle.

14. In the middle ages the Epistle was generally recognized and accounted canonical. At the time of the Reformation, the ancient doubts revived. Both Erasmus and Calvin express them. Cajetan, Grotius, Scaliger, Salmasius, question its genuineness. And in modern

[a] See the testimony of Philastrius of Brescia in favour of our Epistle, above, ch. i. § i. 65.

[1] See above, ch. iii. § i. 11.

times, Semler, Neander, Credner, De Wette, Reuss, Mayerhoff, have ranged themselves on the same side.

15. On the other hand, there have not been wanting in our own days many defenders of the genuineness of the Epistle. The principal of these have been Michaelis, Pott, Augusti, Storr, Flatt, Dahl, Hug, Schmid, Lardner, Guericke, Windischmann, Thiersch. The same result is evidently to be supplied at the end of Brückner's notices, though he himself hesitates to affirm it. From what has already been said of Dietlein's book, it will be readily believed, that it is hardly worth quoting on this side. "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis."

16. If we now come to review the course of ancient testimony, we shall find its tendency to be very much the same as we found it respecting the Epistle of St. James, with which indeed our Epistle is often classed among the ἀντιλεγόμενα. And as far as this portion of the subject of our present section is concerned, we might append to it the same conclusion as that with which we terminated the corresponding section on that Epistle, ch. ii. § v. 15.

17. But another department of evidence in this case requires consideration. Weighty objections have, and that from early times [2], been brought against the Epistle on internal grounds. Some of these I have already dealt with by anticipation, in speaking on its occasion and object, —on the probability as to the same readers being partly in view as those in the former Epistle,—on the kind of use made of the Epistle of St. Jude. If our preceding remarks, which I have endeavoured to make fairly, and not in the spirit of a partisan, have been warranted by fact, then on all these points we have been gathering reasons by which those objections to its genuineness from supposed internal disqualification may be so far met.

18. But they extend to several other points besides those above mentioned. For instance, it is said, that the kind of mention of the coming of our Lord in the two Epistles could not have proceeded from the same person. [In the former Epistle it is simply introduced as one of the great comforting assurances for God's persecuted people: in the latter, it is defended against cavil and unbelief. Now would it not have been more just in this case to say, that the circumstances and persons in view cannot be the same, rather than that the Writers cannot?] For surely there is nothing in this Epistle shewing a belief, on the part of the Writer himself, inconsistent with that professed in the other. Nay, it is evidently shewn by such passages as ch. iii. 8, 10, that the firm persuasion expressed in 1 Pet. iv. 5 was that of our Writer also.

19. It is said, that the peculiarities with regard to certain uncommon points which we find in the first Epistle (e. g. iii. 19, iv. 6, iii. 6, 21) are not found reproduced in the second. But, as Brückner has well

[2] Cf. Jerome, above, par. 12.

observed, the very fact, that it was characteristic of St. Peter to adduce these mysterious and outlying points, would also account in some measure for their appearing, not always, but in a scattered and irregular manner, as illustrations by the way: just as they do appear in this second Epistle also (e. g. iii. 5, 10). So that this is rather an argument for, than against the identity of the Writers. Besides which, it halts in two essential points. For 1) it is not altogether correct in its statement. We do find the Writer's view of ancient prophecy continued from one Epistle (1 Pet. i. 10—12) to the other (2 Pet. i. 19—21; iii. 2):—the new birth by the divine word, which in the first Epistle is alleged as a motive for putting off worldly lusts and passions (i. 22—ii. 2), reappears in the second in i. 4, ἵνα διὰ τούτων (God's ἐπαγγέλματα) γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς: the ἀρεταί of Him who hath called them, 1 Pet. ii. 9, reappear in the same peculiar form, 2 Pet. i. 3: if we read, 1 Pet. iv. 17, that judgment (τὸ κρῖμα) is beginning at the house of God, and will proceed on to the disobedient, we read of the deceivers in the second Epistle, 2 Pet. ii. 3, that their judgment (τὸ κρῖμα) is not idle. Other instances might be and have been produced [3], shewing that the allegation will not hold. And 2) it is forgotten by the objectors, that it would be only in a spurious Epistle imitating the first, that we should find such reproductions carefully carried out: the occasion and object of a second genuine Epistle being totally different, forms a very sufficient reason why they should not be found to any considerable extent.

20. It is again objected, that whereas in the former Epistle the sufferings and death and resurrection of Christ were brought forward frequently and insisted on,—in this, these facts of Redemption are altogether put into the background, and only the exalted Christ is in the view of the Writer. But it is to be remembered that 1) in that first Epistle we found the exalted Person of our Lord mainly before the Apostle's eyes [4]: that 2) the differing occasion and object would tend to produce just the diversity found here, where there is no longer any purpose of comforting under persecution, but only of warning against error and building up in knowledge: that 3) in the first Epistle, where σωτηρία was so conspicuous with its facts and consequences, our Lord is commonly found as χριστός simply (i. 11, 19; ii. 21; iii. 15 (κυρ. τὸν χρ.), 16, 18; iv. 1, 13 (τοῦ χρ.), 14; v. 1 (τοῦ χρ.)), or Ἰησοῦς χρ. (i. 1, 2, 3, 7, 13; ii. 5; iii. 21; iv. 11), or χρ. Ἰησοῦς (v. 10); whereas in the second, where σωτηρία hardly appears (iii. 15), He is ordinarily ὁ κύριος (or θεὸς?) ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰ. χρ. (i. (1,) 11; ii. 20; iii. 18), or ὁ κύριος ἡμ. Ἰ. χρ. (i. 2 (Ἰησ. τ. κ. ἡ.), 8, 14, 16): but never simply χριστός, ὁ χρ., Ἰησ. χρ., or χρ. Ἰησ. This, which has been also alleged as against the identity of writers, is, I submit, strikingly

[3] See Brückner, pp. 127 f.

[4] See above, ch. iii. § vi. 4.

characteristic of the different realms of thought of the two Epistles. In the first, it is community of suffering and glorification with Him, which is to give encouragement: His lordly and glorious titles are dropped, and His office (χριστός) or combined Person and office (Ἰησ. χρ. or χρ. Ἰησ.) is ever brought forward. But in this second, where warning, and caution against rebellion are mainly in view, we are ever reminded of His lordship by κύριος, and of what He did for us by σωτήρ: and without the former, or both titles, He never appears.

21. Another objection has been found in the apparent anxiety of the Writer to shew that he is the Apostle Peter, thereby betraying that he was not that Apostle. But here again, we may surely say just as fairly, that this is in manifest consistency with the character and design of the Epistle, which cautions against, and stigmatizes, false teachers. Thus we find St. Paul, in those Epistles where his object is the same, most strongly asserting his Apostleship, and his personal qualification as a teacher and ruler of the church. Were the Epistle genuine, this is just what we might expect[5].

22. The supposed objection, that in the reference to an apostolic command, ch. iii. 2, the Writer seems to sever himself from the Apostles, loses all weight by the reflection, that the words most naturally mean, as explained in the note on the passage, *the Apostles who preached to you*, much as in 1 Pet. i. 12: the Writer himself forming one only of that class, and thus preferring to specify it as a class[6]. Besides, I submit that such an objection is suicidal, when connected with that last mentioned. If the object of the (apocryphal) Writer was, elaborately to represent himself as St. Peter, how can the same view of the Epistle be consistent in finding in it a proof, by his own deliberate shewing, that he is not an Apostle? Forgers surely do not thus designedly overthrow their own fabrics.

23. The last objection which I shall notice is, the reference to St. Paul's Epistles in ch. iii. 15, 16, as indicating a later date than is consistent with the genuineness of our Epistle. They are there evidently adduced as existing *in some number:* and as *forming part of the recognized Scriptures* (τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς). No doubt, these undeniable phænomena of our Epistle are worthy of serious consideration; and they present to us, I am free to confess, a difficulty almost insuperable, if the common traditions respecting the end of St. Peter's life are to be received as matters of fact. But we are not bound by those traditions, though inclined to retain them in deference to ancient testimonies: we are at all events free to assume as great a latitude in their dates as the phænomena of the sacred writings seem to require. All therefore that we can say of this reference to the writings of

[5] See the instances gone into in detail by Brückner, p. 118.
[6] See also note on Jude 17, 18.

St. Paul, is that, believing on other grounds this Epistle to be written by St. Peter, this seems to require for it a later date than is consistent with the usually received traditions of his death, and that our reception of such traditions must be modified accordingly.

24. At the same time it must be borne in mind, that it is an entirely unwarranted assumption, to understand by πᾶσαι ἐπιστολαί here, an entire collection of St. Paul's Epistles as we now have them, seeing that the words can only represent as many of them as the Writer had seen [7]: and that it is equally unjustifiable to gather from what follows, that the sacred canon of the N. T. was at that time settled. Those words cannot imply more than that there were certain writings by Christian teachers, which were reckoned as on a level with the O. T. Scriptures, and called by the same name (see note there). And that that was the case, even in the traditional lifetime of St. Peter, it would be surely unreasonable to deny [8].

25. The diversity of style in the two Epistles has been frequently alleged [9]. But on going through all that has been said, I own I cannot regard it, considerable as it undoubtedly is, as any more than can well be accounted for by the total diversity of subject and mood in the two Epistles, and by the interweaving into this second one of copious reminiscences from another Epistle. Some of the differences we have already spoken of, when treating of the titles and names of our Lord appearing in the two Epistles; and have found them amply accounted for by the above reasons. The same might be said of the terms used for the coming of our Lord,—ἀποκάλυψις and ἀποκαλύπτειν in the first Epistle, παρουσία, ἡμέρα κυρίου, ἡμέρα κρίσεως in this [1]: the same again of the prevalence of ἐλπίς in the former Epistle, and of ἐπίγνωσις in this. Some of the objections adduced on this head are without foundation in fact, e. g. that which Davidson admits, that whereas "in the first Epistle the Writer makes considerable use of the O. T., incorporating its sentiments and diction into his own composition; in the second there is hardly a reference to the Jewish Scriptures." What then are

[7] See note in loc.; as also on the omission of the art. before ἐπιστολαῖς.

[8] The rest of the objections of this kind, which are not so important as those dealt with in the text, will be seen discussed in Brückner; and in Davidson, vol. iii. pp. 418 ff.

[9] See Jerome, above, par. 12; and the principal particulars treated in Davidson, pp. 430 ff., and Brückner.

[1] Davidson, p. 433, treats this answer as insufficient, "because the phraseology is not confined to that part of the Epistle which is directed against the false teachers, and the Epistle was not wholly or chiefly written to threaten the enemies of the truth with the dreadful day of the Lord. It was the writer's object to establish and comfort, as well as to terrify." But surely we may fairly say, that the spirit in which the Writer set himself to compose his Epistle, which is evident from the ruling tone of it being warning and denunciatory, would of necessity modify the terms in which he introduced those doctrines and expectations which formed the ground of his exhortation or prophecy.

we to say of ch. i. 19—21; ii. 1, 5, 6, 7 f., 15 f., 22; iii. 2, 4, 5 f., 8, 13? May not it be said that although the second Epistle, from the nature of the case, does not require so many references to the new-begetting word, yet the mind of the Writer was equally full of its facts and sentiments?

26. Some of the points of resemblance between the two Epistles have been very fairly stated by Davidson (p. 434), and by Brückner (p. 150): and the latter writer has corrected the over-statements of Dietlein. Of these coincidences, *ἀρετή*, as applied to God, has been already noticed. Others are, *ἀμώμου κ. ἀσπίλου*, 1 Pet. i. 19, compared with *ἄσπιλοι κ. ἀμώμητοι*, 2 Pet. iii. 14; which is the more striking from its independence in the connexion, being used in an entirely different reference. The sound of these two words again occurs in the midst of the adaptation from St. Jude, ii. 13, *σπίλοι κ. μῶμοι*. Again the use of the word *ἴδιος*, 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, cf. 2 Pet. i. 3; ii. 16; iii. 17: the omission of the article, as before *βασιλεῖ* in 1 Pet. ii. 13, compared with that before *θελήματι* in 2 Pet. i. 21, before *ἀγγέλων* ii. 4, *ὄγδοον* and *κόσμου* ib. 5, *δίκαιον Λώτ* ib. 7, are points of similarity, which may be put in the balance against others of discrepancy.

27. It may be allowed us to remark some notes of genuineness which are found in our Epistle, which, though at first sight of small import, and lying beneath the surface, yet possess considerable interest. In ch. i. 17, 18, we have a reference to the presence of the Writer at the transfiguration of our Lord. It is a remarkable coincidence, that close to that reference, and in the verses leading on to it, two words should occur, both of which are connected with the narrative of the Transfiguration in the Gospels. In ver. 13 we have *ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι*: let us remember that it was Peter who at the Transfiguration said *ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς τρεῖς*. In ver. 15 *μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον*. At the Transfiguration Moses and Elias *ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἔμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*.

28. We have also very noticeable coincidences of another kind. Compare the use of *λαχοῦσιν*, ch. i. 1, with *ἔλαχε* in Peter's speech, Acts i. 17: *εὐσέβειαν*, ch. i. 3, 6, 7, with Acts iii. 12, where, in Peter's speech, it is only found, except in the Pastoral Epistles: *θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη*, ch. i. 21, with *βουλῇ . . τοῦ θεοῦ . . ἀνείλατε*, Acts ii. 23: *ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς*, ch. ii. 8, with *τὸ μνῆμα αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν*, Acts ii. 29: *ἀνόμοις ἔργοις*, ibid., with *διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων*, Acts ii. 23: *εὐσεβεῖς*, ch. ii. 9, with Acts x. 2, 7, an account doubtless derived from St. Peter, —the only places where the word occurs in the N. T.: *κολαζομένους*, ibid., with Acts iv. 21, another Petrine account, and also the only places where the word occurs: the double genitive ch. iii. 2, *τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου*, with a very similar one, Acts v. 32, *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων*: *ἡμέρα κυρίου*, ch. iii.

10, with the citation Acts ii. 20, where only it occurs, except 1 Thess. v. 21. Such things are not to be despised, in estimating the probability of our Epistle being a supposititious document.

29. Our general conclusion from all that has preceded must be in favour of the genuineness and canonicity of this second Epistle: acknowledging at the same time, that the subject is not without considerable difficulty. That difficulty however is lightened for us by observing that on the one hand, it is common to this Epistle with some others of those called Catholic, and several of the later writings of the New Testament: and on the other, that no difference can be imagined more markedly distinctive, than that which separates all these writings from even the earliest and best of the post-apostolic period. Our Epistle is one of those latter fruits of the great outpouring of the Spirit on the Apostles, which, not being entrusted to the custody of any one church or individual, required some considerable time to become generally known: which when known, were suspected, bearing as they necessarily did traces of their late origin, and notes of polemical argument: but of which, as apostolic and inspired writings, there never was, when once they became known, any general doubt; and which, as the sacred Canon became fixed, acquired, and have since maintained, their due and providential place among the books of the New Testament.

SECTION V.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. These can only be set down conjecturally, in accordance with views and considerations previously advanced. Assuming the genuineness of the Epistle, St. Peter wrote it in his old age, when he was expecting his death[2]. This, agreeably to what was said on the first Epistle, would be somewhere about the year 68 A.D. and the place of writing would be Rome, or somewhere on the journey thither from the East.

2. But all this is far too uncertain, and too much beset with chronological difficulties, to be regarded as any thing more than a hypothetical corollary, contingent on our accepting the tradition of St. Peter's Roman martyrdom.

3. Several matters, which have formed the subject of sections in our other chapters, such as the character and style of the Epistle, have been already incidentally discussed.

[2] This inference is not made from the word ταχινή in ch. i. 14 (see note there), but from the general spirit of that passage.

Readings of the Codex Vaticanus in the text of this Volume (both parts), ⌜*ascertained by the Editor's inspection of the MS., Rome, Feb.* 1861.⌟

Heb. vii. 4. θεωρειτε δε, not δη, as Mai, edn. 2.

viii. 10. καρδια εαυτων is all 1. m., not, as stated in Mai, edn. 2, "ex mendo secundæ manus." The ε is in the pale ink of the original scribe.

11. not ιδουσιν, as Mai, edn. 2, but ειδουσιν, the ησ being a correction by the first hand, and so assigned by Tischdf. to his B².

James ii. 13. κατακαυχατε, as Bentley.

iii. 5. μεγαλα αυχει, not μεγαλαυχει, as Mai, edn. 1.

1 Pet. i. 7. πολυτειμοτερον, not -μιωτερον, as Mai.

iii. 1. κερδηθησονται, not -ωνται, as Mai.

6. υπηκουεν, not -ουσεν, as Mai.

8. φιλαδελφοι, not φυλ-, as Mai, edn. 2.

13. υμας ει, not εαν, as Muralto.

iv. 13. του χριστου, not χριστου, as Bentley.

1 John ii. 2. ειλασμος εστιν, not εστιν ειλ., as Tischendorf (N. T. ed. 7).

27. αυτου χρεισμα, not αυτο, as Mai, Tischendorf (N. T. ed. 7), and all before the inspection above mentioned.

iii. 6. εορακεν is a 1. m., εωρ. a 2. m., not as Mai.

18. αλλ εν εργω, not αλλ εργω, as Mai.

iv. 4. νενεικ. is a 1. m., νενικ. a 2. m., not as in Mai.

10. εν τουτω, not εν τουτο, as Mai.

21. τον θεον αγαπα και is in marg. a 1. m. (B² Tischdf.; see above on Heb. viii. 11).

v. 16. εστιν αμαρτια προς θανατον is not repeated, as in Mai, edn. 2.

18. αλλα, not αλλ', as Mai.

Subscr. $\bar{α}$ is not omitted, as Bentley.

2 John 8. απολεσητε, not ται, as Birch.

3 John 14. ευθεως σε, not ευθεως, as Mai.

Jude 5. οτι $\overline{ις}$ λαον is in the MS.

12. εισιν οι εν, not εισιν εν, as Mai.

ib. παραφερομενοι, not -ναι, as Bentley and Birch.

CHAPTER V.

1 JOHN.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. The internal testimony furnished by this Epistle to its Author being the same with the Author of the fourth Gospel is, it may well be thought, incontrovertible. To maintain a diversity of Authorship would betray the very perverseness and exaggeration of that school of criticism which refuses to believe, be evidence never so strong.

2. It will be well however not to assume this identity, but to proceed in the same way as we have done with the other books of the New Testament, establishing the Authorship by external ecclesiastical testimony.

Polycarp, ad Philipp. c. 7, p. 1012, writes: *πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν.* Seeing that this contains a plain allusion to 1 John iv. 3, and that Polycarp was the disciple of St. John, it has ever been regarded as an indirect testimony to the genuineness, and so to the Authorship of our Epistle. Lücke, in his Einleitung, p. 3 f., has dealt with and defended this testimony of Polycarp.

3. It is said of Papias by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39, *κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.* And be it remembered that Irenæus says of Papias that he was *Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δ' ἑταῖρος.*

4. Irenæus frequently quotes this Epistle, as Eusebius asserts of him, H. E. v. 8. In his work against heresies, iii. 16. 5, p. 206, after citing John xx. 31, with "quemadmodum Joannes Domini discipulus confirmat dicens," he proceeds "propter quod et in Epistola sua sic testificatus est nobis: Filioli, novissima hora est," &c. 1 John ii. 18 ff. In iii. 16. 8, p. 207, he says, "quos et Dominus nobis cavere prædixit, et discipulus ejus Johannes in prædicta epistola fugere nos præcepit dicens Multi seductores exierunt, &c. (2 John 7, 8: so that "in prædicta epistola" seems to be a lapse of memory): et rursus in epistola ait Multi pseudoprophetæ exierunt," &c. (1 John iv. 1—3.)

In this last quotation it is that Irenæus supports the remarkable reading, *ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, "qui solvit Jesum."

And just after, he proceeds, *διὸ πάλιν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ φησί Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται*, 1 John v. 1.

5. Clement of Alexandria repeatedly refers to our Epistle as written

by St. John. Thus in his Strom. ii. 15 (66), p. 464 P., φαίνεται δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐκδιδάσκων ἐν τούτοις· ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα, κ.τ.λ., 1 John v. 16.

In Strom. iii. 4 (32), p. 525 P., he quotes 1 John i. 6 f. with φησὶν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ. In iii. 5 (42), p. 530, 1 John iii. 3, with φησίν only. In iv. 16 (102), p. 608, 1 John iii. 18, 19, iv. 16, 18, v. 3, with Ἰωάννης, τελείους εἶναι διδάσκων . . . .

6. Tertullian, adv. Marcion. v. 16, vol. ii. p. 511: "ut Johannes apostolus, qui jam antichristos dicit processisse in mundum, præcursores antichristi spiritus, negantes Christum in carne venisse et solventes Jesum . . ." (1 John iv. 1 ff.)

Adv. Praxean. c. 15, p. 173: 'Quod vidimus, inquit Johannes, quod audivimus," &c. (1 John i. 1.)

Ib. c. 28, p. 192 f.: "Johannes autem etiam mendacem notat eum qui negaverit Jesum esse Christum, contra de Deo natum omnem qui crediderit Jesum esse Christum (1 John ii. 22, iv. 2 f., v. 1): propter quod et hortatur ut credamus nomini filii ejus Jesu Christi, ut scilicet communio sit nobis cum Patre et filio ejus Jesu Christo" (1 John i. 7).

See also adv. Gnosticos, 12, p. 147: and other places, in the indices.

7. Cyprian in Ep. 25 (24 or 28), p. 289, writes: "Et Joannes apostolus mandati memor in epistola sua postmodum ponit: In hoc inquit, intelligimus quia cognovimus eum, si præcepta ejus custodiamus," &c. (1 John ii. 3, 4.)

And de orat. dom. ad Demetr. 14, p. 529, "in epistola sua Joannes quoque ad faciendam Dei voluntatem hortatur et instruit dicens: Nolite diligere mundum," &c. (1 John ii. 15—17.)

Also de opere et eleemos. 3, p. 604: "iterum in epistola sua Joannes ponat et dicat: Si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus," &c. (1 John i. 8.)

De bono patientiæ, 9, p. 628: "per Christi exempla gradiamur, sicut Joannes apostolus instruit dicens: Qui dicit se in Christo manere, debet quomodo ille ambulavit et ipse ambulare" (1 John ii. 6).

8. Muratori's fragment on the canon states, "Joannis duæ in catholica habentur."

And the same fragment cites 1 John i. 1, 4: "quid ergo mirum, si Joannes tam constanter singula etiam in epistolis suis proferat, dicens in semetipso Quæ vidimus oculis nostris et auribus audivimus et manus nostræ palpaverunt in hæc scripsimus." Cf. Routh, reliq. sacr. i. p. 395.

9. The Epistle is found in the Peschito, whose canon in the catholic Epistles is so short.

10. Origen (in Euseb. vi. 25), beginning the sentence τί δεῖ περὶ τοῦ ἀναπεσόντος λέγειν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Ἰωάννου . . . ., and proceeding as cited in the Prolegg. to the Apocalypse, § i. par. 12, says,

καταλέλοιπε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνυ ὀλίγων στίχων· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην, ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας· πλὴν οὐκ εἰσὶ στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν. And he continually cites the Epistle as St. John's: e. g., in Ev. Jo. tom. xiii. 21, vol. iv., p. 230, *ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ φῶς· ὁ θεὸς γάρ, φησί, φῶς ἐστι καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία.* Numerous other places may be found in the indices.

11. Dionysius of Alexandria, the scholar of Origen, recognizes the genuineness of the Gospel and Epistle as being written by the Apostle John, by the very form of his argument against the genuineness of the Apocalypse. For (see his reasoning at length in the Prolegomena to the Revelation, § i. par. 48) he tries to prove that it was not written by St. John, on account of its diversity in language and style from the Gospel and Epistle; and distinctly cites the words of our Epistle as those of the Evangelist: *ὁ δέ γε εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προέγραψεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ ἀπερίττως ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς θείας ἀποκαλύψεως ἤρξατο· ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑοράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν.*

12. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 24, says, *τῶν δὲ Ἰωάννου συγγραμμάτων πρὸς τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ ἡ προτέρα τῶν ἐπιστολῶν παρά τε τοῖς νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἔτ' ἀρχαίοις ἀναμφίλεκτος ὡμολόγηται.* And in iii. 25, having enumerated the four Gospels and Acts and the Epistles of Paul, he says, *αἷς ἑξῆς τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν . . . . κυρωτέον.*

13. After the time of Eusebius, general consent pronounced the same verdict. We may terminate the series of testimonies with that of Jerome, who in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers (c. 9, vol. ii. p. 845) says of St. John, "Scripsit autem et unam epistolam, cujus exordium est, Quod fuit ab initio, &c., quæ ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis viris probatur."

14. The first remarkable contradiction to this combination of testimony is found in the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes, in the sixth century. He ventures to assert (lib. vii. p. 292, in Migne, Patr., vol. lxxxviii.[1]), that none of the earlier Christian writers who have treated of the canon, makes any mention of the Catholic Epistles as canonical; *οὐ γὰρ τῶν ἀποστόλων φασὶν αὐτοὺς οἱ πλείους, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων τινῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀφελεστέρων.* He then proceeds in a somewhat confused way to state that Irenæus does mention 1 Peter and 1 John, as apostolic, *ἕτεροι δὲ οὐδὲ αὐτὰς λέγουσιν εἶναι ἀποστόλων, ἀλλὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων· πρώτη γὰρ καὶ δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου γέγραπται, ὡς δῆλον ἑνὸς προσώπου εἶναι τὰς τρεῖς.* But it is evident from the chain of testimonies given above, that Cosmas can have been but ill informed on the subject.

15. It is probable that the Alogi mentioned by Epiphanius as reject-

[1] See the passage at length, with Lücke's remarks, in his Einleitung, pp. 5, 6, note.

ing the Gospel and Apocalypse, included the Epistles in this rejection. Still Epiphanius does not assert it; he only says, τάχα δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολάς, συνᾴδουσι γὰρ καὶ αὗται τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει. Hær. li. c. 34, vol. i. p. 456. But their repudiation of the Epistle would be of no account.

16. Its rejection by Marcion is of equally little consequence. He excluded from the canon all the writings of St. John, as not suiting his views.

17. Lücke closes his review of ancient authorities, which I have followed and expanded, by saying, "Incontestably then our Epistle must be numbered among those canonical books which are most strongly upheld by ecclesiastical tradition."

18. But the genuineness of the Epistle rests not, as already observed, on external testimony alone. It must remain an acknowledged fact, until either the Gospel is proved not to be St. John's, or the similarity between the two is shewn to be only apparent. Lücke has well observed, that neither Gospel nor Epistle can be said to be an imitation: both are original, but both the product of the same mind: so that considered only in this point of view, we might well doubt which was written first.

19. However, its genuineness has been controverted in modern times. First we have a rash and characteristic saying of Jos. Scaliger's: "tres epistolæ Joannis non sunt apostoli Joannis." The first who deliberately and on assigned grounds took the same side, was S. Gottlieb Lange; who, strange to say, receiving the Gospel and the Apocalypse, yet rejected the Epistle.

20. His argument, as reported by Lücke, is as follows: The entire failure in the Epistle of any individual, personal, and local notices, betrays an author unacquainted with the personal circumstances of the Apostle, and those of the churches where he taught. The close correspondence of the Epistle with the Gospel in thought and expression begets a suspicion that some careful imitator of John wrote the Epistle. Lastly, the Epistle, as compared with the Gospel, shews such evident signs of enfeeblement of spirit by old age, that if it is to be ascribed to John, it must have been written at the extreme end of his life, after the destruction of Jerusalem; whereas, from no allusion being made to that event even in such a passage as ch. ii. 18, the Epistle makes a shew of having been written before it. The only solution in Lange's estimation is that some imitator wrote it, as St. John's, it may be a century after his time.

21. To this Lücke replies that Lange is in fourfold error. For 1, it is not true that the Epistle contains no individual and personal notices. These it is true are rather hinted at and implied than brought

to the surface: a characteristic, not only of a catholic epistle as distinguished from one locally addressed, but also of the style of St. John as distinguished from that of St. Paul. As to the fact, the Writer designates himself by implication as an apostle, and seems to allude to his Gospel in ch. i. 1—4: in ch. ii. 1, 18, he implies an intimate relation between himself and his readers: in ch. ii. 12—14, he distinguishes his readers according to their ages: in ch. ii. 18, 19, iv. 1—3, the false teachers are pointed at in a way which shews that both Writer and readers knew more about them: and the warning, ch. v. 21, has a local character, and reminds the readers of something well known to them.

22. Secondly, it is entirely denied, as above remarked, that there is the slightest trace of slavish imitation. The Epistle is in no respect the work of an imitator of the Gospel. Such a person would have elaborated every point of similarity, and omitted no notice of the personal and local circumstances of the Apostle: would have probably misunderstood and exaggerated St. John's peculiarities of style and thought. All such attempts to put off one man's writing for that of another carry in them the elements of failure as against a searching criticism. But how different is all we find in this Epistle. By how wide a gap is it separated from the writings of Ignatius, Clement, Barnabas, Polycarp. Apparently close as it is upon them in point of time, what a totally different spirit breathes in it. This Epistle written after them, written among them, would be indeed the rarest of exceptional cases—an unimaginable anachronism, a veritable ὕστερον πρότερον.

23. Thirdly: it is certainly the strangest criticism, to speak of the weakness of old age in the Epistle. If this could be identified as really being so, it would be the strongest proof of authenticity. For it is altogether inconceivable, that an imitator could have had the power or the purpose to write as John might have written in his old age. But where are the traces of this second childishness? We are told, in the repetitions, in the want of order, in the uniformity. Certainly there is an appearance of tautology in the style: more perhaps than in the Gospel. Erasmus, in the dedication of his paraphrase of St. John's Gospel, characterizes the style of the Gospel as a "dicendi genus ita velut ansulis ex sese cohærentibus contexens, nonnumquam ex contrariis, nonnumquam ex similibus, nonnumquam ex iisdem subinde repetitis,—ut orationis quodque membrum semper excipiat prius, sic, ut prioris finis initium sit sequentis." The same style prevails in the Epistle. It is not however an infirmity of age, but a peculiarity, which might belong to extreme youth just as well.

24. The greater amount of repetition in the Epistle arises from its

being more hortatory and tender in character. And it may also be attributed to its more Hebraistic form, in which it differs from the Grecian and dialectic style of St. Paul: abounding in parallels and apparent arguings in a circle. The epistolary form would account fot the want of strict arrangement in order, which would hardly be observed by the youngest any more than by the oldest writer.

25. And the appearance of uniformity, partly accounted for by the oneness of subject and simplicity of spirit, is often produced by want of deep enough exegesis to discover the real differences in passages which seem to express the same. Besides, even granting these marks of old age, what argument would they furnish against the genuineness? St. John was quite old enough at and after the siege of Jerusalem for such to have shewn themselves: so that this objection must be dealt with on other grounds, and does not affect our present question.

26. Fourthly, it is quite a mistake to suppose that if the Epistle was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, that event must necessarily have been intimated in ch. ii. 18. It cannot be proved, nor does it seem likely from the notices of the παρουσία in the Gospel, that St. John connected the ἐσχάτη ὥρα with the destruction of Jerusalem. It does not seem likely that, writing to Christians of Asia Minor who probably from the first had a wider view of our Lord's prophecy of the end, he should have felt bound to make a corrective allusion to the event, even supposing he himself had once identified it with the time of the end. *They* would not require to be told, why the universal triumph of Christianity had not followed it, seeing they probably never expected it to do so.

27. So that Lange's objections, which I have reported freely from Lücke, as being highly illustrative of the character of the Epistle, certainly do not succeed in impugning the verdict of antiquity, or the evidence furnished by the Epistle itself.

28. The objections brought by Bretschneider, formed on the doctrine of the logos and the antidocetic tendency manifest both in the Epistle and the Gospel, and betraying both as works of the second century, have also been shewn by Lücke, Einl. pp. 16—20, to be untenable. The doctrine of the logos, though formally enounced by St. John only, is in fact that of St. Paul in Col. i. 15 ff., and that of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews i. ff., and was unquestionably prepared for Christian use long before, in the Alexandrine Jewish theology. And though Docetism itself may have been the growth of the second century, yet the germs of it, which are opposed in this Epistle, were apparent long before. A groundless assumption of Bretschneider is, that seeing the three Epistles are by the same hand, and the writer of the second and third, where there was no ground for concealing him-

self, calls himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος,—the first Epistle, where, wishing to be taken for the Apostle, he does not name himself, is also by John the Presbyter. The answer to which is, that we can by no means consent to the assumption that the so-called Presbyter John was the author of the second and third Epistles: see the Prolegomena to 2 John, § i. 2, 12 ff.

29. The objections brought against our Epistle by the modern Tübingen school are dealt with at considerable length by Düsterdieck, in his Einleitung, pp. xxxix—lxxv. It is not my purpose to enter on them here. For mere English readers, it would require an introduction far longer than that which Düsterdieck has devoted to it, at all to enable them to appreciate the nature of those objections and the postulates from which they spring. And when I inform such English readers that the first of those postulates is the denial of a personal God, they will probably not feel that they have lost much by not having the refutation of the objections laid before them. Should any regret it, they may find some of them briefly noticed in Dr. Davidson's Introduction, vol. iii. pp. 454 ff.: and they will there see how feeble and futile they are.

30. Whether then we approach the question of the authorship of this Epistle (and its consequent canonicity) from the side of external testimony, or of internal evidence, we are alike convinced that its claim to have been written by the Evangelist St. John, and to its place in the canon of Scripture, is fully substantiated.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. This question, in the case of our Epistle, might be very easily and briefly dealt with, were it not for one apparent mistake, which complicates it.

In Augustine's Quæst. Evang. ii. 39, vol. iii. p. 1353, we read, "secundum sententiam hanc etiam illud est quod dictum est a Joanne in epistola ad Parthos;" and then follows 1 John iii. 2. This appears to be the only place in Augustine's writings where he thus characterizes it. The "ad Parthos" has found its way into some of the Benedictine editions in the title of the Tractates on the Epistle: but it seems not to have been originally there. It has been repeated by some of the Latin fathers, e. g. by Vigilius Tapsensis (or Idacius Clarus ?) in the 5th century in his treatise against Varimadus the Arian[2]: by Cassiodorus[3]:

[2] Lib. i. c. 5, p. 367; in Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. lxii.
[3] De institut. divin. Script. c. 14, vol. ii. p. 546.

by Bede, who in a prologue to the seven catholic Epistles[4], says, "multi scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, in quibus est sanctus Athanasius, Alexandrinæ præsul ecclesiæ, primam ejus (Joannis) epistolam scriptam ad Parthos esse testantur." These two latter notices involve the matter in more obscurity still. For Cassiodorus thus designates not only the first, but also the second and third Epistles; and, seeing that no Greek writer ever seems to give this title, it is hardly conceivable that the statement of Bede regarding Athanasius can be correct. Düsterdieck suspects, and apparently with reason, that the prologue cannot be from Bede's own hand, seeing that he so uniformly keeps to Augustine.

2. Some, but very few writers, have assumed as a fact that the Epistle was really written to the Parthians. Paulus and Baur made use of the assumption to impugn the apostolicity of the Epistle. Grotius, who was followed by Hammond, and partially by Michaelis and Baumgarten-Crusius, gives a curious reason, in connexion with this idea, for the omission of all address and personal notices: "vocata olim fuit epistola ad Parthos, i. e. ad Judæos Christum professos, qui non sub Romanorum, sed sub Parthorum vivebant imperio in locis trans Euphratem, ubi ingens erat Judæorum multitudo, ut Neardæ, Nisibi et aliis in locis. Et hanc causam puto cur hæc epistola neque in fronte nomen titulumque Apostoli, neque in fine salutationes apostolici moris contineat, quia nimirum in terras hostiles Romanis hæc epistola per mercatores Ephesios mittebatur, multumque nocere Christianis poterat, si deprehensum fuisset hoc, quanquam innocens, litterarum commercium." This is absurd enough, especially as the Epistle is evidently not addressed to Jews at all as such, but mainly to Gentile readers: see below, par 5. And ecclesiastical tradition knows of no mission of St. John to the Parthians, St. Thomas being supposed to have carried the Gospel to them.

3. This being so, it would appear, as hinted before, that the supposed address "ad Parthos" rests upon some mistake. But if so, on what mistake? A conjecture is quoted from Serrarius that in the original text of Augustine it stood "ad Pathmios:" another from Semler, that "adapertius" is the reading, Augustine wishing to contrast St. John's writings with those of St. Paul, as the plainer and more explicit of the two[5]. A more probable conjecture has been, that the word παρθένος has some concern in the mistake: not however in the manner supposed by Whiston[6], that the original address was πρὸς παρθένους, i. e. to "young

[4] Vol. iv. p. 1, Migne, from Cave, Script. eccles. histor. liter. pp. 179, 296.

[5] Other conjectures have derived it from '*ad sparsos*,'—'*ad pantas*.' "*Ad Spartos*" is asserted by Scholz (biblische-kritische Reise, p. 67) to be found in many Latin mss., but Lücke doubts this.

[6] Comm. on the 3 catholic Epistles of St. John, Lond. 1719, p. 6: cited by Lücke and Düsterdieck.

Christians yet uncorrupted both as to fleshly and spiritual fornication." Hug supposes that the πρὸς πάρθους came from a superscription of the second Epistle, found in the cursive mss. 89 (Cent. xi.) and 30 (Cent. xiii.) of Griesbach, and alluded to by Clem. Alex., in a fragment of his Adumbrations on 2 John, ed. Potter, p. 1011, "secunda Joannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta, simplicissima est." And this is very possib le. Another supposition is that of Gieseler, Kirchenge schichte, i. p. 139, that it has arisen out of the circumstance of the name παρθένος being given to the Apostle himself. This name certainly occurs in a superscription of the Apocalypse cited by Lücke from ms. 30 of Griesbach (Cent. xii.) τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδοξοτάτου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ παρθένου ἠγαπημένου ἐπιστηθίου Ἰωάννου θεολόγου. Lücke gives various other notices, from which it appears that this character was attributed to St. John [7].

4. At all events we may fairly assume, that the Epistle was not written to the Parthians. Nor is there more probability in the notion of Benson that it was addressed to the Jewish Christians in Judæa and Galilee, who had seen the Lord in the flesh: nor in that of Lightfoot, who sends it to the Church at Corinth, supposing the Gaius to whom the third Epistle is addressed, identical with him of Acts xix. 29; 1 Cor. i. 14, and the ἔγραψα of 3 John 9 to refer to this first Epistle.

5. Setting aside these, and falling back on the general opinion, we believe the Epistle to have been written not to any one church, but to a cycle of churches, mainly consisting of Gentile converts. This last seems shewn by the warning of ch. v. 21, combined with the circumstance that so little reference is made to O. T. sayings or history.

6. It evidently also appears, that the Apostle is the spiritual teacher of those to whom he is writing. He knows their circumstances and various advances in the faith: the whole tone is that of their father in the faith. Such a relation, following as we surely must the traces furnished by ancient tradition, can only be found in the case of St. John, by believing the readers to have been members of the churches at and round Ephesus, where he lived and taught.

7. The character of the Epistle is too general to admit a comparison between it and the Ephesian Epistle in the Apocalypse, which some have endeavoured to institute. Our Epistle contains absolutely no materials on which such a comparison can proceed.

[7] See the (Ps.?) Ignatius, ad Philad. c. 4, p. 824; Tertullian de monogam. c. 17, vol. ii. p. 952; Cyr. Alex. Orat. de Maria virgine, p. 380

SECTION III.

ITS RELATION TO THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

1. As introductory to this enquiry, it will be well to give an account of opinions respecting the *epistolary form* of this canonical book.

2. This was always taken for granted, seeing that definite readers and their circumstances are continually present, and that the first and second persons plural are constantly used [8],—until Michaelis [9] maintained that it is rather a treatise, or a book, than a letter; and only so far a letter, as any treatise may be addressed to certain readers, e.g. the Acts to Theophilus. Accordingly, he holds this to be a second part of the Gospel.

3. As Lücke remarks, it is of great importance whether we consider the writing as an Epistle or not. Our decision on this point affects both our estimate of it, and our exposition. Surely, however, the question is not difficult to decide. We may fairly reply to the hypothesis which supposes the Epistle to be a second part of the Gospel, that the Gospel is complete in itself and requires no such supplement; see John xx. 30, 31, where the practical object also of the Gospel is too plainly asserted, for us to suppose this to be its practical sequel.

4. To view it again as a preface and introduction to the Gospel, as Hug, seems not to be borne out by the spirit of either writing. The Gospel requires no such introduction: the Epistle furnishes none such. They do not in a word stand in any external relation to one another, such as is imagined by every one of these hypotheses.

5. Hug fancied he found a trace of the Epistle having once been attached to the Gospel, in the Latin version attached to the Codex Bezæ. There, on the back of the leaf on which the Acts of the Apostles begin, the copyist has written the last column of 3 John, with this subscription: "Epistulæ Johanis iii. explicit incipit Actus Apostolorum." But first, this proves too much, seeing that the second and third Epistles of St. John (and the rest of the catholic epistles?) are included, and surely Hug does not suppose these Epistles to have been also sequels to the Gospel: and secondly, this very circumstance, the inclusion of all three Epistles, shews a possible reason of the arrangement, viz. to place together the writings of the same Apostle.

6. The writing then is to be regarded as an Epistle, as it usually has been: and no closer external relation to the Gospel must be sought for.

But, this being premised, a very interesting question follows. The two writings are internally related, in a remarkable manner. Do the

[8] Cf. ch. ii. 1, 7, 13, 14, 18, 28; iii. 18, 21; iv. 1, 7, 11, &c.

[9] Introd. to N. T., Marsh's transl., vol. iv. p. 400.

phænomena of this relation point out the Gospel, or the Epistle, as having been first written?

7. And to this question there can I think be but one answer. The Epistle again and again assumes, on the part of its readers, an acquaintance with the facts of the Gospel narrative. Lücke well remarks, that "as a rule, the shorter, more concentrated expression of one and the same writer, especially when ideas peculiar to him are concerned, is the *later*, while the more explicit one, which first unfolds and puts in shape the idea, is the earlier one." And he finds examples of this in the abbreviated formulæ of ch. i. 1, 2, as compared with John i. 1 ff.; iv. 2, compared with John i. 14.

8. Other considerations connected with this part of our subject will be found treated in the next section.

SECTION IV.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. On both of these, opinions have been much divided; no sure indications being furnished by the Epistle itself. If however we have been right in assigning to it a date subsequent to that of the Gospel, we shall bring that date, by what has been said in the Prolegomena to Vol. 1. ch. v. § iv. (where fifteen years, A.D. 70—85, are shewn to have marked the probable limits of the time of the writing of the Gospel), within a time not earlier than perhaps about the middle of the eighth decade of the first century: and extending as late as the traditional age of the Apostle himself.

2. Some have imagined that the Epistle betrays marks of the extreme old age of the writer. But such inferences are very fallacious. Certainly the repeated use of τεκνία, more frequently than any other term of endearing address, seems to point to an aged writer: but even this is insecure.

3. Again it has been fancied that the ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν of ch. ii. 18, furnishes a note of time; and must be understood of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem. But as Lücke replies, this expression is used simply in reference to the appearance of antichristian teachers, and the apprehension thence arising that the coming of the Lord was at hand. So that we have no more right to infer a note of time from it, than from similar expressions in St. Paul, e. g. 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1

4. As to the place of writing, we are just as much in uncertainty. The Gospel (Vol. I. Prolegg. ch. v. § iv.) is said by Irenæus to have been written at Ephesus. And ancient tradition, if at least represented by the subscriptions to the Epistle, seems to have placed the writing of the Epistle there also. Further, it is impossible to say.

SECTION V.

CONTENTS AND ARRANGEMENT.

1. This Epistle, from its aphoristic and apparently tautological character, is exceedingly difficult to arrange as a continuous contextual whole. Some indeed from this have been induced to believe that there is no such contextual connexion in the Epistle. So Calvin[1], Episcopius[2], and others. And this seems, up to the beginning of the last century, to have been the prevailing view. About that time, Sebastian Schmid, in his commentary on the Epistle, maintained, but only tentatively and timidly, that there is a logical and contextual arrangement. The same side was taken up with more decision by Oporinus of Göttingen, in a treatise entitled "De constanter tenenda communione cum Patre et Filio ejus Jesu Christo, i. e. Joannis Ep. i. nodis interpretum liberata et luci vere innectæ suæ restituta, Goett. 1741."

2. But the principal advocate of this view in the last century was Bengel. In his note in the Gnomon[3] on the famous passage, ch. v. 7, he gives his contextual system of the Epistle, as cited below[4]. It will

[1] "Doctrinam exhortationibus mistam continet. Disserit enim de æterna Christi deitate, simul de incomparabili quam mundo patefactus secum attulit gratia, tum de omnibus in genere beneficiis ac præsertim inæstimabilem divinæ adoptionis gratiam commendat atque extollit. Inde sumit exhortandi materiem, et nunc quidem in genere pie et sancte vivendum admonet, nunc de caritate nominatim præcipit. Verum nihil horum continua serie facit. Nam sparsim docendo et exhortando varius est, præsertim vero multus est in urgenda caritate. Alia quoque breviter attingit, ut de cavendis impostoribus, et similia." Argum. Epist. 1 Joh. vol. vii. p. 107.

[2] "Modus tractandi arbitrarius est, neque ad artis regulas adstrictus . . . sine rhetorico artificio aut logica accurata methodo institutus." Lectiones sacræ in Ep. Joh. Amst. 1665, ii. p. 173.

[3] Vol. ii. p. 568, ed. Steudel. Tübingen and London, 1850.

[4] "Partes sunt tres:

EXORDIUM, c. i. 1—4.
TRACTATIO, c. i. 5—v. 12.
CONCLUSIO, c. v. 13—21.

"In EXORDIO apostolus ab apparitione verbi vitæ constituit auctoritatem prædicationi et scriptioni suæ, et scopum (ἵνα, *ut*, ver. 3) exserte indicat: *exordio* respondet CONCLUSIO, eundem scopum amplius explanans, instituta gnorismatum illorum recapitulans per triplex *novimus*, c. v. 18, 19, 20.

"TRACTATIO habet duas partes, agens

"I. speciatim

α) de communione cum DEO in luce, c. i. 5—10.

β) de communione cum FILIO in luce, c. ii. 1 f. 7 f., subjuncta applicatione propria ad patres, juvenes, puerulos, vv. 13—27. Innectitur hic adhortatio ad *manendum* in eo, c. ii. 28—iii. 24, ut fructus ex *manifestatione* ejus in carne se porrigat ad *manifestationem* gloriosam.

be observed that this arrangement is made in the interest of the disputed verse, and tends to give it an important place in the context of the Epistle. It is moreover highly artificial, and the Trinitarian character, which is made to predominate, is certainly far from the obvious key to the real arrangement, as given us by the Epistle itself[5].

3. Nearer to our own time, differing arrangements of the Epistle have been proposed, by Lücke, De Wette, and Düsterdieck. I shall take these three in order.

4. Lücke professes to have gained much, in drawing up his arrangement, from the previous labours of Knapp[6] and Rickli[7]. He holds the proper theme of the Epistle, the object, ground, and binding together of all its doctrinal and practical sayings, to be this proposition: "As the ground and root of all Christian fellowship is, the fellowship which each individual has with the Father and the Son in faith and in love, so this latter necessarily unfolds and exhibits itself in that former, viz. in the fellowship with the brethren." Having laid this down, he divides the Epistle into many sections, all unfolding in various ways this central truth. Thus, e. g., ch. i. 5—ii. 2, speaks of fellowship with God through Jesus Christ. God is light: fellowship with Him is walking in light: all pretence to it without such walking, is falsehood. And striving after such purity is the condition under which only Christian fellowship subsists, and under which the blood of Christ cleanses from sin. For even the Christian state is a striving, and not free from sin, but proceeding ever in more detection and confession of it: which leads not to a compromise with sin, but to its entire annihilation.

5. This may serve for a specimen of Lücke's setting forth of the connexion of the Epistle: in which, as Düsterdieck observes, he does not attempt to grasp the master thoughts which account for the development, but merely follows it step by step. For this, however, Lücke does not deserve the blame which Düsterdieck imputes to him. His is obviously the right way to proceed, though it may not have been carried far enough in his hands: far better than the à priori assumption of a Trinitarian arrangement by Bengel. He has well given the

γ) de corroboratione et fructu mansionis illius per SPIRITUM, capite iv. toto, ad quod aditum parat c. iii. ver. 24 conferendus ad c. iv. 12.

"II. Per Symperasma sive Congeriem, de Testimonio Patris et Filii et Spiritus, cui fides in Jesum Christum, generatio ex Deo, amor erga Deum et filios ejus, observatio præceptorum, et victoria mundi innititur, c. v. 1—12."

5 Bengel's arrangement has been adopted in the main by Sander, in his Commentary on the Epistle.

6 Script. var. argum. p. 177 f.

7 Johannis erster Brief erklärt und angewendet in Predigten, Luzern 1828.

sequence of thought, *as it stands:* but he has not *accounted for it.* The complete statement of the disposition of the matter of the Epistle must tell us not only *how* the train of thought proceeds, but *why* it thus proceeds.

6. A nearer approximation to this has been made by De Wette[8]. His plan may be thus described. The great design of the Epistle is to comfirm the readers in the Christian life as consisting in purity (love) and faith, and to this end to waken and sharpen the moral conscience by reminding them of the great moral axioms of the Gospel, by reminding them also of the inseparableness of morality and faith, to keep them from the influence of those false teachers who denied the reality of the manifestation of Jesus Christ in the flesh, and to convince them of the reality of that manifestation. The Epistle he arranges under 1. An introduction, ch. i. 1—4: 2. Three exhortations; *a*) i. 5—ii. 28, begins with reminding them of the nature of Christian fellowship, as consisting in walking in light, in purity from sin and keeping of God's commandments (i. 5—ii. 11): then proceeds by an earnest address to the readers (ii. 12—14), a warning against the love of the world (ii. 15—17), against false teachers, and an exhortation to keep fast hold of Christ (ii. 18—57), and concludes with a promise of confidence in the day of judgment.

β) He again reminds them of the fundamental moral axioms of the Gospel. The state of a child of God rests on the conditions of righteousness and purity from sin: he who commits sin belongs to the devil. Especially is the distinction made between those who belong to God and those who belong to the devil, by Love and Hate: and therefore must we ever love in deed and in truth (ii. 29—iii. 18). The Apostle adds a promise of confidence towards God and answer to prayer, and exhorts them to add to love, faith in the Son of God (iii. 19—24): which leads him to a second express warning against the false teachers (iv. 1—6).

γ) In this third exhortation, the Apostle sets out with the simple principle of Love, which, constituting the essence of God Himself, and being revealed in the mission of Christ, is the condition of all adoption into God's family and all confidence towards God (iv. 7—21). But a co-ordinate condition is faith in the Son of God, as including in itself Love, and the keeping of God's commandments, and the strength requisite thereto. And the voucher for this faith is found in the historical facts and testimonies of baptism, of the death of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, and in eternal life which He gives (v. 1—13). At

[8] Handbuch, vol. i. ed. Bruckner, Leipz. 1846. The Gospel and Epistles of St. John are treated together.

the conclusion of the exhortation, we have the repeated promise of confidence towards God and the hearing of prayer, in this case intercessory prayer for a sinning brother, yet with a limitation, and a reminding that strictly speaking, Christians may not sin: ending with a warning against idolatry (v. 14—21).

7. To this division Düsterdieck objects that the terms *exhortation*, *reminding*, &c., are of too superficial a kind to suffice for designating the various portions of the Epistle, and that De Wette is in error in supposing a new train of thought to be begun in ch. iv. 7—21: rather does the leading axiom of ch. ii. 29 proceed through that portion, and in fact even farther than that.

8. His own division, which has been in the main followed in my Commentary, is as follows. Regarding, as the others, ch. i. 1—4 as the Introduction, in which the writer lays down the great object of apostolic preaching, asserts of himself full apostolicity, and announces the purpose of his writing,—he makes *two* great divisions of the Epistles: the first, i. 5—ii. 28, the second, ii. 29—v. 5: on which follows the conclusion, v. 6—21.

9. Each of these great divisions is ruled and pervaded by one master thought, announced clearly in its outset; which we may call its *theme*. These themes are impressed on the readers both by positive and negative unfolding, and by polemical defence against erroneous teachers: and, this being done, each principal portion is concluded with a corresponding promise. And both principal portions tend throughout to throw light on the great subject of the whole, viz. FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD THE FATHER AND THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

10. The theme of the *first* portion is given ch. i. 5, "*God is Light*, and in Him is no darkness." Consequently, fellowship with Him, on which depends our joy in Christ (i. 3, 4), belongs only to him who walks in light (i. 6). To walk thus in light as God is light (i. 6 ff., ii. 8 ff.), and to flee from darkness, in which there can be no fellowship with God (ii. 11 ff.), forms the first subject of the Apostle's Exhortation. To this end, after shewing the relation which this proposition, "God is light," has to us in regard of our fellowship with God and with one another through Jesus Christ (i. 6, 7), he unfolds first *positively* (i. 8—ii. 11) *wherein* our walking in light *consists:* viz. in free recognition and humble confession of our own sinfulness: the knowledge and confession of our own darkness being in fact the first breaking in on us of the light, in which we must walk: viz. fellowship with God through Christ, whose blood is to cleanse us from all our sin.

11. This our walking in light, whose first steps are the recognition, confession, and cleansing of sin, further consists in keeping the commandments of God, which are all summed up in one great command-

ment of *Love* (ii. 3—11). Hence only we know that we know God (ii. 3), that we love Him (ii. 5), that we are and abide in Him (ii. 6), in a word that we have fellowship with Him (cf. i. 3, 5 ff.), when we keep His commandments, when we walk (ii. 6, cf. i. 6) as "He," i. e. Christ, walked.

12. This summing up of all God's commands in love by the example of Christ as perfect love (John xiii. 34) brings in the *negative* side of the illustration of the proposition "God is light." Hate is darkness: is separation from God: is fellowship with the world. So begins then a polemical designation of and warning against the love of and fellowship with the world (ii. 15—17), and against those false teachers (ii. 18—26), who would bring them into this condition: and an exhortation to abide in Christ (ii. 24—28). All this is grounded on the present state and progress of the various classes among them in fellowship with God in Christ (ii. 12—14, 27). See each of these subdivisions more fully specified in the Commentary.

13. The *second* great portion of the Epistle (ii. 29—v. 5) opens, as the other, with the announcement of its theme: "*God is righteous*" (ii. 29), and "he who doeth righteousness, is born of Him." And as before, "God is Light" made the condition of fellowship with God to be, walking in light as "He" walked in light, so now "God is righteous" makes the condition of "sonship" on our part to be that we be righteous, as "He," Christ, was holy. And as before also, so now: it must be shewn wherein this righteousness of God's children consists, in contrast to the unrighteousness of the children of the world and of the devil. And so we have in this second part also a twofold exhortation, a *positive* and a *negative:* the middle point of which is the fundamental axiom "God is righteousness, and therefore we His children must be righteous:" and thus it also serves the purpose of the Epistle announced in i. 3 f. to confirm the readers in fellowship with the Father and the Son, and so to complete their joy: for this fellowship is the state of God's children.

14. This however, as on the one side it brings in all blessed hope and our glorious inheritance (iii. 2, 3), so on the other it induces the moral necessity of that righteousness on which our fellowship with the Father and the Son, our abiding in Him, rests, grounded on His Love (iii. 8, 9, 10 ff.: iv. 7 ff. &c.). Both sides of the birth from God, that which looks forward and that which looks backward, are treated together by the Apostle. Because we are born of God, not of the world, because we are God's children, not the devil's (because we know Him,—because we are of the truth,—because His Spirit is in us,—which are merely parallel enunciations of the same moral fact), therefore we sin not, therefore we practise righteousness, as God our Father is just and holy:

and thus sanctifying ourselves, thus doing righteousness, thus abiding in Him and in His love, as His children, even thus we may comfort ourselves in the blessed hope of God's children to which we are called, even thus we overcome the world.

15. It will be well to examine more in detail the order in which the exhortation proceeds in this second portion of the Epistle.

16. First after the enunciation of the theme in ii. 29, the Apostle takes up the *forward* side of the state of God's children, that hope which is full of promise (iii. 1, 2); then proceeds to the condition of this hope, purifying ourselves even as "He" is pure (iii. 3). This purifying consists in fleeing from sin, which is against God's command (iii. 4), and presupposes abiding in Him who has taken away our sins (iii. 5, 6): the Apostle thus grounding sanctification in its condition, justification.

17. Having laid down (iii. 7) the positive axiom, "*He that doeth righteousness is righteous even as 'He' is righteous*," he turns to the other and negative side (iii. 8 ff.), contrasting the children of God and the children of the devil. And this leads us to an explanation how the abiding in the love of God necessarily puts itself forth in the love of the brethren (iii. 11.—18). Hate is the sure sign of not being from God (iii. 10); love to the brethren a token of being from Him (iii. 18, 19): and being of the truth (ib.): and is a ground of confidence towards God (iii. 20, 21), and of the certainty of an answer to our prayers (iii. 22).

18. This confidence towards Him is summed up in one central and decisive pledge—the Spirit which He has given us (iii. 24): and thus the Apostle is led on to warn us against false spirits which are not of God (iv. 1 ff.), and to give us a certain test whereby we may know the true from the false. He sets the two in direct opposition (iv. 1—6), and designates the false spirit as that of antichrist: making its main characteristic the denial of Christ having come in the flesh. This he concludes with a formula parallel to that in the first part, iii. 10: "*Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.*"

19. After this (iv. 7 ff.) follows a fuller positive description of that which is born of God. Its very essence is love: for God is Love: Love to God grounded on His previous love to us (iv. 7—21) in sending His Son: love to one another, resting on the same motive, and moreover (v. 1—5) because our brethren, like ourselves, are born of Him. And seeing that our love to God and to one another is grounded on God having given us His Son, we come to this, that faith in the Son of God is the deepest ground and spring of our love in both its aspects: and is the true test of being born of God as distinguished from being of the world (iv. 1—6), the true condition of life (iv. 9: cf. v. 13, i. 3, 4), of

outer to the inner side of Christian life. Thus the Writer is ever working upon certain fundamental themes and axioms, to which he willingly returns again and again, sometimes unfolding and applying them, sometimes repeating and concentrating them: so that we have side by side the simplest and clearest, and the most condensed and difficult sayings: the reader who seeks merely for edification is attracted by the one, and the "scribe learned in the Scriptures" is satisfied. and his understanding surpassed and deepened by the other.

3. The logical connexion is not as in the Epistles of St. Paul, indicated by the whole superficial aspect of the writing, nor does it bear onward the thoughts till the conclusion is reached. The logic of St. John moves, as Düsterdieck has expressed it, rather in circles than straight onward. The same thought is repeated as seen from different sides: is transformed into cognate thoughts and thus put into new lights, is unfolded into assertion and negation, and the negation again closed up by the repeated assertion (ch. i. 6 f., 8f., ii. 9 f., &c.). Thus there arise numerous smaller groups of ideas, all, so to speak, revolving round some central point, all regarding some principal theme; all serving it, and circumscribed by the same bounding line. Thus the Writer is ever close to his main subject, and is able to be ever reiterating it without any unnatural forcing of his context: the train of thought is ever reverting back to its central point.

4. Now if we regard the actual process of the Epistle with reference to these characteristics, we find that there is one great main idea or theme, which binds together the whole and gives character to its contents and aim; viz. that fellowship with God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, in which our joy is complete; in other words, that right faith in the Son of God manifest in the flesh, in which we overcome the world, in which we have confidence in God, and eternal life.

5. This idea, which pervades the whole Epistle, is set forth in two great circles of thought, which have been already described as the two portions of the Epistle. These two, both revolving round the one great theme, are also, in their inner construction, closely related to each other. God is light:—then our fellowship with Him depends on our walking in the light: God is righteous:—then we are only manifested as children of God, abiding in His love and in Himself, if we do righteousness. But for both—our walking in light, and our doing righteousness, there is one common term,—Love: even as God is Love, as Christ walked in Love, out of Love became manifest in the flesh, out of Love gave Himself for us. On the other side,—as the darkness of the world, which can have no fellowship with God, who is Light, denies the Son of God and repudiates Love,—so the unrighteousness of the children of the world manifests itself in that hatred which slays brethren, because love

to brethren cannot be where the love of God in Christ is unknown and eternal Life untasted.

6. Such a style and character of the Epistle, not bound by strict dialectic rules, not hurrying onward to a logical conclusion, but loving to tarry, and to repeat, and to limit itself in smaller circles of thought, shews us the simple heart of a child, or rather the deep spirit of a man who, in the richest significance of the expression, has entered the kingdom of heaven as a little child, and, being blessed in it himself, yearns to introduce his brethren further and further into it, that they may rejoice with him. In his Epistle Christian truth, which is not dialectic only but essentially moral and living, is made to live and move and feel and act. When he speaks of knowledge and faith, it is of a moral existence and possession: it is of love, peace, joy, confidence, eternal life. Fellowship with God and Christ, and fellowship of Christians with one another in faith and love, each of these is personal, real; so to speak, incarnate and embodied.

7. And this is the reason why our Epistle appears on the one hand easy intelligible to the simplest reader, if only his heart has any experience of the truth of Christ's salvation,—and on the other hand unfathomable even to the deepest Christian thinker: but at the same time equally precious and edifying to both classes of readers. It is the most notable example of the foolishness of God putting to shame all the wisdom of the world.

8. But as the matter of our Epistle is rich and sublime, so is it fitted, by its mildness and consolatory character, to attract our hearts. Such is the power of that holy love, so humble and so gentle, which John had learned from Him in whom the Father's love was manifested. He addresses all his readers, young and old, as his little children: he calls them to him, and with him to the Lord: he exhorts them ever as his brothers, as his beloved, to that love which is from God. The Epistle itself is in fact nothing else than an act of this holy love. Hence the loving, attracting tone of the language; hence the friendly character and winning sound of the whole. For the Love which wrote the Epistle is but the echo, out of the heart of a man, and that man an Apostle, of that Love of God which is manifested to us in Christ, that it may lead us to the everlasting Fount of Love, of joy and of life.

9. I may conclude this description, so admirably worked out by Düsterdieck, with the very beautiful words of Ewald, which he also cites: speaking of the "unruffled and heavenly repose" which is the spirit of the Epistle, he says, "it appears to be the tone, not so much of a father talking with his beloved children, as of a glorified saint, speaking to mankind from a higher world. Never in any writing has the doctrine of heavenly Love, of a love working in stillness, a love ever unwearied,

never exhausted, so thoroughly proved and approved itself, as in this Epistle."

SECTION VII.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

1. The Apostle himself has given us an account of the object of his Epistle : *ταῦτα γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη*, ch. i. 4 : and again at the close, v. 13 : *ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἴδητε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.* In almost the same words does he sum up the main purpose of his Gospel, John xx. 31. He assumes readers who believe on the Son of God : he writes to them to certify them of the truth and reality of the things in which they believe, and to advance them in the carrying out of their practical consequences, in order that they may gain from them confidence, peace, joy, life eternal.

2. This, and no polemical aim, is to be assigned as the main object of the Epistle. As subservient to this main object, comes in the warning against those persons who, by denying that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh, imperilled all these blessed consequences, by seducing men from the faith on which they rested.

3. The fact of these false teachers having come forward in the church was most probably the occasion which suggested the writing of the Epistle. Such seems to be the reference, hinted at in the background by the repeated *ὅτι* in ch. ii. 12—14. The previous instruction, settlement, and achievements in the faith of the various classes of his readers, furnished him with a reason for writing to each of them : it being understood, that some circumstances had arisen, which made such writing desirable. And what those circumstances were, is not obscurely pointed at in the verses following, ii. 18—25 : cf. especially ver. 21.

CHAPTER VI.

2 & 3 JOHN.

SECTION I.

AUTHORSHIP.

1. THE question of the authorship of both Epistles is one which will require some discussion. On one point however there never has been the slightest doubt: viz., that both were written by one and the same person. They are, as it has been said, like twin sisters: their style and spirit is the same: their conclusions agree almost word for word. I shall therefore treat of them together in all matters which they have in common.

2. *Were the two Epistles written by the author of the former and larger Epistle?* This has been answered in the affirmative by some critics who do not believe St. John to have written the first Epistle: e. g. by Bretschneider and Paulus. Their arguments for the identity of the writer of the three will serve, for us who believe the apostolicity of the former, a different purpose from that which they intended. But the usual opinion of those who have any doubts on the Authorship has taken a different form. Ascribing the first Epistle to St. John, they have given the two smaller ones to another writer; either to the Presbyter John[a], or to some other Christian teacher of this name, otherwise unknown to us. Another exception is found to this in the modern critics of the Tübingen school, Baur and Schwegler, whose method of proceeding I have briefly noticed in the Prolegomena to the former Epistle (§ i. par. 29), and need not further characterize.

3. It will now be my object to enumerate the ancient authorities, and to ascertain on which side they preponderate: whether for, or against, the authorship by the Apostle John.

Irenæus, adv. Hær. i. 16. 3, p. 83, says: Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητὴς ἐπέτεινε τὴν καταδίκην αὐτῶν, μηδὲ χαίρειν αὐτοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν λέγεσθαι βουληθείς· ὁ γὰρ λέγων αὐτοῖς, φησί, χαίρειν, κοινωνεῖ κ.τ.λ. (2 John 10,11.)

And in iii. 16. 8, p. 207: "Et discipulus ejus Joannes in prædicta epistola fugere eos præcepit dicens Multi seductores," &c.

It is true that in the case of this latter citation Irenæus has fallen into the mistake of supposing it to be taken from the first Epistle: but this very circumstance shews him to have had no suspicion that the two were written by different persons.

4. Clement of Alexandria, in a passage already cited above (ch. v. § i.

[a] So Erasmus, Grotius, Dodwell, Harenberg, Beck.

par. 5), cites the first Epistle thus, Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ . . . thereby showing that he knew of more Epistles by that Apostle.

And again in the fragments of the Adumbrations, p. 1001 P., he says, "Secunda Joannis Epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta simplicissima est: scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem ecclesiæ sanctæ."

5. Dionysius of Alexandria, in a passage (Eus. H. E. vii. 25) quoted at length below in the Prolegg. to the Apocalypse (§ i. par. 48), noting that John never names himself in his writings, says, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένῃ Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ, καίτοι βραχείαις οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ πρόκειται, ἀλλὰ ἀνωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται. Whence it appears that Dionysius found no offence in the appellation ὁ πρεσβύτερος, but rather a trace of St. John's manner not to name himself. No argument can be raised on the expression φερομένῃ Ἰωάννου, that Dionysius doubted the genuineness of the two Epistles. Eusebius calls the first Epistle τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν. All we can say of the expression is, that it gives the general sense of tradition.

Alexander of Alexandria cites 2 John 10, 11 with ὡς παρήγγειλεν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης. (Socrates, H. E. i. 6.) And the subsequent Alexandrian writers shew no doubt on the subject.

Cyprian, de hær. baptiz., in Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. iii. p. 1099, in relating the opinions of the various bishops in the council at Carthage, has: "Aurelius a Chullabi dixit: Joannes Apostolus in epistola sua posuit dicens, Si quis ad vos venit," &c. 2 John 10.

He does not in his own writings cite either Epistle, nor does Tertullian. But the above testimony shews that they were received as apostolic and canonical in the North African church.

6. The Muratorian fragment on the canon speaks enigmatically, owing partly to some words in the sentence being corrupt: "Epistola sane Jude et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur et sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta." Routh, Rel. Sacr. i. p. 396.

Lücke, Huther, al., find here a testimony *for* the Epistles: Düsterdieck on the contrary understands the sentence (reading *ut* sapientia) as meaning that they were not written by John, just as the Wisdom was not written by Solomon.

Most probably the Peschito did not contain either Epistle. Cosmas Indicopleustes (Cent. vi.) says (lib. vii. p. 292, in Migne, Patr., vol. lxxxviii.) that in his time the Syrian church acknowledged but three catholic Epistles, 1 Peter, 1 John, and James. Still Ephrem Syrus quotes the second Epistle, as also 2 Peter (see Prolegg. to 2 Pet. § iv. 13) and Jude: possessing them probably, as he did not understand Greek, in another Syriac version.

7. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 25, reckons both Epistles among the antilego-

mena: saying, τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων . . . ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι, εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνῳ.

Still, Eusebius's own opinion may be gathered from his Demonstratio Evangelica, iii. 5, vol. iv. p. 120, where he says of St. John, ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ μνήμην τῆς οἰκείας προσηγορίας ποιεῖται, ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ ἀπόστολον οὐδὲ εὐαγγελιστήν. Whence it would appear that he received the two smaller Epistles as genuine.

8. Origen mentions them with a similar expression of doubt (Eus. H. E. vi. 25): καταλέλοιπε (Ἰωάννης) δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνυ ὀλίγων στίχων· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην· ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας· πλὴν οὐκ εἰσὶ στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν.

9. Theodore of Mopsuestia, if we are thus to interpret Leontius of Byzantium (see above, ch. iii. § i. 11), rejected these in common with the other catholic Epistles.

10. Theodoret makes no mention of them.

11. In a Homily on Matt. xxi. 23 ascribed to Chrysostom, but written probably by some Antiochene contemporary of his, we read τὴν δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην οἱ πατέρες ἀποκανονίζονται.

12. Jerome (Vir. Illustr. c. 9, vol. ii. p. 845) says, "Scripsit Joannes et unam epistolam, . . . quæ ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis viris probatur: reliquæ autem duæ, quarum principium . . . 'Senior,' . . . Joannis presbyteri asseruntur, cujus et hodie alterum sepulchrum apud Ephesios ostenditur."

13. In the middle ages there seems to have been no doubt on the authenticity of the Epistles, till Erasmus revived the idea of their being the work of John the Presbyter. This view, grounded on the fact that the Writer names himself πρεσβύτερος, has been often maintained since: e. g. by Grotius, Beck, Fritzsche, al.

14. If we take into strict account the import of this appellation, it will appear, as Lücke, Huther, and Düsterdieck have maintained, to make rather for than against the authorship by St. John. For in the first place, assuming, which is very doubtful, the existence of such a person as John the Presbyter, this name could only have been given him by those who wished to distinguish him from the Apostle, and would never have been assumed by himself as a personal one, seeing that he bore it in common with many others his co-presbyters.

15. Again, such an appellation is not without example as used of Apostles, and might bear two possible senses, either of which would here be preferable to the one just impugned. In the very fragment of Papias (Eus. H. E. iii. 39), from which the existence of the presbyter John is inferred, he several times uses the term πρεσβύτερος of Apostles and apostolic men as a class. He tells ὅσα παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἔμαθον:

he says that if he met with any one who had conversed with τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, he enquired about τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λόγους. Here it is certain that πρεσβύτερος must not be taken officially, but of priority in time and dignity: it bears that meaning from which its official sense was derived, not that official sense itself[1].

16. And this leads us to the other meaning, that of the old age of the writer[2]. St. Paul in Philem. 9, calls himself Παῦλος ὁ πρεσβύτης in this sense: and πρεσβύτερος is but another form of the same word, though a form carrying a different possible meaning.

17. It is impossible to decide for which of these reasons the Apostle might choose thus to designate himself, or whether any other existed of which we are not aware. But we may safely say that inasmuch as St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 1), writing to the πρεσβύτεροι, calls himself their συμπρεσβύτερος, there was no reason why St. John might not thus have designated himself. And we may hence lay down that the occurrence of such a word, as pointing out the Writer of these Epistles, is no reason against their having been written by that Apostle.

18. On the whole then we infer from the testimony of the ancient Fathers, and from the absence of sufficient reason for understanding the title πρεσβύτερος, of any other person than the Apostle himself, that these two smaller Epistles were written by St. John the Apostle and Evangelist.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS WRITTEN.

1. The third Epistle leaves no doubt on this question. It is addressed to one Γάϊος (Caius). Whether this Caius is identical with Gaius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29), with Gaius of Corinth (1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23), or with Gaius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4), it is impossible to say. The name was one of the commonest: and it is possible, as Lücke remarks, that the persons of St. John's period of apostolic work in Asia may have been altogether different from those of St. Paul's period. A Caius is mentioned in the Apostolic Constitutions, vii. 46, Migne, Patr. Gr., vol. i. p. 1052, as bishop of Pergamus: and Mill and Whiston believe this person to be addressed in our Epistle.

[1] Cognate to this sense is that taken by Lyra: "qui tunc regebant ecclesias senes vel seniores dicebantur ratione discretionis vel maturitatis in moribus: inter rectores vero ecclesiarum qui tunc erant in Asia, Joannes erat principalior:" by Bartholomæus Petrus, understanding that John designates himself as Bishop, and Primate of Asia: by Corn.-a-lapide, taking the word as equivalent to Senior, Seigneur, Signore: by Beza, Whitby, Mill, Bertholdt, Baumgarten-Crusius, Lücke, Huther, &c.

[2] This is taken by Piscator, Erasm.-Schmid, Hermann, G. C. Lange, Wolf, Rosenmüller, Benson, Carpzov, Augusti, al. Some of the above, and Aretius and Guericke, unite the two.

2. It is not so plain to whom the *second* Epistle was written. The address is ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς: τὰ τέκνα σου are mentioned in ver. 4: κυρία in the vocative occurs ver. 5: τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς are mentioned as sending greeting, ver. 13.

3. On these data the following doubts arise. Is it an individual lady who is addressed? And if so, is either of the two words a proper name ἐκλεκτή or κυρία, and which? Or is it a church, thus called figuratively? And if so, is it some particular body of Christians, or the Church universal?

4. These questions were variously answered even in ancient times. The Scholiast (ii.) says, ἢ πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν ἢ πρός τινα γυναῖκα διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἐντολῶν τὴν ἑαυτῆς οἰκίαν οἰκονομοῦσαν πνευματικῶς. We have also in Œcumenius and Theophylact, as a comment on the last verse of the Epistle, βούλονταί τινες διὰ τοῦτο βεβαιοῦν ὡς οὐ πρὸς γυναῖκα ἡ ἐπιστολὴ αὕτη, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν· περὶ οὗ οὐδὲν τῷ βουλομένῳ διενεχθείη. The *individual* hypothesis was held in its various forms by Lyra, Cappellus, Wetstein, Grotius, Middleton (taking Ἐκλεκτή for the proper name); Benson, Heumann, Bengel, G. C. Lange, C. F. Fritzsche, Carpzov, Jachmann, Paulus, De Wette, Lücke, al. (taking Κυρία as the proper name[3]); by Luther, Piscator, Beza, Aretius, Heidegger, Bart.-Petrus, Corn.-a-lap., Joachim Lange, Wolf, Baumg.-Crusius, Sander, al. (taking neither word as a proper name,—"to the elect woman, a lady"): Corn.-a-lap. giving a tradition that she was named Drusia or Drusiana: Carpzov, a conjecture that she was Martha the sister of Lazarus and Mary. Another conjecture has been, that she was Mary, the mother of our Lord[4].

5. On the other hand, the *ecclesiastical* hypothesis has been held by Jerome, Ep. 123 ad Ageruchiam, vol. i. p. 909, taking the words as meaning the whole Christian church: so also perhaps Clem.-Alex., as cited above, § i. par. 4. The Scholiast i. in Matthiæ says, ἐκλεκτὴν κυρίαν λέγει τὴν ἔν τινι τόπῳ ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου διδασκαλίαν ἀκριβῆ φυλάττουσαν. And so Cassiodorus, Calov., Hammond, Michaelis, Hofmann[5], Mayer, Huther, al. Some have carried conjecture so far as to designate the particular church; e. g. Serrarius, supposing the Caius of the third Epistle to have belonged to this church, and that it consequently was at Corinth: Whiston, arguing for Philadelphia: Whitby, for Jerusalem, as being κυρία, the mother of all churches: Augusti, for the same, as being κυρία, founded by our Lord Himself.

6. In now proceeding to examine these various opinions, we will first dispose of a grammatical point. It has been insisted by Huther and

[3] So too Athanasius apparently, γράφει κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς.
[4] Kraner, in the Stud. u. Krit. for 1833, part 2, pp. 452 ff.
[5] Schriftbeweis, i. 301.

others, that were Κυρία a proper name, St. John would have written not ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ, but Κυρίᾳ τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ, as Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ, 3 John 1. But this argument seems to me not to hold: and that principally on account of the peculiar nature of the name. Κυρία, like Κύριος, often in the LXX and N. T., is really an anarthrous appellation, abbreviated from ἡ κυρία, as that from ὁ κύριος. This being so, it follows, even when used as a proper name, the rules of anarthrous nouns in general. Thus we have 1 Cor. x. 21, ποτήριον κυρίου, τραπέζης κυρίου, whereas in 1 Cor. xi. 27. we have τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου, τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου: cf. also ib. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. iii. 18 bis, and the expression κύριος παντοκράτωρ, 2 Cor. vi. 18, whereas when ὁ θεός follows it is κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, Rev. iv. 8, xv. 3 al. So that no argument can be fairly founded on this. If κυρία was a proper name, it still retained in the mind of the Writer its power as an anarthrous substantive, and caused the adjective following to drop its distinctive article.

7. In weighing the probability of either hypothesis, the following considerations are of importance. It would seem, as I have remarked in my note in loc., as if the salutation in ver. 13 rather favoured the idea of a church being addressed, because we have no mention there of the elect sister herself, but only of her children. But then we must set against this the fact, that in the process of the Epistle itself, the κυρία herself does distinctly appear and is personally addressed. It would be, to say the least, strange, to address the whole church in the one case, and not to send greeting from the whole church in the other.

8. Again, would it have been likely that the salutation should have run ἀσπάζεταί σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου, if the κυρία had been a mere abstraction? Does not this personal address, as well as that in ver. 5, καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία, imply personal reality of existence?

9. Let us, again, compare the address of this Epistle with that of the third, confessedly by the same Writer. The one runs ὁ πρεσβύτερος (Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ) ὃν ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. The other ὁ πρεσβύτερος (ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς) οὓς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. Can any one persuade us that the well-known simplicity of St. John's character and style would allow him thus to write these two addresses, word for word the same, and not to have in the words enclosed in brackets a like reference to existing persons in both cases?

10. Besides, as Lücke has well observed, we are not justified in thus attributing to St. John a mystic and unaccountable mode of expression, not found in any other writer of the apostolic age, nor indeed even in the apocryphal writings which followed it.

11. St. Peter's expression, ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή, 1 Pet. v. 13, even if understood of a church, which I have questioned in my note in loc., would not justify a like interpretation of κυρία here:

though in the use of ἐκλεκτή the passages are closely connected. If a person be addressed here, it is highly probable that we must understand a person there also: if a church be conceded to be addressed there, we have still the strange and unaccountable κυρία to deal with here [6].

12. On all these grounds I believe that an individual and not a church is addressed. And if so, first, is *either* of the words ἐκλεκτή or κυρία a proper name? We may safely answer this in the affirmative, on account of the anarthrousness of κυρίᾳ and ἐκλεκτῇ in ver. 1, which I submit could only be occasioned by one or other of the words being a proper name.

13. Then if so, *which* of the two words is the proper name? Here again there can be little doubt, if we compare ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ with τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς. Both sisters were ἐκλεκταί: but both had not the same name. Hence it would appear, unless we are to understand τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς in ver. 13 to be a mere play on the name of the person addressed, that ἐκλεκτή is not the name, but an epithet. And if so, then Κυρία *is* the name, and ought perhaps to be substituted for the rendering "lady," in the notes. The name is elsewhere found: so in Gruter, inscriptt. p. 1127, No. xi., φένιππος καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ κυρία: and in other examples given by Lücke, p. 351, note 2.

14. This Kyria then appears to have been a Christian matron generally known and beloved among the brethren, having children, some of whom the Apostle had found (at a previous visit to her?) walking in the truth. She had a sister, also a Christian matron, whose children seem to have been with the Apostle when he wrote this Epistle.

15. In the third Epistle, mention is made of Demetrius with praise, and of Diotrephes with blame, as a turbulent person, and a withstander of the Apostle's authority. But it is quite in vain to enquire further into the facts connected with these names. We know nothing of them, and conjectures are idle.

16. Of the occasion and object of these Epistles, it is hardly needful to remark. Both are too plainly declared in the letters themselves, to require further elucidation.

SECTION III.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. It is impossible to lay down either of these with any degree of certainty. From the similarity in style of both Epistles, it is probable

[6] It appears certain that Clem.-Alex. must have confused the two passages in his memory, when he stated (see above, § i. par. 4) that this Epistle was written "ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine."

that the times of writing were not far apart. The journeys mentioned in 2 John 12 and 3 John 10, 14, may be one and the same. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 23, relates that the Apostles, *ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανοῦ τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς . . ἀπῄει παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πλησιόχωρα τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἁρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαινομένων.* It may have been in prospect of this journey that he threatens Diotrephes in 2 John 10. If so, both Epistles belong to a very late period of the Apostle's life: and are probably subsequent to the writing of the Apocalypse. See below in the Prolegomena to that book, § ii. par. 7.

2. With regard to the *place* of writing, probability points to Ephesus: especially if we adopt the view suggested by the passage of Eusebius just cited.

CHAPTER VII.

JUDE.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. THE author of this Epistle calls himself in ver. 1, *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δοῦλος*, and *ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου*. The former of these appellations is never thus barely used, in an address of an epistle, to designate an Apostle. It is true that in Phil. i. 1 we have *Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δοῦλοι χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*: but a designation common to two persons necessarily sinks to the rank of the inferior one. In every other case where an Apostle names himself *δοῦλος*, it is in conjunction with *ἀπόστολος*; see Rom. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1 [7]. That I see no exception to this in James i. 1, is plain to the readers of my Prolegomena to that Epistle.

2. That an Apostle *may* have thus designated himself, we of course cannot deny; but we deal with analogy and probability in discussing evidence of this kind.

3. The second designation, *ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου*, still further confirms the view that the Writer is not an Apostle. Whoever this *Ἰάκωβος* may be, it is extremely improbable, that an Apostle of the Lord should have put forward in the opening of an Epistle of solemn warning and exhortation,

[7] St. Paul in Philem. 1 calls himself merely *δέσμιος χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*; but obviously both the name and the circumstances are widely different.

not his exalted commission from Christ himself, but his mere earthly relationship to one who was better known than himself.

4. But this is met by some with the allegation, that we have elsewhere the Apostle Judas called the brother of James, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13. Even were this so (and it is uncertain whether we are making the right supplement, see note on Matt. x. 2 ff.), that designation must stand on its own independent ground, and being mere matter of conjecture, cannot claim to enter as evidence here. If the considerations arising from this Epistle itself tend to shew that the Jude who wrote it was not an Apostle, then either we must 1) otherwise fill up the ellipsis in that Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, or 2) leave that difficult appellation in entire uncertainty. From the nature of the case, this must rule that other, not that other, this.

5. The question for us is, How would the probability arise, that any one should call himself "brother of James?" and the reply to this will depend somewhat on the personal dignity of the James here mentioned. If this person be assumed to be the well-known bishop of the church at Jesusalem, then there will be no difficulty in the Writer of this Epistle thus designating himself.

6. And this has been the general supposition. Those who see in that James, the Apostle James, son of Alphæus, regard our Writer as the Apostle Jude, also the son of Alphæus: the "Judas not Iscariot" of John xiv. 22. Those, on the other hand, who see in that James, not one of the Twelve, but the actual (maternal) brother of our Lord, the son of Joseph and Mary, regard our Writer as the Judas of Matt. xiii. 55, another brother of our Lord, and a younger son of Joseph and Mary.

7. The reader will at once gather from what has been said in the Prolegomena to the Epistle of James, that this latter is the view here taken. The other seems to me to be beset with insuperable difficulties: involving us as it does in the wholly unjustifiable hypothesis, that those who are called in Scripture the brethren of our Lord were not his brethren, but his cousins, sons of Alphæus (Clopas).

8. It may be asked, if this Writer were indeed the brother of James, and thus the brother of the Lord Himself, should we not rather expect that he would give himself this high character, stating his relationship to Jesus, rather than that to James? But surely such a question would shew great ignorance of the true spirit of the apostolic writers. It would be the last thing I should expect, to find one of the brethren of the Lord asserting this relationship as a ground of reception for an Epistle. Almost all agree that the Writer of the Epistle of James was the person known as the brother of the Lord. Yet there we have no such designation. It would have been in fact altogether inconsistent with the true spirit of Christ (see Luke xi. 27, 28), and in harmony

with those later and superstitious feelings with which the next and following ages regarded His earthly relatives. Had such a designation as *ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου* been found in the address of an Epistle, it would have formed a strong à priori objection to its authenticity.

9. I have before remarked in the Prolegomena to 2 Peter that such expressions as that in our ver. 17, *μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, cannot be fairly alleged as evidence of the apostolicity or non-apostolicity of a writer[8].

10. Of this Judas, one of the Lord's brethren, we know nothing from early ecclesiastical tradition. The only trace of him is found in an interesting story which Eusebius gives from Hegesippus (H. E. iii. 20) of Domitian, in jealousy of the survivors of the family of David, sending for and examining two grandsons of this Judas (*ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ κυρίου υἱωνοὶ Ἰούδα, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*), and dismissing them, on finding that they were poor working men, and hearing that the kingdom of Christ which they expected was not to be in this present world.

11. In this defect of our knowledge of the personal history of the Writer, we can only say that he, like his greater brother St. James, did not believe on our Lord during His ministry, but became a convert after the resurrection, and, as in Acts i. 14, consorted usually with the Apostles and followers of Jesus. All else respecting him is left to be gathered from the spirit and style of this Epistle: and will be found treated in the section devoted to that part of our subject.

SECTION II.

AUTHENTICITY.

1. Eusebius reckons our Epistle, as indeed all the Catholic Epistles except 1 John and 1 Peter, among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. *Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα* . . . H. E. iii. 25.

And again, H. E. ii. 23, *οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν· ὅμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοίπων ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιουμένας ἐκκλησίαις.*

2. Tertullian however cites it as authentic, and attributes it to the apostle Jude: "Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet." . . . De cultu fæmin. i. 3, vol. i. 1308.

3. Clement of Alexandria gives citations from it as from Scripture:

[8] See above, Prolegg. to 2 Pet. § iv. 22: also the notes, in loc., and on 2 Pet. iii. 2.

ἐπὶ τούτων οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἱρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκέναι . . . (citing our vv. 8, 17) Strom. iii. 2 (11), p. 515 Potter.

And again: εἰδέναι γὰρ ὑμᾶς, φησὶν ὁ Ἰούδας, βούλομαι, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἅπαξ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸν λαὸν σώσας, κ.τ.λ. (ver. 5, 6) Pæd. iii. 8 (44), p. 280 P.

And Eusebius says of Clement, H. E. vi. 14, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγομένας παρελθών, τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τήν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν.

4. The Muratorian fragment speaks of the Epistle as genuine and canonical: "Epistola sane Judæ, et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur." Routh, Rel. Sacr. i. p. 396.

5. Origen, Comm. on Matt. xiii. 55, tom. x. 17, vol. iii. p. 463, says: Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν ὀλιγόστιχον μέν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐῤῥωμένων λόγων, ὅστις ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ εἴρηκεν, Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.

And again, on Matt. xxii. 23, tom. xvii. 30, p. 814: εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα πρόσοιτό τις ἐπιστολήν, ὁράτω τί ἕπεται τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τὸ ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας κ.τ.λ.

And again, on Matt. xviii. 10, tom. xiii. 27, p. 607: καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰούδα ἐπιστολῇ, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις κ.τ.λ.

See also pp. 692 f., where he argues on Jude, ver. 6: ana several other places in the Latin remains of his works, cited in Davidson, Introd. vol. iii. p. 498. In two of these latter he calls the Writer of the Epistle "Judas apostolus."

6. Jerome, Catalog. script. eccles. 4, vol. ii. p. 834 f., says: "Judas frater Jacobi parvam quidem quæ de septem catholicis est epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur: tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, ut inter sacras Scripturas computetur."

7. In the older copies of the Peschito the Epistle is wanting: but Ephrem Syrus recognized its authenticity.

8. In later times, the Epistle has been generally received as authentic. The circumstance that the Writer does not call himself au Apostle, has ensured for it a more favourable reception than some other books of the N. T., with those who are fond of questioning the genuineness of the Epistles. Even De Wette thinks there is no reason why we should suspect it to be spurious. He is willing to pass over the phænomena in it which have appeared stumbling-blocks to others: its citation of the book of Enoch, its probable acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans, its difficult but apparently Greek style.

9. Schwegler, on the other hand, though acknowledging its very simple and undeveloped character in point of doctrine, yet draws from vv. 17, 18 a proof that it belongs to the post-apostolic times. He thinks

that the forger prefixed the name of Jude, brother of James, in order to give his writing the weight of connexion, in point of doctrine and spirit, with this latter great name.

10. But as Huther well remarks, had this been so ;—in other words, for so the hypothesis seems to imply, had the Epistle been written in the interests of Judaizing Christianity against Pauline, we should surely have found more indications of this in it : and as to the superscription we may reply, that a forger would hardly have attributed his composition to a man otherwise so entirely unknown as Jude was

11. The fact that doubts were entertained respecting the authenticity of the Epistle in early times, and that we do not find many traces of its use in the primitive Fathers, may easily be accounted for from its shortness, from its special character, from its presumed reference to apocryphal sources from its apparently not being written by an Apostle.

SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT WRITTEN.

1. The readers are addressed merely as Christians : perhaps, as De Wette suggests, because the matters mentioned in the Epistle are little to their credit. The evil persons stigmatized in it do not seem to have been heretical teachers, as commonly supposed[9], but rather *libertines*, practical unbelievers (vv. 4, 8), scoffers (ver. 18), whose pride and wantonness (vv. 8, 10, 12 f.), whose murmuring, and refractory and party spirit (vv. 11, 16, 19), threatened to bring about the destruction of the church. In 2 Peter, as I have already observed above, ch. iv. § iii. 4, these persons are developed into false teachers: one of the circumstances from which I have inferred the posteriority of that Epistle.

2. It is mainly to warn his readers against these, that St. Jude writes the Epistle: "to exhort them that they should contend earnestly for the faith once," and once for all, "delivered to the saints."

3. When we come to ask whether the readers formed a circumscribed circle of Christians, and if so, where, we find ourselves left to mere speculation for an answer. There does certainly appear to be a speciality about the circumstances of those addressed, but it is difficult exactly to define it. They seem to have been Jews, from the fact of the altogether Judaic spirit of the Epistle: from its appeal to Jewish traditions, and perhaps to Jewish books. They evidently dwelt among

[9] Even by Dorner, Lehre v. der Person Christi i. 104; and Huther, Einleit. § 2.

an abundant and a wicked population, probably of a commercial character. Hence some have thought of Corinth as their abode: some of Egypt, to which land it is said the physical phænomena are suitable (vv. 12 ff.): some of a commercial city in Syria, seeing that Palestine, where St. Jude dwelt, must at the time of writing the Epistle have been in a state of commotion, to which there is no allusion in it.

SECTION IV.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. On the former of these it is impossible to speak with any degree of certainty. Our principal indications are, the state of the church which may be inferred from the Epistle, the apparent use made in it of the apocryphal book of Enoch, and the reference made to the previous teaching of the Apostles.

2. The state of the church indicated is one not far advanced in historical development. Those errors which afterwards expanded into heresies were as yet in their first stage. The evil men were as yet mixed with the church, rocks of danger in their feasts of love. They had not yet been marked off and stigmatized: for this very purpose the Epistle is written, that they might no longer be latent in the bosom of the church. All this points to an early date.

3. The datum furnished by the apparent allusion to the apocryphal book of Enoch, guides us to no certain result. It is even yet matter of uncertainty, when that book was written[1]. So that this consideration brings us no nearer to our desired result.

4. The fact that St. Jude (ver. 17) refers his readers to previous teaching by the Apostles, is hardly of more value for our purpose. On the one hand the imperfect tense ἔλεγον (ver. 18) seems to speak of the Apostles as if their work was done and they were passed away,—"they used to tell you:" on the other hand, it might fairly be used of men who were dispersed and carrying on their work in other parts. Then again, the language seems necessarily to imply that the readers had for themselves heard the Apostles. No safe inference can be drawn from the words that they were written *after* the apostolic age: nay, the natural inference is rather the other way. They appear to point to a time when the agency of the Apostles themselves had passed away from the readers, but the impress of their warning words had not faded from their memories.

5. Another note of time has been imagined to lie in the circumstance,

[1] See below, § v. par. 8.

that the destruction of Jerusalem is not mentioned in the Epistle. It has been replied, that there was no reason why any allusion should have been made to that event, as the immediate subject before the Writer did not lead him to it. Still I cannot help feeling that the reply is not wholly satisfactory. Considering that St. Jude was writing to Jews, and citing signal instances of divine vengeance, though he may not have been led to mention the judgment of the Flood,—I can hardly conceive that he would have omitted that which uprooted the Jewish people and polity.

6. So that on the whole, as De Wette, himself often sceptical on the question of the genuineness and antiquity of the N. T. writings, confesses, there is no reason why we should place our Epistle later than the limit of the apostolic age. That it was anterior to the second Epistle of Peter, I have already endeavoured to prove (see above, ch. iv. § iii. 3 ff.).

7. Of the place where this Epistle was written, absolutely nothing is known. From its tone and references, we should conjecture that the Writer lived in Palestine: but even thus much must be uncertain.

SECTION V.

ON THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS APPARENTLY REFERRED TO IN THIS EPISTLE.

1. In ver. 14 we have a reference to a prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam. This has by many been supposed to indicate an acquaintance on the part of the Writer with the existing apocryphal "book of Enoch." It becomes desirable therefore that we should briefly put the student in possession of the history and nature of that document. In so doing I shall take my matter partly from Mr. Westcott's article in Dr. Smith's Biblical Dictionary, partly from a notice by Prof. Volkmar (see below): to which sources the reader is referred for further details.

2. The book appears to have been known to the early fathers, Justin, Irenæus, Clem. Alex., and Origen, and we have numerous references to it in the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Tertullian (de Cult. Fæm. i. 3, vol. i. p. 1308; a passage well worth the reader's perusal) quotes it as a book not admitted into the Jewish canon, but profitable, and indeed to be received by Christians on the ground that "nihil omnino rejiciendum est quod pertineat ad nos" and that "legimus, omnem scripturam ædificationi habilem divinitus inspirari." Augustine was acquainted with it, as also was an anonymous writer whose work is printed among those of Jerome: but during the middle ages it was known to the Western Church only through the (presumed) quotations in our

Epistle. The Eastern Church possessed considerable fragments of it, incorporated into the Chronographia of Georgius Syncellus (cir. 792).

3. About the close of the last century, the traveller Bruce brought from Abyssinia the Æthiopic translation of the entire book. An English version of this translation was published by Archbishop Lawrence in 1821; and the Æthiopic itself in 1838. Since then a more complete edition has been published in Germany (Das Buch Henoch, von Dr. A. Dilmann, Leipzig, 1853), which is now the standard one, and has given rise to the Essays, among others, of Ewald and Hilgenfeld[a].

4. The Æthiopic version appears to have been made from the Greek; as, though wanting a considerable passage quoted by Syncellus, it yet agrees in the main with the citations found in the early Fathers. But it is probable that the Greek itself is but a version of a Hebrew original. The names of the angels and of the winds betray an Aramaic origin: and a Hebrew book of Enoch was known and used by the Jews as late as the thirteenth century.

5. The book consists of revelations purporting to have been given to Enoch and to Noah: and its object is, to vindicate the ways of Divine Providence: to set forth the terrible retribution reserved for sinners, whether angelic or human: and to "repeat in every form the great principle that the world, natural, moral and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God."

6. "In doctrine," says Mr. Westcott in the article above mentioned, "the book of Enoch exhibits a great advance of thought within the limits of revelation in each of the great divisions of knowledge. The teaching on nature is a curious attempt to reduce the scattered images of the O. T. to a physical system. The view of society and man, of the temporary triumph and final discomfiture of the oppressors of God's people, carries out into elaborate detail the pregnant images of Daniel. The figure of the Messiah is invested with majestic dignity, as 'the Son of God,' 'whose name was named before the sun was made,' and who existed 'aforetime in the presence of God.' And at the same time his human attributes as the 'son of man,' 'the son of woman,' 'the elect one,' 'the righteous one,' 'the anointed,' are brought into conspicuous notice. The mysteries of the spiritual world, the connexion of angels and men, the classes and ministries of the hosts of heaven, the power of Satan, and the legions of darkness, the doctrines of resurrection, retribution, and eternal punishment, are dwelt upon with growing earnestness as the horizon of speculation was extended by intercourse with Greece. But the message of the book is emphatically one of faith and truth: and while the Writer combines and repeats the thoughts of Scripture,

[a] See however its merits discussed in an article referred to below, par. 8.

he adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His errors spring from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from a proud exultation in present success. For the great characteristic by which the book is distinguished from the latter apocalypse of Esdras is the tone of triumphant expectation by which it is pervaded."

7. The date of the book has been matter of great uncertainty. Abp. Lawrence, and Hofmann, suppose it to have been compiled in the reign of Herod the Great: and with this view Gfröær, Wieseler, and Gieseler agree. Lücke (Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh. pp. 89 ff.) goes very fully into the question, and determines that it consists of an earlier and a later portion: the former written early in the Maccabæan period, the latter in the time of Herod the Great. It is from the former of these that the quotation in our Epistle is taken.

8. But the whole question of the date has been recently discussed by Prof. Volkmar, of Zurich, in the "Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft" for 1860. He undertakes to prove the book a production of the time of the sedition of Barchochebas (A.D. cir. 132), and to have been written by one of the followers of Rabbi Akiba, the great upholder of that impostor. And certainly, as far as I can see, his proof seems not easy to overthrow. In that case, as he remarks (p. 991), the book of Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin. But this one point in the progress of his argument seems to me debateable. He assumes that the words cited in our Epistle as a prophecy of Enoch are of necessity taken from the apocryphal book, and regards it as an inevitable sequence, that if the book of Enoch is proved to be of the first half of the second century, the Epistle of Jude must be even later. In order however for this to be accepted, we need one link supplied, which, it seems to me, Prof. Volkmar has not given us. We want it shewn, that the passage cited is so interwoven into the apocryphal book as necessarily to form a part of it, and that it may not itself have been taken from primitive tradition, or even from the report of that tradition contained in our Epistle.

9. The account of the matter hence deduced would be, that the book, in its original groundwork, is of purely Jewish origin, but that it has received Christian interpolations and additions. "It may be regarded," remarks Mr. Westcott, "as describing an important phase of Jewish opinion shortly before the coming of Christ." If we accept the later date, this must of course be modified accordingly.

There never has been in the church the slightest doubt of the apocryphal character of the book of Enoch. The sole maintainer of its authority seems to have been Tertullian[8]: it is plainly described as apocryphal

[8] l. c. above; cf. also de Idololatr. c. 4, vol. i. p. 665, where, after quoting the second commandment, he adds, "Antecesserat prædicens Enoch . . . :" and id. c. 15, p. 684,

by Origen[4], Augustine[5], and Jerome[6], and is enumerated among the apocryphal books in the Apostolical Constitutions (vi. 16, Migne Patr. Gr. vol. i. p. 953)[7].

10. The other passage in our Epistle which has been supposed to come from an apocryphal source, viz. the reference to the dispute between the archangel Michael and the devil concerning the body of Moses (ver. 9), has been discussed in the notes ad loc., and held more likely to have been a fragment of primitive tradition.

11. But it yet remains, that something should be said concerning the fall of the angels spoken of vv. 6, 7. In the notes on those verses, I have mentioned the probability, in my view, that the narrative in Gen. vi. 2 is alluded to. This impression has been since then much strengthened by a very able polemical tract by Dr. Kurtz, the author of the "Geschichte des alten Bundes," in which he has maintained against Hengstenberg the view taken by himself in that work. It seems to me that Dr. Kurtz has gone far to decide the interpretation as against any reference of Gen. vi. 2 to the Sethites, or of our vv. 6, 7 to the fall of the devil and his angels. The exegesis of Hengstenberg and those who think with him depends on the spiritual acceptation, in this case, of the word *ἐκπορνεύσασαι*, which Kurtz completely disproves. The facts of the history of the catastrophe of the cities of the plain render it quite out of the question: and LXX usage, which Hengstenberg cites as decisive on his side, is really against him[8]. And this point being disposed of,

"Hæc igitur ab initio prævidens spiritus sanctus . . . . præcecinit per antiquissimum prophetam Enoch." In Apolog. c. 22 (vol. i. p. 405; but the reference may be to the citation by St. Jude, not to the original from which it was taken) he speaks even more definitely, apparently numbering the book among the litteræ sanctæ.

[4] Cont. Cels. v. 54; vol. i. p. 619: *ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἐνὼχ γεγραμμένων, ἅτινα οὐδ᾽ αὐτὰ φαίνεται ἀναγνοὺς, οὐδὲ γνωρίσας ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνὼχ βιβλία.* Cf. also Hom. xxviii. in Numeros, § 2, vol. ii. p. 384: and Spencer's note on l. c.

[5] De Civ. Dei, xv. 23. 4, vol. vii. p. 470: "Omittamus igitur earum scripturarum fabulas, quæ apocryphæ nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus, a quibus usque ad nos auctoritas veterum Scripturarum certissima et notissima successione pervenit. . . . . Scripsisse quidem nonnulla divina Enoch illum septimum ab Adam negare non possumus, cum hoc in epistola canonica Judas apostolus dicat. Sed non frustra non sunt in eo canone Scripturarum qui servabatur in templo Hebræi populi succedentium diligentia sacerdotum, nisi quia ob antiquitatem suspectæ fidei judicata sunt, nec utrum hæc essent quæ ille scripsisset, poterat inveniri, non talibus proferentibus, qui ea per seriem successionis reperientur rite servasse."

[6] In the catalogue of ecclesiastical writers: see the passage cited above, § ii. par. 6.

[7] For more, and very interesting information on the book of Enoch, see the article of Volkmar's above alluded to.

[8] He alleges that Gen. xxxviii. 24 is the only place where *ἐκπορνεύειν* is used of carnal fornication: whereas there are at least six other places, viz. Lev. xxi. 9; xix. 29 (bis); Num. xxv. 1; Deut. xxii. 21; Ezek. xvi. 33. See these discussed, and the meaning established, in Kurtz, Die Söhne Gottes, u. s. w. p. 47.

the whole fabric falls with it: Hengstenberg himself confessing that τούτοις, in ver. 7, must refer to ἄγγελοι above.

12. That the particulars related in 2 Pet. and our Epistle of the fallen angels are found also in the book of Enoch[a], is again no proof that the Writers of these Epistles took them from that book. Three other solutions are possible: 1, that the apocryphal Writer took them from our Epistles: 2, that their source in each case was ancient tradition: 3, that the book of Enoch itself consists of separate portions written at different times.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVELATION.

SECTION I.

AUTHORSHIP, AND CANONICITY.

1. THE Author of this book calls himself in more places than one by the name John, ch. i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8. The general view has been, that this name represents St. John the son of Zebedee, the Writer of the Gospel and the three Epistles, the disciple whom Jesus loved.

2. This view rests on external, and on internal evidence. I shall first specify both these, and then pass on to other views respecting the authorship. And in so doing, I shall at present cite merely those testimonies which bear more or less directly on the *authorship*. The most ancient are the following:

3. Justin Martyr, Dial. 81, p. 179 (written between A.D. 139 and 161): *καὶ . . . παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνήρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἷς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένῃ αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσειν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσε, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ συνελόντι φάναι αἰωνίαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα πάντων ἀνάστασιν γενήσεσθαι καὶ κρίσιν.*

We may mention by the way, that this testimony of Justin is doubly important, as referred to by Eusebius, himself no believer in the apostolic authorship: H. E. iv. 18: *μέμνηται δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψεως σαφῶς τοῦ ἀποστόλου αὐτὴν εἶναι λέγων.*

The authenticity and value of the passage of Justin has been discussed at considerable length and with much candour by Lücke, Einl.

[a] Cf. Kurtz, ibid. pp. 51, 52.

pp. 548—56. He, himself a disbeliever in St. John's authorship, confesses that it is a genuine and decided testimony in its favour.

4. Melito, bishop of Sardis (+ cir. 171), is said by Euseb. H. E. iv. 26, to have written treatises (or a treatise, but the plural is more likely: and so Jer. Catal. 24, vol. ii. p. 867: "de diabolo librum unum, de Apocalypsi Joannis librum unum") on the devil, and on the Apocalypse of John: *καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου, καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου.* It is fairly reasoned that Eusebius would hardly have failed to notice, supposing him to have seen Melito's work, any view of his which doubted the apostolic origin: and that this may therefore be legitimately taken as an indirect testimony in its favour. See Lücke, p. 564; Stuart, p. 258; Davidson, Introd. iii. 540.

5. Of a similar indirect nature are the two next testimonies. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (+ cir. 180), whose Libri ad Autolycum are still extant, is said by Euseb. iv. 24 to have written a book *πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν Ἑρμογένους τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχον, ἐν ᾧ ἐκ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου κέχρηται μαρτυρίαις.*

6. And similarly Eusebius, H. E. v. 18, says of Apollonius (of Ephesus? so in the treatise Prædestinatus, cent. v.: see Lücke, p. 567), who flourished in Asia Minor at the end of cent. ii., and wrote *against* the Montanists, thereby making his testimony more important: *κέχρηται δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψεως· καὶ νεκρὸν δὲ δυνάμει θείᾳ πρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐγηγέρθαι ἱστορεῖ.* From this latter sentence there can be no doubt that Apollonius regarded the Apocalypse as the work of John the Apostle.

7. We now come to the principal second century witness, Irenæus (+ cir. 180). Respecting the value of his testimony, it may suffice to remind the student that he had been a hearer of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John. And this testimony occurs up and down his writings in great abundance, and in the most decisive terms. "Joannes domini discipulus" is stated to have written the Apocalypse in Hær. iv. 20. 11; 30. 4; v. 26. 1; 35. 2, pp. 256, 268, 323, 336: and "Joannes" in iv. 21. 3; v. 36. 3, pp. 258, 337. And this John can be no other than the Apostle: for he says, iii. 1. 1, p. 174, *Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου* (in the Latin, as above) *ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσών, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων.* But the most remarkable testimony, and one which will come before us again and again during the course of these Prolegomena, is in v. 30. 1—3, pp. 328 ff. There, having given certain reasons for the number of Antichrist's name being 666, he proceeds, *τούτων δὲ οὕτως ἐχόντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τούτου κειμένου, καὶ μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἑωρακότων.* . . . Then, after some remarks, and stating two names current as suiting the number, he concludes, *ἡμεῖς*

οὖν οὐκ ἀποκινδυνεύομεν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἀντιχριστοῦ, ἀποφαινόμενοι βεβαιωτικῶς· εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἀναφανδὸν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ δι' ἐκείνου ἂν ἐῤῥέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακότος. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.

This is beyond question the most important evidence which has yet come before us. And we may observe that it is in no way affected by any opinion which we may have formed respecting Irenæus's exegetical merits, nor by any of his peculiar opinions. He here merely asserts what, if he were a man of ordinary power of collecting and retaining facts, he must very well have known for certain.

8. Keeping at present to the direct witnesses for the authorship by St. John, we next come to Tertullian (+ cir. 220). His testimonies are many and decisive.

Adv. Marcion. iii. 14, vol. ii. p. 340: "Nam et apostolus Johannes in apocalypsi ensem describit ex ore Domini prodeuntem. . . ."

Ib. 24, p. 356: "Hanc (cœlestem civitatem) et Ezekiel novit, et apostolus Joannes vidit."

De Pudicitia 19, p. 1017: "Sed quoniam usque de Paulo, quando etiam Joannes nescio quid diversæ parti supplaudere videatur, quasi in apocalypsi manifeste fornicationi posuerit pœnitentiæ auxilium, ubi ad angelum Thyatirenorum," &c.

See also de Resurr. 27, p. 834; de Anima, 8, p. 658; adv. Judæos, 9, p. 620; de Cor. Militis, 13, p. 96; adv. Gnosticos, 12, p. 147.

9. The fragment on the Canon called by the name of Muratori, and written cir. 200, says, "et Joannes enim in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit . . . ," where the context shews that the Apostle John must be intended.

10. Hippolytus, bishop of Ostia (Portus Romanus), cir. 240, in his writings very frequently quotes the Apocalypse, and almost always with Ἰωάννης λέγει. Whom he meant by Ἰωάννης is evident from one passage, De antichristo, c. 36, Migne, Patr. Gr., vol. x. p. 756: λέγε μοι, μακάριε Ἰωάννη, ἀπόστολε καὶ μαθητὰ τοῦ κυρίου, τί εἶδες καὶ ἤκουσας περὶ Βαβυλῶνος. And then he proceeds to quote ch. xvii. 1—18. Multitudes of other citations will be found by consulting the index to Lagarde's edition[1]. And one of his principal works, as specified in the catalogue found inscribed on his statue, was ἀπολογία (or τά, for the word has become obliterated, only A being now legible) ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως: mentioned also by Jerome, Catal. 61, vol. ii. p. 901.

11. Clement of Alexandria (cir. 200), in his Strom. vi. 13 (106), p.

[1] See also his lately-discovered Refutatio omnium hæresium, lib. vii. § 36, p. 408, ed. Duncker.

793 P., says of the faithful presbyter, οὗτος πρεσβύτερος . . . ἐν τοῖς εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσαρσι καθεδεῖται θρόνοις, ὥς φησιν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννης. And elsewhere he fixes this name as meaning the Apostle, by saying in his Quis dives salv. § 42, p. 959: ἄκουσον μῦθον, οὐ μῦθον ἀλλ' ὄντα λόγον, περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου παραδεδομένον . . . ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἔφεσον. . . .: and then he proceeds to tell the well-known story of St. John and the young robber.

12. Origen, the scholar of Clement (+ cir. 233), who so diligently enquired into and reported any doubts or disputes about the canonicity and genuineness of the books of the N. T., appears not to have known of any which regarded the Apocalypse. In a passage of his Commentary on St. Matt. preserved by Euseb. H. E. vi. 25, he says, τί δεῖ περὶ τοῦ ἀναπεσόντος λέγειν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Ἰωάννου, ὃς εὐαγγέλιον ἓν καταλέλοιπεν, ὁμολογῶν δύνασθαι τοσαῦτα ποιήσειν ἃ οὐδὲ ὁ κόσμος χωρῆσαι ἐδύνατο; ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν, κελευσθεὶς σιωπῆσαι καὶ μὴ γράψαι τὰς τῶν ἑπτὰ βροντῶν φωνάς.

We have also this remarkable testimony in his Commentary on Matt. tom. xvi. 6, vol. v. p. 719 f.: καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐβαπτίσθησαν οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου υἱοί, ἐπείπερ Ἡρώδης μὲν ἀπέκτεινεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρᾳ, ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεύς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον. διδάσκει δὲ τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννης, μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκασε, φάσκων ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει ταῦτα, Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης . . . τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev. i. 9), καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. καὶ ἔοικε τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρηκέναι.

And Origen again repeatedly cites the Apocalypse without the least indication of doubt as to its author: as may be seen by consulting any of the indices to the editions. His procedure in this case forms a striking contrast to that in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews: see Prolegg. to this vol. ch. i. § i. 16—23.

13. Still keeping to those Fathers who give definite testimony as to the *authorship*, we come to Victorinus, bishop of Pettau in Pannonia, who suffered martyrdom under Diocletian in 303. His is the earliest extant commentary on the Apocalypse. On ch. x. 4, he says (see Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. v. p. 333), "Sed quia dicit se scripturum fuisse (Joannes) quanta locuta fuissent tonitrua, id est, quæcunque in veteri testamento erant obscura prædicata, vetatur ea scribere sed relinquere ea signata, quia est Apostolus. . . . ."

And afterwards, on "oportet autem te iterum prophetare," "Hoc est, propterea quod quando hæc Joannes vidit, erat in insula Pathmos, in metallo damnatus a Domitiano Cæsare. Ibi ergo vidit Apocalypsin: et cum jam senior putaret se per passionem accepturum receptionem, interfecto Domitiano omnia judicia ejus soluta sunt, et Joannes de metallo

dimissus, sic postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Deo Apocalypsin."

14. Ephrem Syrus (+ cir. 378), the greatest Father in the Syrian church, repeatedly in his numerous writings cites the Apocalypse as canonical, and ascribes it to John: see the reff. in Stuart's Introduction, p. 271. In the Greek translation of his works, we read in the second Homily on the Second Advent of the Lord, *καθὼς ἀκούομεν τοῦ ἀποστόλου λέγοντος*, and then he quotes Rev. xxi. 4, 5: vol. ii. p. 248, ed. Assem. See Lücke, Einl. p. 598, note.

Now these citations are the more remarkable, because the old Syriac or Peschito version does not contain the Apocalypse: as neither indeed apparently did the later or Philoxenian version originally, nor its re-publication by Thomas of Harkel (see Lücke, p. 598). It may fairly be asked then, How came Ephrem by his Syriac version of the Apocalypse (for he seems not to have been acquainted with Greek)? And, How came the Peschito to want the Apocalypse, if it was held to be written by the Apostle?

15. It would exceed the limits of these Prolegomena to enter into the answers to these questions, which have been variously given: by Hug and Thiersch, that the Peschito originally contained the book, and that it only became excluded in the fourth century through the influence of the schools of Antioch and Nisibis: by Walton and Wichelhaus, that the Peschito was made in the first century, when as yet the Apocalypse had not won its way among the canonical books: by Hengstenberg, that the Peschito was not made till the end of the third century, after the objections against the apostolicity of the book had been raised by Dionysius of Alexandria[2].

16. These answers are all discussed by Lücke, Einl. pp. 597—605, and severally rejected. His own solution is by no means satisfactory as to the former of the two questions,—how Ephrem came by his Syriac version. The latter he answers by postponing the date of the reception of the Apocalypse into the canon till after the publication of the Peschito, i. e. as now generally acknowledged, the end of the second century.

17. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus at the end of the fourth century, cites the Apocalypse as written by the Apostle. In combating the Alogi, who rejected the gospel of John and the Apocalypse, he speaks much and warmly of that book, and says among other things (Hær. li. 35, p. 457), *οἵ τε ἅγιοι προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ χαρίσματος τοῦ ἁγίου μεταδέδωκε*: and ib. 32, p. 455,

[2] See below, parr. 47 ff.

having cited 1 Cor. xv. 52, he proceeds, *συνᾴδοντος τοίνυν τοῦ ἀποστόλου τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀποστόλῳ Ἰωάννῃ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει, ποία τις ὑπολείπεται ἀντιλογία;*

18. Basil the Great (+ 378), adv. Eunomium ii. 14, vol. i. p. 249, says, *τὰ παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος διὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου λαληθέντα ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ.*, and afterwards, *ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐν ἑτέρῳ λόγῳ, τοῦ τοιούτου ἦν τὸ σημαινόμενον ἔδειξεν, εἰπών, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, Rev. i. 8.

19. Hilary of Poictiers (+ 368), in his Prologue to the Psalms, says (c. 6, vol. i. p. 5), "ita beati Johannis Apocalypsi docemur: et angelo Philadelphiæ Ecclesiæ scribe." So also in his Enarratio in Ps. i. 12, p. 26, "sanctus Joannes in Apocalypsi testatur, dicens, Rev. xxii. 2." Stuart cites from p. 891 of the Paris edn. of 1693,—"et ex familiaritate Domini revelatione cœlestium mysteriorum dignus Johannes [3]."

20. Athanasius (+ 373) in his Orat. i. contra Arianos, § i. 11, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 327, cites John i. 1, and then says, *καὶ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει τάδε λέγει, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.*

21. Gregory of Nyssa, brother of Basil the Great (+ 395), in his discourse, "In suam ordinationem," vol. iii. p. 546, Migne, says, *ἤκουσα τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν ἀποκρύφοις πρὸς τοὺς τοιούτους δι' αἰνίγματος λέγοντος ὡς δεὸν ἀκριβῶς ζέειν μὲν πάντως τῷ πνεύματι, κατεψύχθαι δὲ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ· ὄφελον γὰρ ἦσθά φησι ψυχρὸς ἢ ζεστός, κ.τ.λ.* Rev. iii. 15. Of course this cannot mean that the Revelation is what we now commonly know as an apocryphal book, or, as Lücke remarks, the sentence would contradict itself: but *ἀπόκρυφα* here is equivalent to *μυστικὰ* or *προφητικά*: in the same way as Dion. Areop. De Eccl. Hierarch. iii. 4, vol. i. p. 287, calls the book *τὴν κρυφίαν καὶ μυστικὴν ἐποψίαν τοῦ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ θεσπεσίου.*

22. Didymus (+ 394) in his Enarr. in Epist. i. Joann. iv. 1, 2, p. 1795, says, "Et in apocalypsi frequenter Joannes (the writer of the Epistle) propheta vocatur."

23. Ambrose (+ 397) constantly cites the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John: e. g. De virginitate 14 (86), vol. iii. p. 234: "Quomodo igitur adscendamus ad cœlum, docet Evangelista qui dicit Et duxit me Spiritus in montem magnum, &c." Rev. xxi. 10: and De Spiritu Sancto iii. 20 (153), p. 697, "Sic enim habes, dicente Johanne evangelista Et ostendit mihi flumen aquæ vivæ, &c." Rev. xxii. 1 ff.

24. Augustine (+ 430) uses every where the Apocalypse as a genuine production of the Apostle and Evangelist John. Thus we have, Ep. lv. (cxix.) 6 (10), vol. ii. p. 209, "Joannes apostolus in apocalypsi:" De Civ. Dei xx. 7. 1, vol. vii. p. 666, "Joannes Evangelista in libro qui dicitur apocalypsis." In Joan. Tract. xxxvi. 5, vol. iii.

[3] I have sought in vain for this citation in the Paris edition of 1631, and in its index, and have not access to the edn. of 1693.

p. 1665,—"in Apocalypsi ipsius Joannis cujus est hoc evangelium:" see also Tract. xiii. 2, p. 1493; De peccat. mer. ii. 7 (8), vol. x. p. 156; de Trinit. ii. 6 (11), vol. viii. p. 852, &c.[4]

25. Jerome (+ 420), adv. Jovin. i. 26, vol. ii. p. 280, speaks of the Apostle John as also being a prophet, "vidit enim in Pathmos insula, in qua fuerat a Domitiano principe ob Domini martyrium relegatus, apocalypsin, infinita futurorum mysteria continentem." And then follows, as also in his Catal. 9, vol. ii. p. 845, see below, § ii. par. 12, Irenæus's account of the place and time of writing the book.

We shall have to adduce Jerome again in treating of the canonicity. And now that we have arrived at the beginning of the fifth century, the latter question becomes historically the more important of the two, and indeed the two are henceforth hardly capable of being treated apart.

26. Before we pass to the testimonies *against* the authorship by the Apostle and Evangelist St. John, let us briefly review the course of evidence which we have adduced in its favour. It will be very instructive to compare its character with that of the evidence for the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as collected in the Prolegomena to that Epistle.

27. There we found that, while there prevailed in the great majority of the more ancient Fathers a habit, when they are speaking loosely, or ad populum, of citing the Epistle as the work of St. Paul,—on the one hand, all attempts fail to discover any general ecclesiastical tradition to this effect: and on the other, the greatest and ablest of these writers themselves, when speaking guardedly, throw doubt on the Pauline authorship, while some of them set it aside altogether. In course of time, we there also found, the habit of citing the Epistle as St. Paul's became more general: then sprung up assertion, more and more strong, that it veritably was his: till at last it was made an article of faith to believe it to be so. So that the history of opinion in that case may be described as the gradual growing up of a belief which was entirely void of general reception in the ancient church.

28. We are not yet prepared to enter on the whole of the corresponding history of opinion in this case: but as far as we have gone, it may be described as the very converse of the other. The apostolic authorship rests on the firmest traditional ground. We have it assured to us by one who had companied with men that had known St. John himself: we have it held in continuous succession by Fathers in all

[4] It hardly appears fair in Lücke to lay a stress on such expressions as this "ipsius Joannis cujus est," as implying that Augustine thought it necessary to protest by implication against the opposite view. There is nothing in the expression which he might not very well have said in speaking of the Acts as related to the Gospel of St. Luke: in which case there was no doubt.

parts of the church. Nowhere, in primitive times, does there appear any counter-tradition on the subject. We have nothing corresponding to the plain testimonies of Tertullian in favour of Barnabas, or of Origen that there was an *ἱστορία* come down that Clement of Rome or St. Luke had written the Epistle. In subsequent paragraphs we shall see how variation of opinion was first introduced, and why.

29. But before doing so, it will be well to complete this portion of our enquiry, by mentioning those early writings and Fathers which, though they do not expressly state who was the author of the book, yet cite it as canonical, or at all events shew that they were acquainted with and approved it.

30. Among these the very earliest have been matter of considerable question. The supposed allusions in Polycarp, for instance, though strongly maintained by Hengstenberg, are really so faint and distant, that none but an advocate would ever have perceived them. Such are, e. g. the expression in Polyc. ad Phil. c. 1, p. 1005, Migne, *ἔλεος ὑμῖν κ. εἰρήνη παρὰ θεοῦ παντοκράτορος*, seeing that *ὁ παντοκράτωρ* is as a N. T. word confined to the Apocalypse, being in 2 Cor. vi. 18 cited from the O. T.:—in p. 1012, c. 8, *μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ*, because in Rev. we find *ἡ ὑπομονὴ* [*Ἰησοῦ*], (i. 9, rec.) iii. 10. But so do we in 2 Thess. iii. 5: indeed it need not be an allusion at all, being a very obvious expression. And Hengstenberg's next instance, which he calls as good as an express citation of the Apocalypse as an inspired writing, c. 6, p. 1012, *οὕτως οὖν δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης εὐλαβείας, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο, καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ προφῆται οἱ προκηρύξαντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, is in reality no instance at all, the citation being from Heb. xii. 28, and the following words being just as applicable to St. James and St. Jude, as to St. John. Nay, Hengstenberg's argument has two edges: for if the allusion here be to the Apocalypse, then we have a most important early witness to its not having been written by an Apostle.

31. The passages which Hengstenberg brings from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp, are even more uncertain and far-fetched [5]. Such advocacy is much to be lamented: it tends to weaken instead of strengthening the real evidence.

[5] They are these: in c. 2, p. 1032, Migne, we read, *προσέχοντες τῇ τοῦ χριστοῦ χάριτι τῶν κοσμικῶν κατεφρόνουν βασάνων, διὰ μιᾶς ὥρας τὴν αἰώνιον κόλασιν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι· καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἦν αὐτοῖς ψυχρόν, τὸ τῶν ἀπηνῶν βασανιστῶν, πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν γὰρ εἶχον φυγεῖν τὸ αἰώνιον καὶ μηδέποτε σβεννύμενον πῦρ*, supposed to be an allusion to Rev. xiv. 9—11. But why not to Mark ix. 44 ff. and parallels? In c. 17, p. 1041, *ὁ δὲ ἀντίζηλος καὶ βάσκανος καὶ πονηρός, ὁ ἀντικείμενος τῷ γένει τῶν δικαίων, ἰδὼν τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ τῆς μαρτυρίας, καὶ τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀνεπίληπτον πολιτείαν, ἐστεφανωμένον τε τῷ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας στεφάνῳ . . .*, supposed to refer to Rev. ii. 10, but why not to 1 Cor. ix. 25? There *might* be a referenco, which H. has not noticed, in *ὁ ἀντικείμενος*

32. The next testimony produced is however of a very different kind. It is that of Papias, of whom Iren., Hær. v. 33. 4, p. 333, in adducing the traditional words of our Lord respecting the millennial abundance of the earth, says, *ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν αὐτοῦ βίβλων· ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῷ πέντε βιβλία συντεταγμένα.* It is well known that Eusebius, in his famous chapter, H. E. iii. 39, attempts to set aside this *Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής* by citing from Papias himself his assertion that he set down in his work what he had heard as the sayings of the Apostles, naming St. John among them. But there is nothing to prevent his having united both characters,—that of a hearer, and that of a collector of sayings: and Irenæus, the scholar of Polycarp, is hardly likely to have been mistaken on such a point. Now regarding Papias, as a witness for the Apocalypse, we have a scholium of Andreas, of Cappadocia, at the end of the fifth century (see Lücke, p. 525 note), printed in substance in Cramer's Catena, p. 176, at the beginning of the commentaries on the Apocalypse: *περὶ μὲν τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου περιττὸν μηκύνειν τὸν λόγον ἡγούμεθα, τῶν μακαρίων Γρηγορίου φημὶ τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ Κυρίλλου, προσέτι τε καὶ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων Παππίου, Εἰρηναίου, Μεθοδίου καὶ Ἱππολύτου ταύτῃ προσμαρτυρούντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον· παρ' ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πολλὰς λαβόντες ἀφορμὰς εἰς τοῦτο ἐληλύθαμεν, καθὼς ἐν τισὶ τόποις χρήσεις τούτων παρεθέμεθα.* And accordingly, on Rev. xii. 7—9, he expressly cites Papias's work: *Παππίας δὲ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῆς λέξεως*[6], *κ.τ.λ.*

33. There seems to be ample proof here that Papias did maintain, as from what we otherwise know we should expect, the inspiration, i. e. the canonicity of the book. All that has been argued on the other side seems to me to fail to obviate the fact, or to weaken the great importance of this early testimony. See the whole discussed at length in Stuart, pp. 250—254: Lücke, pp. 524—546: Hengstenberg, pp. 101—116. I may be permitted to say, that both the last-mentioned Commentators have suffered themselves to be blinded as to the real worth of the evidence by their zeal to serve each his own hypothesis.

34. The Epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne to the churches of Asia and Phrygia concerning the persecution which befell them under Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 177, is preserved by Eusebius, H. E. v. 1, 2. The citations in it from the Apocalypse are unmistakable. In speak-

τῷ γένει τῶν δικαίων, to Rev. xii. 17: but it is at best uncertain. In c. 20, p. 1044, *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα, τιμή, κράτος, μεγαλωσύνη, εἰς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν*, which, H. says, is from Rev. v. 13. This really is not worth an answer.

[6] Surely this expression, *ἐπὶ τῆς λέξεως*, meets Lücke's very improbable notion (p. 530 f.) that the extract which follows had no reference to the passage in the text of the Apocalypse.

ing of the martyr, Vettius Epagathus, they say, ἦν γαρ καὶ ἔστι γνήσιος χριστοῦ μαθητὴς ἀκολουθῶν τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ (Rev. xiv. 4). They account for the rage of the Pagans against the Christians by its being the fulfilment of Rev. xxii. 11, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ, ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιωθήτω ἔτι[7]. They call Christ ὁ πιστὸς κ. ἀληθινὸς μάρτυς, and ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, expressions manifestly taken from Rev. i. 5, iii. 14. See Lücke, pp. 567, 568.

35. The testimony of Polycrates of Ephesus, in Euseb. H. E. v. 24, concerning the burial of St. John in Ephesus, has been pressed by Hengstenberg into the service of the canonicity of the Apocalypse, but is far too uncertain in meaning to be fairly introduced[8]. See Hengstb., pp. 125—129: and Lücke, pp. 568—571.

36. Cyprian (cir. 250) repeatedly refers to the Apocalypse, and unhesitatingly treats it as part of Holy Scripture. In Ep. xiii. 1, p. 260, he says, "maxime cum scriptum sit Memento unde cecideris, et ago pœnitentiam," Rev. ii. 5; see also Ep. xxviii. 1, p. 300, lii. (ad Antonianum Ep. x., Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. iii.) 22, p. 787. In Ep. xxvi. 4, p. 293, he cites the Apocalypse as on a level with the Gospels: "tuba Evangelii sui nos excitat Dominus dicens, Qui plus diligit patrem, &c. . . . : et iterum, Beati qui persecutionem passi fuerint, &c. . . . : et, Vincenti dabo sedere super thronum meum, &c." Rev. iii. 21.

In Ep. lii. ubi supra, "pœnitentiam non agenti Dominus comminatur; Habeo, inquit, adversus te multa, &c." Rev. ii. 20.

De lapsis, c. 27, p. 488, "ipse quoque Dominus præmoneat et præstruat dicens Et scient omnes ecclesiæ, &c. . . ." Rev. ii. 23.

De opere et eleem. c. 14, p. 611, "Audi in Apocalypsi Domini tui vocem . . . . Dicis, inquit, dives sum, &c. . . ." Rev. iii. 17. The opening chapters of the treatise, De Exhortatione Martyrii, consist of Scripture testimonies strung together. In them he cites the Apocalypse

[7] Some think this refers to Dan. xii. 10. But the words there are very different, and not in this grammatical construction: and as the Epistle undeniably quotes the Apocalypse elsewhere, it is far more natural to believe them to come from it. This being so, the words ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ are very important. Lücke himself acknowledges this; supposing however that Irenæus and the Asiatic Greeks who came over into Gaul, brought with them the belief of the canonicity into the Gallican churches. Such a concession is not to be despised.

[8] Hengstb. maintains that in the words, Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκὼς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος, the μάρτυς alludes to the μαρτυρία of Rev. i. 9, and the ἱερεὺς κ.τ.λ. to his having penetrated the Apocalyptic mysteries. It is obvious that nothing can be more unsafe than to reason on such hypotheses. Lücke's view which refers the μάρτυς to the exile at Patmos, and the other to St. John's position as patriarch of the Asiatic churches, is just as likely. Nay, with regard to μάρτυς, is not a third view more likely still? For if he was banished to Patmos, διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ, the μαρτυρία preceded and occasioned the exile, and means his preaching and testimony in Ephesus or elsewhere.

as Scripture, c. 2, 3, 8, pp. 657 f., 661 ("e. in Apocalypsi eadem loquitur divinæ prædicationis hortatio dicens"), 10, 11, 12. The same is the case in the Libri Testimoniorum.

Besides these places Stuart quotes from his works, p. 168, "Aquas namque populos significare in Apocalypsi Scriptura divina declarat, dicens, Aquæ, &c." Rev. xvii. 15.

37. Athanasius[9] (+ cir. 373) gives in his 23rd ἐπιστολὴ ἑορταστική, Opp. Pars ii. vol. ii. p. 156, a list of the books of the sacred canon, dividing them into three classes: the first of these being the *canonical*, which are the sources of salvation: in which only is the true doctrine of religion declared, to which no man can add, and from which none can take away: the second *ecclesiastical*—such as may be read in the church for edification, but are not inspired: the third, *apocryphal*, written by heretics, and supposititious. In the first class he places the Apocalypse: and in his writings accordingly he refers to it frequently[1].

38. In Chrysostom's own works we have no comments on the Apocalypse, nor any distinct references to it as Scripture. That he was acquainted with it, plainly appears from such passages as that in Hom. i. on Matt. § 8, vol. vii. p. 23, ed. Migne, where in speaking of the heavenly city, he says, καταμάθωμεν οὖν αὐτῆς τὰ θεμέλια, τὰς πύλας τὰς ἀπὸ σαπφείρου καὶ μαργαριτῶν συγκειμένας.

Suidas says under Ἰωάννης, δέχεται δὲ ὁ Χρυσόστομος καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῦ τρεῖς, καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν.

39. I recur again to Jerome's testimony[2]. In his letter to Paulinus, Ep. liii., he gives the whole sacred canon. And in including the Apocalypse in it, he remarks, § 8, vol. i. p. 280, "Apocalypsis Joannis tot habet sacramenta quot verba. Parum dixi pro merito voluminis. Laus omnis inferior est. In verbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiæ." In his Comm. on Ps. cxlix., vol. vii. App. p. 1267, Migne, he says, "legimus in Apocalypsi Joannis, quæ in ecclesiis legitur et recipitur; neque enim inter apocryphas scripturas habetur, sed inter ecclesiasticas."

In his Ep. to Dardanus, § 3 (vol. i. p. 971), we have the passage cited at length in the Proleg. to the Epistle to the Hebrews, § i. par. 74, in which he says, "quod si eam (the Ep. to the Heb.) Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, nec Græcorum quidem ecclesiæ Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt. et tamen nos utramque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, quippe qui et gentilium literarum raro utantur exemplis, sed quasi canonicis."

[9] See above, par. 20.

[1] See contra Arianos, i. 11, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 327; iv. 28, p. 506 f.; Ep. ii. ad Serap. 2, p. 547, &c.

[2] See above, par. 25.

40. It is hardly worth while to cite later and less important authorities on this side. They will be found enumerated in Stuart, Introd. p. 276 : Davidson, p. 545 : and still more at length in Lücke, pp. 638 ff. Of the general tendency of later tradition I shall speak below, par. 68.

41. I now come to consider those ancient authorities which impugn the apostolicity and canonicity of the book.

42. First among these in point of time, though not of importance, are the Antimontanists or Alogi of the end of the second and beginning of the third century (see Epiphan. Hær. li. 32 ff. pp. 455 ff.: Neander, Kirchengesch. i. 2, p. 907) who rejected the writings of St. John. *οὐκ αἰδοῦνται δὲ πάλιν*, says Epiphanius, *οἱ τοιοῦτοι κατὰ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου εἰρημένων ἐξοπλιζόμενοι, νομίζοντες μή πη ἄρα δύνωνται τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀνατρέπειν . . . . φάσκουσι δὲ κατὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως τάδε χλευάζοντες* . . . . Then follow their objections against the book, which are entirely of a subjective character: *τί με ὠφελεῖ ἡ ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου, λέγουσά μοι περὶ ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἑπτὰ σαλπίγγων*; and again, *φάσκουσιν ἀντιλέγοντες, ὅτι εἶπε πάλιν Γράψον τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῷ ἐν Θυατείροις· καὶ οὐκ ἔνι ἐκεῖ ἐκκλησία χριστιανῶν ἐν Θυατείρῃ. πῶς οὖν ἔγραφε τῇ μὴ οὔσῃ*: &c. To these apparently Dionysius of Alexandria, presently to be cited, alludes, when he says (ut infra, par. 48), *τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἠθέτησαν καὶ ἀνεσκεύασαν πάντῃ τὸ βιβλίον, καθ' ἕκαστον κεφάλαιον διευθύνοντες, ἄγνωστόν τε καὶ ἀσυλλόγιστον ἀποφαίνοντες. ψεύδεσθαί τε τὴν ἐπιγραφήν, Ἰωάννου γὰρ οὐκ εἶναι λέγουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀποκάλυψιν εἶναι, τὴν σφόδρῳ καὶ παχεῖ κεκαλυμμένην τῷ τῆς ἀγνοίας παραπετάσματι· καὶ οὐχ ὅπως τῶν ἀποστόλων τινά, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὅλως τῶν ἁγίων ἢ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τούτου γεγονέναι ποιητὴν τοῦ συγγράμματος. Κήρινθον δὲ τὸν καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου κληθεῖσαν Κηρινθιακὴν συστησάμενον αἵρεσιν, ἀξιόπιστον ἐπιφημίσαι θελήσαντα τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πλάσματι ὄνομα. τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ τὸ δόγμα, ἐπίγειον ἔσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ βασιλείαν, καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς ὠρέγετο φιλοσώματος ὢν καὶ πάνυ σαρκικός, ἐν τούτοις ὀνειροπολεῖν ἔσεσθαι, γαστρὸς καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γαστέρα πλησμοναῖς, τουτέστι σιτίοις καὶ πότοις καὶ γάμοις, καὶ δι' ὧν εὐφημότερον ταῦτα ᾠήθη πoριεῖσθαι, ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἱερείων σφαγαῖς.*

43. I have considered it important to quote this passage at length, as giving an account of the earliest opponents to the authenticity of the Apocalypse and of the reason of their opposition. The student may further follow out the account of these Alogi in Epiphanius, l. c. They have been very lightly passed over by Lücke (p. 582) and others, who are not willing that their procession of opponents to the apostolic authorship should be led by persons whose character is so little creditable. But the fair enquirer will not feel at liberty thus to exclude them. They were perhaps more outspoken and thorough, perhaps also less learned and cautious than those who follow: but their motives of oppo-

sition were of the same kind: and it is especially to be noted, as a weighty point in the evidence, that, being hostile to the authority of the writings commonly received as those of the Apostle John, they in their time conceived it necessary to destroy the credit of the Apocalypse as well as that of the Gospel.

44. The Roman presbyter Caius, *λογιώτατος ἀνήρ* according to Euseb. vi. 20, who lived in the Episcopate of Zephyrinus (i. e. 196—219), wrote a polemical dialogue against the Montanist Proclus, of which a fragment has been preserved by Eusebius iii. 28, speaking out still more plainly: *ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήρινθος ὁ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει, λέγων μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ χριστοῦ· καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν. καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀριθμὸν χιλιονταετίας ἐν γάμῳ ἑορτῆς θέλων πλανᾷν λέγει γίνεσθαι.*

45. Some, as Hug, al., have in vain endeavoured to persuade us that some other book is here meant, and not the Apocalypse of John. No such work is to be traced, though we have very full accounts of Cerinthus from Irenæus (Hær. i. 26, p. 105) and Epiphanius (Hær. xxviii. pp. 110 ff.): and neither the plural *ἀποκαλύψεων* (which is also used by Dionysius, as cited below, of *our* apocalyptic visions), nor the exaggerated account of the earthly Kingdom as promised (see the same in the objections of the Alogi as cited by Dionysius above) can have the least weight in inducing us to concur in such a supposition.

46. When Lücke sets aside Caius in the same category as the Alogi, as having equally little to do with ecclesiastical tradition, we cannot help seeing again the trick of a crafty partisan wishing to get rid of an awkward ally.

47. Undoubtedly the weightiest objector to the canonicity of the Apocalypse in early times is DIONYSIUS, the successor next but one to Origen in the presidency of the catechetical school of Alexandria, and afterwards bishop of that see (A.D. 247). This worthy scholar of Origen (see Neander, Kirchengesch. i. p. 1229 f.) remained ever attached to him, loving and honouring him: and wrote him a letter of consolation when he was thrown into prison in the Decian persecution. This Dionysius, as he himself tells us, had become a believer in the Gospel by a course of free investigation, and unbiassed examination of all known systems: and after his conversion, he remained true to this principle as a Christian and as a public teacher. He read and examined without bias all the writings of heretics, and did not reject them, until he was thoroughly acquainted with them, and was in a situation to confute them with valid arguments. While he was thus employed, one of the presbyters of his church warned him of the harm which his own

soul might take by so much contact with their impure doctrines. Of this danger, he says, he was himself too conscious: but while pondering on what had been said to him he was determined in his course by a heavenly vision (*ὅραμα θεόπεμπτον προσελθὸν ἐπέῤῥωσέ με*): and a voice distinctly said to him, "Read every thing that comes into thy hands: for thou art well able to judge and prove them all (*πᾶσιν ἐντύγχανε οἷς ἂν εἰς χεῖρας λάβοις· διευθύνειν γὰρ ἕκαστα καὶ δοκιμάζειν ἱκανὸς εἶ*): indeed such was at the first the source of thine own faith." And, he says, "I received the vision as agreeing with the apostolic saying (*ἀποστολικῇ φωνῇ*) which says to the strong (*τοὺς δυνατωτέρους*) Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται."

48. The notices left us of Dionysius in the seventh book of Eusebius, entirely correspond with the above. And the judgment which he passes on the Apocalypse is characterized by sound discretion and moderation. I give it at length.

After the passage already cited in par. 42, he proceeds (Eus. H. E. vii. 25): "*Καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὴ συνίημι, ἀλλ' ὑπονοῶ γε νοῦν τινὰ βαθύτερον ἐγκεῖσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασιν. Οὐκ ἰδίῳ ταῦτα μετρῶν καὶ κρίνων λογισμῷ, πίστει δὲ πλέον νέμων, ὑψηλότερα ἢ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ καταληφθῆναι νενόμικα· καὶ οὐκ ἀποδοκιμάζω ταῦτα ἃ μὴ συνεώρακα, θαυμάζω δὲ μᾶλλον ὅτι μὴ καὶ εἶδον.*" *Ἐπὶ τούτοις τὴν ὅλην τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως βασανίσας γραφήν, ἀδύνατον δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ τὴν πρόχειρον ἀποδείξας νοεῖσθαι διάνοιαν, ἐπιφέρει λέγων* "*Συντελέσας δὴ πᾶσαν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τὴν προφητείαν, μακαρίζει ὁ προφήτης τούς τε φυλάσσοντας αὐτήν, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἑαυτόν. Μακάριος γάρ φησιν ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα. Καλεῖσθαι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ εἶναι τὴν γραφὴν Ἰωάννου ταύτην, οὐκ ἀντερῶ. Ἁγίου μὲν γὰρ εἶναί τινος καὶ θεοπνεύστου συναινῶ. Οὐ μὴν ῥᾳδίως ἂν συνθείμην τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἀπόστολον, τὸν υἱὸν Ζεβεδαίου, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐπιγεγραμμένον, καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡ καθολική. Τεκμαίρομαι γὰρ ἔκ τε τοῦ ἤθους ἑκατέρων, καὶ τοῦ τῶν λόγων εἴδους, καὶ τῆς τοῦ βιβλίου διεξαγωγῆς λεγομένης, μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ παρεγγράφει, οὐδὲ κηρύσσει ἑαυτόν, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὔτε διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς.*" *Εἶθ' ὑποβάς, πάλιν ταῦτα λέγει,* "*Ἰωάννης δὲ οὐδαμοῦ οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ ἑτέρου· ὁ δὲ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν γράψας, εὐθύς τε ἑαυτὸν ἐν ἀρχῇ προτάσσει· Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἐν τάχει. Καὶ ἐσήμανεν ἀποστείλας διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, ὃς ἐμαρτύρησε τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ ὅσα εἶδεν. Εἶτα καὶ ἐπιστολὴν γράφει· Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. Ὁ δέ γε εὐαγγελιστής, οὐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προέγραψεν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ ἀπερίττως ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς θείας ἀποκαλύψεως ἤρξατο Ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ γὰρ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει καὶ ὁ κύριος τὸν Πέτρον ἐμακάρισεν εἰπὼν Μακάριος εἶ Σίμων*

βὰρ Ἰωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέ σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένῃ Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ, καίτοι βραχείαις οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ πρόκειται, ἀλλὰ ἀνωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται. Οὗτος δέ γε οὐδὲ αὔταρκες ἐνόμισεν εἰςάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, διηγεῖσθαι τὰ ἑξῆς, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἀναλαμβάνει Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἐν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ δὴ καὶ πρὸς τῷ τέλει ταῦτα εἶπε Μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου. Κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν Ἰωάννης ἐστὶν ὁ ταῦτα γράφων, αὐτῷ λέγοντι πιστευτέον· ποῖος δὲ οὗτος, ἄδηλον. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι, ὡς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ πολλαχοῦ, τὸν ἠγαπημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητήν, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου, οὐδὲ τὸν αὐτόπτην καὶ αὐτήκοον τοῦ κυρίου γενόμενον. Εἶπε γὰρ ἄν τι τούτων τῶν προδεδηλωμένων, σαφῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐμφανίσαι βουλόμενος. Ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν οὐδέν. Ἀδελφὸν δὲ ἡμῶν καὶ συγκοινωνὸν εἶπε καὶ μάρτυρα Ἰησοῦ, καὶ μακάριον ἐπὶ τῇ θέᾳ καὶ ἀκοῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων. Πολλοὺς δὲ ὁμωνύμους Ἰωάννῃ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ νομίζω γεγονέναι, οἳ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἀγάπην, καὶ τὸ θαυμάζειν καὶ ζηλοῦν, ἀγαπηθῆναί τε ὁμοίως αὐτῷ βούλεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἠσπάσαντο. Ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πολὺς καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τοῖς τῶν πιστῶν παισὶν ὀνομάζεται. Ἔστι μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερος Ἰωάννης ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Μάρκος· ὃν Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος ἑαυτοῖς συμπαρέλαβον, περὶ οὗ καὶ πάλιν λέγει Εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην. Εἰ δὲ οὗτος ὁ γράψας ἐστίν, οὐκ ἂν φαίην· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀφῖχθαι σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν γέγραπται· ἀλλὰ Ἀναχθέντες μέν φησιν ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου οἱ περὶ Παῦλον, ἦλθον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας. Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀποχωρήσας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Ἄλλον δέ τινα οἶμαι τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γενομένων· ἐπεὶ καὶ δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι. Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν νοημάτων δὲ καὶ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς συντάξεως αὐτῶν, εἰκότως ἕτερος οὗτος παρ' ἐκεῖνον ὑπονοηθήσεται. Συνάδουσι μὲν γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολή, ὁμοίως τε ἄρχονται. Τὸ μὲν φησὶν Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος· ἡ δέ, Ὃ ἦν ἀπαρχῆς. Τὸ μὲν φησὶ Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός· ἡ δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ σμικρῷ παρηλλαγμένα, Ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη. Ταῦτα γὰρ προανακρούεται διατεινόμενος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἐδήλωσε πρὸς τοὺς οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ φάσκοντας ἐληλυθέναι τὸν κύριον· δι' ἃ καὶ συνῆψεν ἐπιμελῶς Καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ὑμῖν· ὃ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν. Ἔχεται αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν προθέσεων οὐκ ἀφίσταται. Διὰ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν κεφαλαίων καὶ ὀνομάτων πάντα διεξέρχεται· ὧν τινα μὲν ἡμεῖς συντόμως ὑπομνήσομεν. Ὁ δὲ προσεχῶς ἐντυγχάνων εὑρήσει ἐν

ἑκατέρῳ πολλὴν τὴν ζωήν, πολὺ τὸ φῶς, ἀποτροπὴν τοῦ σκότους, συνεχῆ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τὴν χάριν, τὴν χαράν· τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου, τὴν κρίσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ, τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἡμᾶς ἀγάπης ἐντολήν, ὡς πάσας δεῖ φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολάς· ὁ ἔλεγχος τοῦ κόσμου, τοῦ διαβόλου, τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἡ υἱοθεσία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ διόλου πίστις ἡμῶν ἀπαιτουμένη, ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς πανταχοῦ· καὶ ὅλως διὰ πάντων χαρακτηρίζοντας, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν συνορᾷν τοῦ τε εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς χρῶτα πρόκειται. Ἀλλοιοτάτη δὲ καὶ ξένη παρὰ ταῦτα ἡ ἀποκάλυψις, μήτε ἐφαπτομένη, μήτε γειτνιῶσα τούτων μηδενὶ σχεδόν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, μηδὲ συλλαβὴν πρὸς αὐτὰ κοινὴν ἔχουσα· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μνήμην τινὰ οὐδὲ ἔννοιαν, οὔτε ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἔχει· ἐῶ γὰρ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· οὔτε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἡ ἀποκάλυψις· Παύλου διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ὑποφήναντός τι καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων αὐτοῦ, ἃς οὐκ ἐνέγραψε καθ' αὑτάς. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς φράσεως τὴν διαφοράν ἐστι τεκμήρασθαι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἀπταίστως κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων φωνήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λογιώτατα ταῖς λέξεσι, τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς, ταῖς συντάξεσι τῆς ἑρμηνείας γέγραπται. Πολλοῦ γε δεῖ βάρβαρόν τινα φθόγγον, ἢ σολοικισμόν, ἢ ὅλως ἰδιωτισμὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς εὑρεθῆναι. Ἑκάτερον γὰρ εἶχεν, ὡς ἔοικε, τὸν λόγον, ἀμφότερα αὐτῷ χαρισαμένου τοῦ κυρίου, τόν τε τῆς γνώσεως, τόν τε τῆς φράσεως. Τούτῳ δὲ ἀποκάλυψιν μὲν ἑωρακέναι, καὶ γνῶσιν εἰληφέναι καὶ προφητείαν, οὐκ ἀντερῶ, διάλεκτον μέντοι καὶ γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἑλληνίζουσαν αὐτοῦ βλέπω, ἀλλ' ἰδιώμασι μὲν βαρβαρικοῖς χρώμενον, καί που καὶ σολοικίζοντα. Ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον νῦν ἐκλέγειν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπισκώπτων, μή τις νομίσῃ, ταῦτα εἶπον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὴν ἀνομοιότητα διευθύνων τῶν γραφῶν."

49. It will be seen that while on the one hand he separates himself from those who disparaged the book and ascribed it to Cerinthus, on the other he distinctly repudiates all literal interpretations of it as impossible, and approaches the enquiry with a strong anti-chiliastic bias. This more especially appears, from a previous chapter of the same book of Eusebius, in which is detailed the proceeding of Dionysius with regard to the schism of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop of chiliastic views: Eus. H. E. vii. 24.

50. With regard to the whole character of Dionysius's criticism, we may make the following remarks:

a) its *negative* portion rests upon grounds common to him and ourselves, and respecting which a writer in the third century, however much we may admire his free and able treatment of his subject, has no advantage at all over one who writes in the nineteenth. It is as open to us as it was to him, to judge of the phænomena and language of the Apocalypse as compared with the Gospel and Epistles of St. John.

b) the *positive* result of his argument, if fairly examined, is worth absolutely nothing. The writer to whom he ascribes the book is, even

to himself, entirely unknown: more unknown than Silvanus as a conjectural author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: more unknown than even Aquila. The very existence, in his mind, of the other John, who wrote the Apocalypse, depends on the very shadowy words ἐπεὶ καὶ δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι.

51. And this latter consideration is very important. It shews us that at all events, the idea of John the Presbyter having written the Apocalypse was, in the middle of the third century, wholly unknown to ecclesiastical tradition in the church of Alexandria: or else we should never have found this seeking about and conjecturing on the matter.

52. I shall treat, further on, the question raised by this criticism of Dionysius as to the internal probability of the authorship by the Apostle John. At present I advance with notices of those who impugned or doubted it in ancient times.

53. And of those we next come to Eusebius of Cæsarea, the well-known ecclesiastical historian. His opinion on the question is wavering and undecided. In his H. E. iii. 24, having asserted the genuineness of St. John's Gospel and First Epistle, and placed the other two Epistles among the ἀντιλεγόμενα, he proceeds, τῆς δ' ἀποκαλύψεως ἐφ' ἑκάτερον ἔτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς περιέλκεται ἡ δόξα. ὅμως γε μὴν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μαρτυρίας ἐν οἰκείῳ καιρῷ τὴν ἐπίκρισιν δέξεται καὶ αὕτη. Again in the next chapter, in giving a list of the ὁμολογούμεναι θεῖαι γραφαί, when he has mentioned the four Gospels and Acts and one Epistle of St. John and one of St. Peter, he says, ἐπὶ τούτοις τακτέον εἴ γε φανείη, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου, περὶ ἧς τὰ δόξαντα κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκθησόμεθα. And a little below, when he is speaking of the νόθα, he says, ἔτι τε ὡς ἔφην ἡ Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψις εἰ φανείη, ἥν τινες ὡς ἔφην ἀθετοῦσιν, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσι τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις.

54. In iii. 39, in adducing the well-known passage of Papias, εἰ δήπου καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἤ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἅ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν, he says, ἔνθα καὶ ἐπιστῆσαι ἄξιον δὶς καταριθμοῦντι αὐτῷ τὸ Ἰωάννου ὄνομα, ὧν τὸν μὲν πρότερον Πέτρῳ καὶ Ἰακώβῳ καὶ Ματθαίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις συγκαταλέγει, σαφῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν, τὸν δ' ἕτερον Ἰωάννην διαστείλας τὸν λόγον ἑτέροις παρὰ τὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀριθμὸν κατατάσσει, προτάξας αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἀριστίωνα· σαφῶς τε αὐτὸν πρεσβύτερον ὀνομάζει. ὡς καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀληθῆ τῶν δύο κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὁμωνυμίᾳ κεχρῆσθαι εἰρηκότων, δύο τε ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου ἔτι νῦν λέγεσθαι, οἷς καὶ ἀναγκαῖον πρὸς ἔχειν τὸν νοῦν. εἰκὸς γὰρ τὸν δεύτερον, εἰ μή τις ἐθέλοι τὸν πρῶτον τὴν ἐπ' ὀνόματος φερομένην Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακέναι.

55. The student will observe how entirely conjectural, and valueless as evidence, is this opinion of Eusebius. Certainly Lücke is wrong in his very strong denunciations of Hengstenberg for describing Eusebius as studiously leaving the question open. For what else is it, when he numbers the book on one side among the undoubted Scriptures with an *εἰ φανείη*, and then on the other among the spurious writings with an *εἰ φανείη* also: while at the very moment of endorsing Dionysius's conjecture that the second John saw its visions, he interposes *εἰ μή τις ἐθέλοι τὸν πρῶτον*? That a man with the anti-chiliastic leanings of Eusebius concedes thus much, makes the balance of his testimony incline rather to than away from the canonicity of the book. I would not press this, but simply take it as indicating that in Eusebius's time, as well as in that of Dionysius, there was no ecclesiastical tradition warranting the disallowing it as the work of the Evangelist. Adverse opinion there was, which found its fair and worthier employ in internal criticism, and issued in vague conjecture, resting on the mere fact of two persons named John having existed in Ephesus. Who and what the second John was, whether he had any right to speak of himself as the writer of the Apocalypse does, or to address with authority the seven churches of Asia,—on these and all such questions we are wholly in the dark.

56. Cyril of Jerusalem (+ 386) is a more decided witness for the exclusion of the Apocalypse from the Canon. In his Catecheseis, iv. 35, 36, pp. 68 f., having prefaced the account of the twenty-two canonical books of the O. T. with *πρὸς τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μηδὲν ἔχε κοινόν*, he enumerates the canonical books of the N. T., the four Gospels, Acts, seven catholic epistles, fourteen of St. Paul, and concludes *τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ. καὶ ὅσα ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται, ταῦτα μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγίνωσκε, καθὼς ἤκουσας.* And it is to be observed that he appeals for this arrangement to ancient authorities: for he says to his catechumen, in the words alluded to in the last-cited clause, *ταύτας μόνας μελέτα σπουδαίως, ἃς καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ παῤῥησίας ἀναγινώσκομεν. πολύ σου φρονιμώτεροι καὶ εὐλαβέστεροι ἦσαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπίσκοποι οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προστάται, οἱ ταύτας παραδόντες.*

57. Cyril nowhere mentions the Apocalypse by name. But he seems to use it, and even where he by inference repudiates it, to adopt its terms unconsciously. An instance of the former is found in Cat. i. 4, p. 18, where he says to his catechumen, speaking of his baptism, *καταφυτεύῃ εἰς τὸν νοητὸν παράδεισον· λαμβάνεις ὄνομα καινόν* Rev. ii. 7, 17. Of the latter, in Cat. xv. 13, p. 230, where, professing to get his particulars respecting Antichrist from Daniel, and having said *ὀπίσω αὐτῶν ἀναστήσεται βασιλεὺς ἕτερος ὃς ὑπεροίσει κακοῖς πάντας τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν,*

he proceeds, καὶ τρεῖς βασιλεῖς ταπεινώσει, δῆλον δὲ ὅτι ἀπὸ τῶν δέκα τῶν προτέρων, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δέκα τούτων τοὺς τρεῖς ταπεινῶν πάντως ὅτι αὐτὸς ὄγδοος βασιλεύσει: this last particular being from Rev. xvii. 11. Again,—although, ib. c. 16, p. 232, he protests respecting the three and a half years of Antichrist's reign, οὐκ ἐξ ἀποκρύφων λέγομεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Δανιήλ,—in c. 27, p. 239, he alludes to the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra in these words, τοῦ δράκοντός ἐστιν ἄλλη κεφαλὴ προσφάτως περὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν ἀναφυεῖσα (Rev. xii. 3). Indeed previously in c. 15, p. 232, he had written δεινὸν τὸ θηρίον, δράκων μέγας, ἀνθρώποις ἀκαταγώνιστος, ἕτοιμος εἰς τὸ καταπιεῖν, evidently from the same place in the Apocalypse.

58. Thus Cyril presents to us remarkable and exceptional phænomena: familiarity with the language of the book, so as to use it unconsciously as that of prophecy, combined with a repudiation of it as canonical, and a prohibition of its study. It would appear that there had been at some timè a deliberate change of opinion, and that we have, in these evident references to the Apocalypse, instances of slips of memory, and retention of phraseology which belonged to his former, not to his subsequent views.

59. In the sixtieth canon of the synod of Laodicea, held between 343 and 381 (see Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i. 721 ff.), an account of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments is given in which the Apocalypse is omitted. The genuineness of this canon has been doubted (Lücke, p. 361), but apparently without reason: see Hefele, ut supra, pp. 749 ff. We next come to the testimony of Gregory of Nazianzen (+ 390), who in his poem, περὶ τῶν γνησίων βιβλίων τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, vol. ii. (iii. Migne) p. 259 ff., gives the same canon as Cyril, and adds, πάσας ἔχεις· εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτός, οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις. But here again, as in Cyril's case, we are met by the phænomenon of reference to the book and citation of it as of theological authority. In Oratio xlii. 9, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 755, he says, speaking of the angels presiding over churches, πείθομαι μὲν ἄλλους ἄλλης προστατεῖν ἐκκλησίας, ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως. And in another place, Oratio xxix. 17, p. 536, he cites, in speaking of the Godhead of Christ, καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ, adding, σαφῶς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λεγόμενα.

Lücke suggests in explanation of this, that possibly the churches of Asia Minor, especially that of Cappadocia, had excluded the Apocalypse from public reading in the church, on account of the countenance which it had been made to give to the errors of Montanism, and placed it among the ἀπόκρυφα. This may have been so: but I cannot think his inference secure, that *therefore* we may infer the general fact, that the book rested on no secure ecclesiastical tradition.

60. In the Iambi ad Seleucum, printed in Gregory's works, ii. (iii.

Migne) p. 1104 f., ascribed by some to Gregory himself, but more usually to Amphilochius of Iconium, we have the Apocalypse mentioned by name: *τὴν δ᾽ ἀποκάλυψιν τὴν Ἰωάννου πάλιν τινὲς μὲν ἐγκρίνουσιν, οἱ πλείους δέ γε νόθον λέγουσιν. οὗτος ἀψευδέστατος κανὼν ἂν εἴη τῶν θεοπνεύστων γραφῶν.*

But it is to be noticed, that in the scholium of Andreas cited above, par. 32, he enumerates Gregory among those who recognized the canonicity of the Apocalypse.

61. After this, it will be sufficient to give a general view of the antagonism to the authority of the book. It was maintained chiefly in the Eastern church; the Western, after the fifth century, universally recognizing the Apocalypse. It is remarkable that Sulpicius Severus (Hist. Sacr. ii. 31, Lücke) says the Apocalypse is "a plerisque aut stulte aut impie" rejected. But as Lücke observes, he must have found these "plerique" in the Greek, not in the Latin church. Pope Gelasius (Migne Patr. Lat. vol. cxxx. p. 984) in his decree "de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis" (500) gives the book its place in the Canon of the Catholic Church, between the Epistles of St. Paul and the Catholic Epistles. Primasius and Cassiodorus, in the sixth century, expound it as apostolic and canonical. But Junilius the African, the friend of Primasius, says, De partib. leg. div. i. 4, in Migne Patr. Lat. vol. lxviii. p. 18, that only seventeen books, viz. the O. T. prophets and the book of Psalms, contain the Scripture prophecy: "cæterum," he continues, "de Joannis apocalypsi apud Orientales admodum dubitatur." This he had learned from Paulus, a Persian, of the school of Nisibis: and he consequently seems inclined not to place it among the "libri perfectæ auctoritatis."

62. The fourth synod of Toledo (633) in its seventeenth canon, decrees that, seeing the Apocalypse is by many councils and Popes sanctioned as a work of the Apostle John, and as canonical, it should under pain of excommunication, be preached on in the church between Easter and Pentecost. The Synod speaks of "plurimi qui ejus auctoritatem non recipiunt, atque in ecclesiis Dei prædicare contemnunt." This, Lücke thinks, points to doubters in the West also. But Isidore of Seville (+ 636) in his De officiis eccl. i. 12, vol. vi. pp. 374 ff., having given the generally received canon, speaks of many Latins who doubted of the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of the genuineness of 2 Peter, of the Epistle of James, and 2 and 3 John; but not a word of any who doubted about the Apocalypse. So that it may be after all that the Synod of Toledo, as Junilius, may allude to Orientals only.

63. Henceforward in the Western church, with the sole exception of the Capitulare of Charlemagne, which, following Greek authorities and

especially the Synod of Laodicea, excluded the book from public reading, we find universal recognition of the Apocalypse until the Reformation.

64. In the Greek church during the last noticed period opinions were much in the same state as in the fourth century. On one side we find rejection of the book, at the least from public ecclesiastical use: on the other, unsuspecting reception of it as a genuine work of the Apostle John. Neither side takes any pains to justify its view critically, but simply conforms to local ecclesiastical usage. Cyril of Alexandria, de Adorat. vi. vol. i. p. 188, says, *τὸ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως βιβλίον ἡμῖν συντιθεὶς ὁ σοφὸς Ἰωάννης, ὃ καὶ ταῖς τῶν πατέρων τετίμηται ψήφοις.* The very expression here, it is true, betrays consciousness of the existence of doubts, which however do not affect his confidence, nor that of his contemporaries Nilus and Isidore of Pelusium[3].

65. At Antioch, however, the opinion in cent. v. seems to have been different. Its greatest Father of this period, Theodore of Mopsuestia (+ 429), never cites the Apocalypse in his extant writings and fragments, even where we might have certainly expected it. In the fragments of his expositions of the N. T. we have no allusion to it, even when on 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxvi. pp. 933 ff.) he speaks of Antichrist and of the second Advent; nor again in his Commentary on the twelve prophets. Opponent as he was of the allegorical method of interpretation, he may have been withheld from receiving the Apocalypse by consciousness that no other mode would suit it: or he may have followed the older practice of the Syrian church, and the canon of the Laodicean Synod. Still, he rejected the Epistle of James, which both these recognized: and Lücke thinks he may have rejected the Apocalypse from the decision of his own judgment, helped by his disinclination to the book, and the existing doubt about its canonicity: being one of those who, like Luther in later times, "den Kanon im Kanon suchten und fanden."

66. Theodoret (bishop of Cyrus, + 457) alludes two or three times to the book in his Dialogues on the Trinity (iii. 12) and on the Holy Ghost (i. 18, printed by Migne among the works of Athanasius, vol. iv. pp. 447, 485): but on 2 Thess. ii. and on Heb. xii. 22, he leaves it unnoticed, as also in his Commentary on Daniel. On Ps. lxxxvi. 2, vol. i. p. 1217, he seems to aim at describing the heavenly Jerusalem in contrast to the apocalyptic description. In speaking (hæret. fabb. lib. ii. 3, vol. iv. p. 329 f.) of Cerinthus, and (lib. iii. 1, 2, 6, pp. 340 f., 346 ff.) of the Nicolaitans, the Montanists, and even of the chiliast Nepos and his antagonist Dionysius of Alexandria, he says not a word of the

[3] Nilus de Orat. 75, 76, p. 494 f. Isidor. Pel. Epp. i. 13, 188, pp. 4, 56; ii. 175, p. 208 (*λέων κέκληται ὁ χριστός*).

Apocalypse. Only in his Dialogus Immutabilis (vol. iv. p. 59) he once names it, and adduces ch. i. 9 with the formula Ἰωάννης φησίν : but then it is in citing from Athanasius.

67. After this, in the sixth century, the Syrian churches were divided on the matter. The Nestorians rejected the Apocalypse, following Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Peschito : the Monophysites received it, following the Alexandrians, and Hippolytus, and Ephrem Syrus. See Lücke, pp. 644, 5, who thinks from certain indications that even among them it was not in ecclesiastical, but only in theological use.

68. In the Greek church in Asia Minor, we have Andreas, of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the writer of the first entire and connected Commentary on the Apocalypse. He fully and earnestly recognizes its genuineness and inspiration, and (see above, par. 32) appeals to the testimony of the ancients to bear him out : mentioning by name Papias, Irenæus, Methodius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Gregory Theologus (of Nazianzum). It is perhaps hardly fair in Lücke to infer that, because he names so few, more might not have been adduced : hardly fair again to conclude that, because he promises to use their writings in his Commentary, and has not expressly cited them, he did not so use them, or was himself one of the first who explained the book.

69. Arethas, who followed Andreas[4] in his see, and in his work of commenting on the Apocalypse, repeats in his prologue the scholium of Andreas on the Inspiration of the book, adding the authority of Basil the Great. But we are now approaching a time when, as Lücke remarks, it is really of small import who used the book and who did not, who regarded it as the work of the Apostle, and who did not. Still, a few facts stand out from the general mass, which may be useful as indications, or at all events have a claim to our attention.

70. Such is the fact of the omission of all reference to the Apocalypse in the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes in cent. vi. In his Topogr. Christiana, book vii. (in Migne, Patr. vol. lxxxviii.), he treats of the duration of the heavens according to Scripture, and Lücke thinks must of necessity have cited the book had it been in his canon. Still, he uses the Festal Epistle of Athanasius, in which it is expressly included in the Canon.

71. The second canon of the Trullian, or Quinisextan council, sanctions on the one hand the canon of the Laodicean council and that of the eighty-five apostolical canons, both which omit the Apocalypse, and on the other that of the African Synods of the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, which include it. Various conjectures

[4] At what interval, is uncertain. Some place him as early as 540 : others, not till the 10th century. See Lücke, p. 647, note.

have been made as to the account to be given of this (see Lücke, pp. 648, 9). The desire to leave the question open (Lücke) can hardly have been the cause. We may safely leave such evidence to correct itself.

72. The list may be closed with one or two notices from later centuries, shewing that the doubts were not altogether forgotten, though generally given up.

Nicephorus (beginning of cent. ix.), in his Chronographia brevis, p. 1057, Migne, reckons only twenty-six books of the N. T., and does not mention the Apocalypse either in the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* or in the *ἀπόκρυφα*.

73. A prologue to the book in the cursive codex 64 (cent. x. or beginning of xi.), after defending its canonicity and apostolic origin, apologizes thus for the ancient Fathers not mentioning it among the books to be openly read in church: *περὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἦν αὐτοῖς ἡ σπουδή, καὶ πρὸς τὰ κατεπείγοντα ἵσταντο, ταύτην μὴ ἐγκρίνοντες αὐτοῖς, ἢ διὰ τὸ μερικῶς μὴ ἐκτίθεσθαι αὐτούς, ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀσαφὲς αὐτῆς καὶ δυσέφικτον καὶ ὀλίγοις διαλαμβανόμενον καὶ νοούμενον, ἄλλως τε οἶμαι διὰ τὸ μηδὲ συμφέρον εἶναι τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ βάθη ἐρευνᾷν, μηδὲ λυσιτελές.*

74. In the prooemium given in Cramer's Catena to the extracts from the comments of Œcumenius (cent. xi.), p. 173, the canonicity of the book is strongly asserted, and its being *μύησις τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος ἀνακλίσεως τῆς ὑπερθέου σοφίας τοῦ ἠγαπημένου*, and not *τῶν νόθων, ὥς τινὲς πλάνῳ συγκροτούμενοι πνεύματι ἐληρώδησαν.* For this, the writer refers to Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Methodius, Cyril, and Hippolytus: and then says *οὐκ ἂν τοιούτοις καὶ τοσούτοις ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο δόκουν, εἰ μὴ τὸ μέτριον αὐτῷ ᾔδεσαν σπουδαζόμενον.*

75. In the Church History of Nicephorus Callistus (cent. xiv.), he treats it (ii. 42) as an acknowledged fact that the Apostle John, when in exile in Patmos under Domitian, wrote his Gospel and his *ἱερὸν καὶ ἔνθεον ἀποκάλυψιν*. Still, when enumerating the books of the canon in ii. 46, partly from Eusebius, he says summarily of the Apocalypse, that *τινὲς ἐφαντάσθησαν* that it was the work of John the Presbyter.

76. It will be well to review the course and character of the evidence from antiquity. As we have before noticed, so again we may observe, that throughout, we have results here in marked contrast to those of our enquiry regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews. In that case there was a total lack of any fixed general tradition in the earliest times. Gradually, the force and convenience of an illustrious name being attached to the Epistle bore down the doubts originally resting on its authorship, and the Pauline origin became every where acquiesced in. Nothing could be more different from the history of the doubts about the authorship of the Apocalypse. Here we have a fixed and thoroughly authenticated primitive tradition. It comes from men only removed by one step from the Apostle John himself. There is absolutely *no objective*

evidence whatever in favour of any other author. The doubts first originate in considerations purely subjective.

77. These are divisible into two classes, *anti-chiliastic* and *critical*. It was convenient to depreciate the book, on controversial grounds. It was found advisable not to read it in the churches, and to forbid it to the young scholar. And, as matter of fact, thus it was that the doubts about the authorship sprung up. If it countenanced error, if it was not in the canon, if it was not fit to be read, then it would not be the work of the Evangelist and Apostle.

78. Again, to the same result contributed the critical grounds so ably urged by Dionysius of Alexandria and observed upon above, par. 50. I have there remarked, not only how absolutely shadowy and nothing-worth is Dionysius's *οἶμαι* that John the Presbyter wrote the book, but how this very word is most valuable, as denoting the entire absence of all objective tradition to that effect in the middle of the third century.

79. Thus the doubts grew up, and in certain parts of the church, prevailed : the whole process being exactly the converse of that which we traced in our Prolegomena to the Hebrews.

80. And, as far as the force of ancient testimony goes, I submit that our inference also must be a contrary one. The authorship of the book by the Apostle John, as matter of primitive tradition, rests on firm and irrefragable ground. Three other authors are suggested: one, Cerinthus, by the avowed enemies of the Apocalypse,—an assertion which has never found any favour: the second, John the Presbyter, whose existence *seems* indeed vouched for by the passage of Papias, but of whom we know nothing whatever, nor have we one particle of evidence to connect him with the authorship of the Apocalypse: and the third John Mark the Evangelist, who is equally unknown to ancient tradition as its author.

81. As far then as purely external evidence goes, I submit that our judgment can only be in one direction: viz. that the Apocalypse *was written by the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee.*

82. It will now be for us to see how far internal critical considerations substantiate or impugn the tradition of the primitive church.

83. And in so doing, it will be well for us at once to deal with certain confident assertions which Lücke and others are in the habit of making respecting the testimony of the Apocalypse itself.

84. Lücke begins this portion of his Introduction by setting aside at once the evidence of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, on the ground of supposed inconsistency with the "Selbstzeugniss" of the writer himself;—he cannot be the Apostle and Evangelist, "because he plainly distinguishes himself from the Apostles;"—referring back to a previous section for the confirmation of this assertion. On looking there, we

find "in ch. xxi. 14, in describing the heavenly Jerusalem, he speaks expressly of the twelve Apostles of Christ and their names on the twelve foundation stones of the celestial city, but apparently in such a manner as not in any way to include himself among them, but rather to exclude himself from them, and to speak of them as a higher and special class of servants and messengers of God."

85. Now let the reader observe that the "apparently" ("augenscheinlich") of the former section has become "plainly" ("deutlich") in the latter: for it is thus that even the best of the Germans are often apt to creep on, and to build up a whole fabric of argument upon an inference which at first was to themselves merely an uncertainty.

86. In this particular case, the original assertion has in fact no ground to rest upon. The apocalyptic writer is simply describing the heavenly city as it was shewn to him. On the foundations are the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. Now we may fairly ask, What reason can be given, why the beloved Apostle should not have related this? Was he who, with his brother James, sought for the highest place of honour in the future kingdom, likely to have depreciated the apostolic dignity just because he himself was one of the Twelve? and on the other hand, was he whose personal modesty was as notable as his apostolic zeal, likely, in relating such high honour done to the Twelve, to insert a notice providing against the possible mistake being made of not counting himself among them?

87. So that the first tentative introduction, and the very confident after-assertion, of this testimony of the book itself, are alike groundless. A similar instance will be found below, when we come to discuss the time and place of writing, of confident assertion respecting two supposed notices of date contained in the book itself. They turn out to be altogether dependent for their relevancy on a particular method of interpretation, not borne out by fair exegesis.

88. The notices contained in the Apocalypse respecting its writer may be stated as follows·

First, his name is John, ch. i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8.

89. Secondly, he was known to, and of account among, the churches of proconsular Asia.

90. Thirdly, he was in exile (for so we submit must the words of ch. i. 9 be understood: see note there) in the island of Patmos on account of his Christian testimony.

We may add to these personal notices, that he takes especial pains to assert the accuracy of his testimony, both in the beginning and at the end of his book: ch. i. 2, xxii. 8.

91. Now thus far we have nothing which goes against the ecclesiastical tradition that he was the Apostle and Evangelist John. In

the latter part of his life, this Apostle was thus connected with proconsular Asia, long residing, and ultimately dying at Ephesus: see Prolegomena to Vol. I., ch. v. § i. 9 ff. It is impossible to reject this concurrent testimony of Christian antiquity: nor have even those done so, whose doubts on the Apocalypse are the strongest.

92. Again, the exile of the Apostle John in Patmos under Domitian is matter of primitive tradition, apparently distinct from the notice contained in the Apocalypse: for his return from it under Nerva, of which no notice is contained in that book, is stated as such by Eusebius: *τότε* (when the senate after Domitian's death decreed that the unjustly exiled should return to their homes) *δὴ οὖν καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰωάννην ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον φυγῆς τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐφέσου διατριβὴν ἀπειληφέναι, ὁ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαίων παραδίδωσι λόγος*, H. E. iii. 20. And again, ib. 23, *ἐπὶ τούτοις κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἔτι τῷ βίῳ περιλειπόμενος αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπόστολος ὁμοῦ καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ἰωάννης τὰς αὐτόθι διεῖπεν ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανοῦ τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς.*

93. Equally definite is the tradition, that St. John lived on among the Asiatic churches till the time of Trajan: see Prolegg. Vol. I., ut supra.

94. It is worth while just to pause by the way, and consider, in what situation we are placed by these traditions. To reject them altogether would be out of all reason: and this is not done by Lücke himself. So that we must either suppose that portion of them which regards the exile to have found its way in, owing to the notice of Rev. i. 9, or to have been, independently of that notice, the result of a confusion in men's minds between two persons of the same name, John. Either of these is undoubtedly *possible:* but it is their *probability*, in the face of other evidence, which we have to estimate.

95. We may safely ask then, was either of these mistakes at all likely to have been made by Irenæus, who could write as follows: *ὥςτε με δύνασθαι εἰπεῖν καὶ τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ καθεζόμενος διελέγετο ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος, καὶ τὰς προόδους αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς εἰσόδους καὶ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ βίου καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἰδέαν καὶ τὰς διαλέξεις ἃς ἐποιεῖτο πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννου συναναστροφὴν ὡς ἀπήγγειλε, καὶ τὴν τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν ἑωρακότων τὸν κύριον, καὶ ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευε τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν.* I own it seems to me out of all probability that such a writer, in ascribing the Apocalypse to John the Apostle, could have confused him with another person of the same name. If we ever have trustworthy personal tradition, it is surely when it mounts up to those who saw and conversed with him respecting whom we wish to be informed.

96. It may be said indeed, that Irenæus does not mention the exile in Patmos. But this would be mere trifling: he does not, simply because he had no occasion to do so: but his own date of the seeing of

the Apocalypse, at the end of the reign of Domitian (see above, par. 7), would, in combination with other notices, be sufficient to imply it: and besides, he admits it by inference from his unhesitatingly adopting the book as written by the Apostle.

97. It seems then to me that the course of primitive tradition, even among those who did not believe the Apocalypse to have been written by the Apostle, asserts of him that he was exiled in Patmos under Domitian: and that we have no reasonable ground for supposing this view to have arisen from any confusion of persons, or to have been adopted merely from the book itself. Persons are appealed to, who knew and saw and heard the Apostle himself: and those who thus appeal were not likely to have made a mistake in a point of such vital importance.

98. We now come to a weighty and difficult part of our present enquiry: how far the matter and style of the Apocalypse bear out this result of primitive tradition. The reader will have seen, by the previous chapters of these Prolegomena, that I am very far from deprecating, or depreciating, such a course of criticism. I do not, as some of those who have upheld against all criticism the commonly received views, characterize such an enquiry as presumptuous, or its results as uncertain and vague. It is one which the soundest and best critics of all ages have followed, from Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria down to Bleek and Lücke: and, as I have elsewhere observed, is one which will be more esteemed in proportion as biblical science is spread and deepened.

99. In applying it to the book before us, certainly the upholder of the primitive tradition of its Authorship is not encouraged by first appearances. He is met at once by the startling phænomena so ably detailed by Dionysius of Alexandria at the end of his judgment (above, par. 48). The Greek construction of the Gospel and Epistle[5], though peculiar, is smooth and unexceptionable, free from any thing like barbarism or solœcism in grammar: *οὐ μόνον ἀπταίστως κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων φωνήν*, says Dionysius, *ἀλλὰ καὶ λογιώτατα ταῖς λέξεσι, τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς, ταῖς συντάξεσι τῆς ἑρμηνείας γέγραπται.* When however we come to compare that of the Writer of the Apocalypse, we find, at first sight, all this reversed: *διάλεκτον καὶ γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἑλληνίζουσαν αὐτοῦ βλέπω, ἀλλ᾽ ἰδιώμασι μὲν βαρβαρικοῖς χρώμενον, καί που καὶ σολοικίζοντα.*

100. All this must be freely acknowledged, and is abundantly exemplified in the following Commentary. The question for us however is

[5] I speak in the course of this argument of the first Epistle only, as undoubted; not that I do not believe the second and third to be genuine and characteristic also. See above, chap. vi. § i.

one which lies deeper than the surface, and beyond mere first appearances. It presents itself to us in a double form:

1) Is there any account which might be given of this great dissimilarity, consistent with identity of Authorship?

2) Are there any indications of that identity lying beneath the surface, notwithstanding this great dissimilarity?

101. In reply to the first question, several thoughts at once suggest themselves as claiming mention and contributing to its solution. The *subject* of the Apocalypse is so different from those of the Gospel and Epistle, that we may well expect a not inconsiderable difference of style. In those, the Writer is, under divine guidance, calmly arranging his material, in full self-consciousness, and deliberately putting forth the product, in words, of his own reflectiveness: in this, on the other hand, he is the rapt seer, borne along from vision to vision, speaking in a region and character totally different[e]. Is this circumstance any contribution to our reply? Let us consider further.

102. St. John was not a Greek, but a Galilean. To speak a certain kind of Greek was probably natural to him, as to almost all the inhabitants of Palestine of his time. But to write the Greek of his Gospel and Epistle, can hardly but have been to him matter of effort. Or to put it in another point of view, the diction and form in which they were conveyed were the result of a deliberate exercise of a special gift of the Spirit, matured by practice, and deemed necessary for the purpose of those writings, to be put forth in them.

103. In the Apocalypse, the case may be conceived to have been different. The necessarily rhapsodical and mysterious character of that book may have led to the Apostle being left more to his vernacular and less correct Greek. Circumstances too may have contributed to this. The visions may have been set down in the solitude of exile, far from friends, and perhaps from the appliances of civilized life. The Hebraistic style may have come more naturally in a writing so fashioned on Old Testament models, and bound by so many links to the prophecies of Hebrew prophets. The style too of advanced age may have dropped the careful elaboration of the preceding years, and resumed the rougher character of early youth.

104. I do not say that these considerations are enough to account for the great diversity which is presented: nay, I fairly own, that taken alone, they are not: and that the difficulty has never yet been thoroughly solved. Still I do not conceive that we are at liberty to cut the knot by denying the Apostolic Authorship, which primitive tradition has

[e] Since writing this I see in Davidson's Introduction, p. 587, "As Guerike has well expressed it (Einleitung, p. 559), the Gospel was conceived and written ἐν τῷ νοΐ, in the understanding: but the Apocalypse ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, in the Spirit."

so firmly established. Far better is it to investigate patiently, and not, by blind partisanship on either side, to stop the way against unfettered search for a better account of the phænomena than has hitherto been given.

105. It has been shewn more than once, and in our own country by Dr. Davidson in his Introduction, pp. 561 ff., that the roughnesses and solœcisms in the Apocalypse have been, for the purposes of argument, very much exaggerated: that there are hardly any which may not be paralleled in classical authors themselves, and that their more frequent occurrence here is no more than is due to the peculiar nature of the subject and occasion. This consideration should be borne in mind, and the matter investigated by the student for himself.

106. Our second question asked above was, whether there are any marks of identity of Authorship linking together the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse, notwithstanding this great and evident dissimilarity?

107. The individual character of the Writer of the Gospel and Epistle stands forth evident and undoubted. We seem to know him in a moment. Even in the report of sayings of our Lord common to him and the other Evangelists, the peculiar tinge of expression, the choice and collocation of words, leave no doubt *whose* report we are reading. And so strongly does the Epistle resemble the Gospel in these particulars, that the criticism as well as the tradition of all ages has concurred in ascribing the two to the same person.

108. If now we look at the Apocalypse, we cannot for a moment feel that it is less individual, less reflecting the heart and character of its Writer. Its style, its manner of conception and arrangement of thought, its diction, are alike full of life and personal reality. So that our conditions for making this enquiry are favourable. Our two objects of comparison stand out well the one over against the other. Both are peculiar, characteristic, individual. But are the indications presented by them such that we are compelled to infer different authorship, or are they such as seem to point to one and the same person?

109. The former of these questions has been affirmed by Lücke and the opponents of the Apostolic authorship: the latter by Hengstenberg and those who uphold it. Let us see how the matter stands. And in so doing (as was the case in the similar enquiry in the Prolegomena to the Epistle to the Hebrews), I shall not enter fully into the whole list of verbal and constructional peculiarities, but, referring the reader for these to Lücke and Davidson, shall adduce, and dwell upon, some of the more remarkable and suggestive of them.

110. The first of these is one undeniably connecting the Apocalypse with the Gospel and the Epistle, viz. the appellation ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ given to our Lord in ch. xix. 13 (see John i. 1; 1 John i. 1). This

name ὁ λόγος for our Lord is found in the N. T., only in the writings of St. John. I am aware of the ingenuity with which Lücke (p. 679) has endeavoured to turn this expression to the contrary account, maintaining that it is a proof of diversity of authorship, inasmuch as the Evangelist never writes ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ: but I may leave it to any fair-judging reader to decide, whether it be not a far greater argument for identity that the remarkable designation ὁ λόγος is used, than for diversity that, on the solemn occasion described in the Apocalypse, the hitherto unheard adjunct τοῦ θεοῦ is added.

111. Another reply may be given to our deduction from the use of this name: viz. that it indicates not necessarily John the Apostle, but only one familiar with his teaching, as we may suppose that other John to have been. All I can say to this is, that which I cannot help feeling to apply to the whole hypothesis of the authorship by the second John, that if it be so,—if one bearing the same name as the Apostle, having the same place among the Asiatic churches, put forth a book in which he also used the Apostle's peculiar phrases, and yet took no pains to prevent the confusion which must necessarily arise between himself and the Apostle, I do not well see how the advocates of his authorship can help pronouncing the book a forgery, or at all events the work of one who, in relating the visions, was not unwilling to be taken for his greater and Apostolic namesake.

112. Another link, binding the Apocalypse to both Gospel and Epistle, is the use of ὁ νικῶν, in the Epistles to the churches, ch. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26, iii. 5, 12, 21(bis): and in ch. xii. 11, xv. 2, xvii. 14, xxi. 7. Compare John xvi. 33; 1 John ii. 13, 14, iv. 4, v. 4(bis), 5. It is amusing to observe again how dexterously Lücke turns the edge of this. ὁ νικῶν is never used *absolutely* in Gospel or in Epistle, as it is in the Apocalypse: therefore it again is a mark of diversity, not of identity. But surely this is the very thing we might expect. The νικᾷν τὸν κόσμον, τὸν πονηρόν, αὐτούς, &c.,—these are the details, and come under notice while the strife is proceeding, or when the object is of more import than the bare act: but when the *end* is spoken of, and the final and general victory is all that remains in view, nothing can be more natural than that he who alone spoke of νικᾷν τὸν κόσμον, τὸν πονηρόν, αὐτούς,—should also be the only one to designate the victor by ὁ νικῶν. Besides which, we have also the other use, in Rev. xii. 11, xvii. 14.

113. A third remarkable word, ἀληθινός, is once used by St. Luke (Luke xvi. 11), once by St. Paul (1 Thess. i. 9), and three times in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. viii. 2, ix. 24, x. 22): but nine times in the Gospel of St. John[7], four times in the Epistle[8], and ten times in

[7] John i. 9, iv. 23, 37, vi. 32, vii. 28, viii. 16, xv. 1, xvii. 3, xix. 35.

[8] 1 John ii. 8, v. 20(3ce).

the Apocalypse[9]. Here again, it is true, Lücke adduces this on the other side, alleging that while the Evangelist uses the word only in the sense of *genuine*—ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἀληθινός,—the Author of the Apocalypse uses it of Christ as a synonym with πιστός, δίκαιος, ἅγιος, and as a predicate of the λόγοι, κρίσεις, ὁδοί of God. This latter is true enough; but the former assertion is singularly untrue. For in three out of the nine places in the Gospel, the subjective sense of ἀληθινός must be taken: viz. in iv. 37, viii. 16, xix. 35: and in the last of these, ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, the word is used exactly as in Rev. xxii. 6, οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί.

114. The word ἀρνίον, which designates our Lord 29 times in the Apocalypse, only elsewhere occurs in John xxi. 15, not with reference to Him. But it is remarkable that John i. 29, 36 are the only places where he is called by the name of a lamb, the word ἀμνός being used, in reference doubtless to Isa. liii. 7 (Acts viii. 32), as in one other place where He is *compared* to a lamb, 1 Pet. i. 19. The Apocalyptic writer, as Lücke observes, probably chooses the diminutive, and attaches to it the epithet ἐσφαγμένον, for the purpose of contrast to the majesty and power which he has also to predicate of Christ: but is it not to be taken into account, that this personal name, *the Lamb*, whether ἀμνὸς or ἀρνίον, whether with or without τοῦ θεοῦ, is common only to the two books?

115. To these many minor examples might be added, and will be found treated at length in Lücke, p. 669 ff., Davidson, p. 561 ff.[1] The latter writer has succeeded in many cases in shewing the unfairness of Lücke's strong partisanship, by which he makes every similarity into a dissimilarity: but on the other hand he on his side has gone perhaps too far in attempting to answer every objection of this kind. After all, while there certainly are weighty indications of identity of authorship, there is also a residuum of phænomena of diversity quite enough for the reasonable support of the contrary hypothesis. If the book stood alone in the matter of evidence, I own I should be quite at a loss how to sub-

[9] ch. iii. 7, 14, vi. 10, xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 2, 9, 11, xxi. 5, xxii. 6.

[1] I have observed the following which I have not seen elsewhere noticed, occurring *only* in the three books, or *only in the peculiar sense*:—

1. *οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι*, John xvi. 12
   οὐ δύνῃ βαστάσαι κακούς, Rev. ii. 2.
2. *κεκοπιακὼς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας*, John iv. 6.
   οὐ κεκοπίακες, Rev. ii. 3.
3. *δύο ἀγγέλους ἐν λευκοῖς* . . . John xx. 12.
   περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, Rev. iii. 4.
4. The verb *κεῖμαι* used of *mere position*, John ii. 6, xix. 29, xx. 5, 6, xxi. 9; Rev. iv. 2 only.
5. *ὄνομα αὐτῷ*, John i. 6, iii. 1 (xviii. 10); Rev. vi. 8, ix. 11.
6. Compare Rev. iii. 18 with 1 John ii. 20, 27, as to the χρίσμα and its effects.

stantiate identity of authorship between it and the Gospel and Epistle. But as it is our main reliance is on the concurrent testimony of primitive tradition, which hardly can be stronger than it is, and which the perfectly gratuitous hypothesis respecting a second John as the author entirely fails to shake.

116. Our question respecting the internal evidence furnished by the book itself is thus in a position entirely different from that which it occupied in the Prolegomena to the Epistle to the Hebrews. There, we had no primitive tradition so general, or of such authority as to command our assent. The question was perfectly open. The authorship by St. Paul was an opinion at first tentatively and partially held: then as time wore on, acquiring consistency and acceptance. Judging of this by the book itself, is it for us to accept or to reject it? In lack of any worthy external evidence, we were thrown back on this as our main material for a judgment.

117. But with regard to the Apocalypse, external and internal evidence have changed places. The former is now the main material for our judgment. It is of the highest and most satisfactory kind. It was unanimous in very early times. It came from those who knew and had heard St. John himself. It only begins to be impugned by those who had doctrinal objections to the book. The doubt was taken up by more reasonable men on internal and critical grounds. But no real substantive counter-claimant was ever produced : only one whose very existence depended on the report of two tombs bearing the name of John, and on a not very perspicuous passage of Papias.

118. This being so, our inquiry has necessarily taken this shape :—*Is the book itself inconsistent with this apparently irrefragable testimony?* And in replying to it we have confessed that the differences between it and the Gospel and Epistle are very remarkable, and of a character hitherto unexplained, or not fully accounted for: but that there are at the same time striking notes of similarity in expression and cast of thought: and that perhaps we are not in a position to take into account the effect of a totally different subject and totally different circumstances upon one, who though knowing and speaking Greek, was yet a Hebrew by birth.

119. Thus, all things considered, being it is true far from satisfied with any account at present given of the peculiar style and phænomena of the Apocalypse, but being far less satisfied with the procedure of the antagonists of the Apostolic authorship, we are not prepared to withhold our assent from the firm and unshaken testimony of primitive tradition, that the author was the Apostle and Evangelist St. John.

SECTION II.

PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

1. The enquiry as to the former of these is narrowed within a very small space. From the notice contained in the book itself (ch. i. 9) the writing must have taken place either in Patmos, or after the return from exile. The past tenses, ἐμαρτύρησεν in ch. i. 2, and ἐγενόμην in i. 9, do not decide for the latter alternative; they may both be used as from the point of time when the book should be read, as is common in all narratives. On the other hand, it would be more probable ab extra, that the writing should take place after the return, especially if we are to credit the account given by Victorinus, that St. John was condemned to the mines in Patmos. We have no means of determining the question, and must leave it in doubt. If the style and peculiarities are to be in any degree attributed to outward circumstances, then it would seem to have been written in solitude, and sent from Patmos to the Asiatic churches.

2. The only traditional notice worth recounting is that given by Victorinus: on Rev. x. 11, Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. v. p. 333: where he relates that John *saw* the Apocalypse in Patmos, and then after his release on the death of Domitian, "postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Deo Apocalypsin." Arethas indeed says on Rev. vii., ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐχρησμῳδεῖτο ταῦτα ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ τῇ κατ' Ἔφεσον: but this is too late to be of any account in the matter.

3. It has been remarked[a], that the circumstance of John having prepared to write down the voices of the seven thunders, Rev. x. 4, appears to sanction the view that the writing took place at the same time with the seeing of the visions.

4. As regards Patmos itself, it is one of the group called the Sporades, to the S. of Samos (Pliny, iv. 23. Strabo, x. p. 488. Thucyd. iii. 23). It is about thirty Roman miles in circumference. A cave is still shewn in the island (now *Patmo*) where St. John is said to have seen the Apocalypse. See Winer's Realwörterbuch, and the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography.

5. With regard however to the *time* of writing, there has been no small controversy. And at this we need not be surprised, seeing that principles of interpretation are involved.

We will first deal with ancient tradition as far as it gives us any indication as to the date.

6. Irenæus, v. 30. 3, p. 330, in a passage already cited (§ i. par. 7),

[a] Stuart, p. 215.

tells us that the Apocalypse (for such is the only legitimate understanding of the construction) ἑωράθη . . . σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.

7. Clement of Alexandria (Quis dives salvus, § 42, p. 949 P., cited also by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 23), says ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἔφεσον, κ.τ.λ. This passage, it is true, contains no mention who the tyrant was, nor any allusion to the writing of the Apocalypse: but it is interesting for our present enquiry as shewing, in its citation by Eusebius, how *he* understood the date furnished by it. For he introduces it by saying that St. John τὰς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν διεῖπεν ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανου τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς, and cites Clement as one of the witnesses of the fact.

8. Origen merely calls St. John's persecutor ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεύς, without specifying which. And he seems to do this wittingly: for he notices that John himself does not mention who condemned him. See the passage quoted above, § i. par. 12.

9. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 18, having cited the passage of Irenæus noticed above, says οἵ γε καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπ' ἀκριβὲς ἐπεσημήναντο ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ Δομετιανοῦ, μετὰ πλειόνων ἑτέρων καὶ Φλαβίαν Δομετίλλαν ἱστορήσαντες, ἐξ ἀδελφῆς γεγονυῖαν Φλαβίου Κλήμεντος, ἑνὸς τῶν τηνικάδε ἐπὶ Ῥώμης δυνατῶν, τῆς εἰς χριστὸν μαρτυρίας ἕνεκεν εἰς νῆσον Ποντίαν κατὰ τιμωρίαν δεδόσθαι. And this same statement he repeats in his Chronicon, A.D. 95, vol. i. p. 551 f., Migne. In H. E. iii. 20 he gives the account of the return of St. John from Patmos in the beginning of Nerva's reign, cited above, § i. par. 92.

10. Tertullian does not appear quite to bear out Eusebius's understanding of him, H. E. iii. 20: for he only says, Apol. c. 5, vol. i. p. 293 f., after mentioning the persecution of Nero, "Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate: sed qua et homo, facile cœptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat." Here he certainly makes Domitian himself recall the exiles.

11. Victorinus, in the passage above referred to ("quando hoc vidit Johannes, erat in insula Patmos, in metallum damnatus a Domitiano Cæsare"), and afterwards ("Johannes, de metallo dimissus, sic postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Deo apocalypsin"), plainly gives the date: as also in another place, p. 338: "Intelligi oportet tempus quo scripta apocalypsis edita est, quoniam tunc erat Cæsar Domitianus . . . . unus exstat sub quo scripta est apocalypsis, Domitianus scilicet."

12. Jerome (de Vir. illustr. 9, vol. ii. p. 845) says, "quarto decimo anno secundam post Neronem persecutionem movente Domitiano in Patmos insulam relegatus scripsit apocalypsin . . . . interfecto autem Domitiano et actis ejus ob nimiam crudelitatem a Senatu rescissis sub

Nerva principe redit Ephesum." So also his testimony above, § i. par. 25.

13. So also Sulpicius Severus and Orosius, and later writers generally. The first who breaks in upon this concurrent tradition is Epiphanius, Hær. li., in two very curious passages: the first where he says c. 12, vol. i. p. 433 f., ὕστερον ἀναγκάζει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τὸν Ἰωάννην παραιτούμενον εὐαγγελίσασθαι δι' εὐλάβειαν καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ γηραλέᾳ αὐτοῦ ἡλικίᾳ, μετὰ ἔτη ἐνενήκοντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς, μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου ἐπάνοδον, τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου γενομένην Καίσαρος: the other, c. 33, p. 456, αὐτοῦ δὲ προφητεύσαντος ἐν χρόνοις Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος ἀνωτάτω, ὅτε εἰς τὴν Πάτμον νῆσον ὑπῆρξεν . . . .

14. Now it is plain that there must be some strange blunder here, which Lücke, who makes much of Epiphanius's testimony as shewing that the tradition, which he calls the Irenæan, was not received by Epiphanius, entirely, and conveniently, omits to notice. The passage evidently sets the return from exile in the extreme old age of St. John. To say that a considerable interval may be supposed to elapse between the ἐπάνοδος and his ninetieth year, would be mere trifling with the context. Now if this is so, seeing that Claudius reigned from 41 to 54 A.D., putting the return from exile at the last of these dates, we should have St. John aged ninety in the year 54: in other words, thirty-three years older than our Lord, and sixty-three at least when called to be an Apostle: a result which is at variance with all ancient tradition whatever. Either Epiphanius has fallen into some great mistake, which is not very probable, or he means by Claudius some other Emperor: if Nero, then he would still be wrong as to St. John's age at or near to his return.

15. The testimony of Muratori's fragment on the Canon has been cited (by Stuart, p. 218) as testifying to an early date. But all it says is this: "Ipse beatus Apostolus Paulus sequens prædecessoris sui Johannis ordinem, nomine nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat ordine tali." And the word *prædecessoris*, as has been pointed out by Credner, merely seems to mean that St. John was an Apostle before St. Paul, not that he wrote his seven epistles before St. Paul wrote his.

16. The preface to the Syriac version of the Apocalypse published by De Dieu, supposed to have been made in the 6th century, says that the visions were seen by St. John in the island of Patmos, "in quam a Nerone Cæsare relegatus fuerat."

17. Theophylact, in his preface to the Gospel of St. John, vol. i. p. 504, says that *it* was written in the island of Patmos, thirty-two years after the Ascension: and in so saying, places the exile under Nero. But he clearly is wrong, as Lücke remarks, or his meaning not clearly understood, when he attributes the writing of the Gospel to this time: and

moreover he is inconsistent with himself: for in commenting on Matt. xx. 23, vol. i. p. 107, he remarks that as Herod put to death the Apostle James the greater, so Trajan condemned John as a martyr to the word of truth.

18. Jerome, adv. Jovin. i. 26, vol. ii. p. 280, determines nothing, only citing Tertullian, "Refert autem Tertullianus quod a Nerone (for "a Nerone," Migne reads "Romæ") missus in ferventis olei dolium purior et vegetior exiverit quam intraverit." But Tertullian only says, if at least De præscript. Hæret. c. 36, vol. ii. p. 49, be the place referred to, "Felix ecclesia (Romana) . . . . . ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Johannis (scil. baptistæ) exitu coronatur, ubi Apostolus Joannes posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur." It surely is stretching a point here to say that he implies all three events to have taken place under Nero.

19. The author of the "Synopsis de vita et morte prophetarum, apostolorum et discipulorum Domini" (ostensibly Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, so cited in Theophylact, vol. i. p. 500: but probably it belongs to the 6th century), makes John to be exiled to Patmos by Trajan. Andreas and Arethas give no decided testimony on the point. Arethas, in commenting on Rev. vi. 12, says, that some applied this prophecy to the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian: but this is distinctly repudiated by Andreas: allowing however (on vii. 2) that such things did happen to the Jewish Christians who escaped the evils inflicted on Jerusalem by the Romans, yet they more probably refer to the times of Antichrist. Arethas again, on Rev. i. 9, cites without any protest Eusebius, as asserting St. John's exile in Patmos to have taken place under Domitian.

20. Much more evidence on this subject from other later writers whose testimonies are of less consequence,—and more minute discussion of the earlier testimonies, will be found in Elliott, Horæ Apocalypticæ, i. pp. 31—46, and Appendix, No. i. pp. 503—517. In the last mentioned, he has gone well and carefully through the arguments on external evidence adduced by Lücke and Stuart for the writing under Galba and Nero respectively, and, as it seems to me, disposed of them all.

21. Our result, as far as this part of the question is considered, may be thus stated. We have a constant and unswerving primitive tradition that St. John's exile took place, and the Apocalypse was written, towards the end of Domitian's reign. With this tradition, as has been often observed, the circumstances seem to agree very well. We have no evidence that the first, or Neronic, persecution, extended beyond Rome, or found vent in condemnations to exile. Whereas in regard to the second we know that both these were the case. Indeed the liberation at Domitian's death of those whom he had exiled is substantiated by Dio Cassius, who, in relating the beginning of Nerva's reign, lib. lxviii. 1,

says, μίσει δὲ τοῦ Δομετιανοῦ αἱ εἰκόνες αὐτοῦ . . . συνεχωνεύθησαν . . . . καὶ ὁ Νερούας τούς τε κρινομένους ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφῆκε, καὶ τοὺς φεύγοντας κατήγαγε . . . . τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἄλλοις οὔτ' ἀσεβείας, οὔτ' Ἰουδαικοῦ βίου καταιτιᾶσθαί τινας συνεχώρησε.

22. Assuming then the fact of St. John's exile at Patmos during a persecution for the Gospel's sake, it is far more likely that it should have been under Domitian than under Nero or under Galba. But one main reliance of the advocates of the earlier date is internal evidence supposed to be furnished by the book itself. And this, first, from the rough and Hebraistic style. I have already discussed this point, and have fully admitted its difficulty, however we view it. I need only add now, that I do not conceive we at all diminish that difficulty by supposing it to be written before the Gospel and Epistle. The Greek of the Gospel and Epistle is not the Greek of the Apocalypse in a maturer state: but if the two belong to one and the same writer, we must seek for the cause of their diversity not in chronological but rather in psychological considerations.

23. Again, it is said that the book furnishes indications of having been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, by the fact of its mentioning the city and the temple, ch. xi. 1 ff., and the twelve tribes as yet existing, ch. vii. 4—8. This argument has been very much insisted on by several of the modern German critics. But we may demur to it at once, as containing an assumption which we are not prepared to grant: viz. that the prophetic passage is to be thus interpreted, or has any thing to do with the literal Jerusalem. Let the canon of interpretation be first substantiated, by which we are to be bound in our understanding of this passage, and then we can recognize its bearing on the chronological question. Certainly Lücke has not done this, pp. 825 ff., but, as usual with him, has fallen to abusing Hengstenberg, for which he undoubtedly has a strong case, while for his own interpretation he seems to me to make out a very weak one.

24. Another such assumption is found in the confident assertion by the same critics, that the passages in ch. xiii. 1 ff., xvii. 10 point out the then reigning Cæsar, and that by the conditions of those passages, such reigning Cæsar must be that one who suits their chronological theory. It is not the place here to discuss principles of interpretation: but we may fairly demur again to the thus assuming a principle irrespective of the requirements of the book, and then judging the book itself by it. This is manifestly done by Lücke, pp. 835 ff. Besides which, the differences among themselves of those who adopt this view are such as to deprive it of all fixity as an historical indication. Are we to reckon our Cæsars forwards (and if so, are we to begin with Julius, or with Augustus?), or backwards, upon some independent assumption of the time

of writing, which the other phænomena must be made to fit? If the reader will consult the notes on ch. xvii. 10, I trust he will see that any such view of the passages is untenable.

25. Upon interpretations like these, insulated, and derived from mere first impressions of the wording of single passages, is the whole fabric built, which is to supersede the primitive tradition as to the date of the Apocalypse. On this account, Irenæus must be supposed to have made a mistake in the date which he assigns, who had such good and sufficient means of knowing: on this account, all those additional testimonies, which in any other case would have been adduced as independent and important, are to be assumed to have been mere repetitions of that of Irenæus.

26. But it is most unfortunate for these critics that, when once so sure a ground is established for them as a direct indication in the book itself of the emperor under whom it was written, they cannot agree among themselves who this emperor was. Some among them (e. g. Stuart, al.) taking the natural (and one would think the only possible) view of such an historical indication, begin according to general custom with Julius, and bring the writing under Nero. Ewald and Lücke, on account of the οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ πάρεσται of ch. xvii. 8, which they wish to apply to Nero, desert the usual reckoning of Roman emperors, and begin with Augustus, thus bringing the writing under Galba. Again, Eichhorn and Bleek, wishing to bring the writing under Vespasian, omit Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, relying on an expression of Suetonius that their reigns were a mere "rebellio trium principum." Thus by changing the usual starting-point, and leaving out of the usual list of the Cæsars any number found convenient, any view we please may be substantiated by this kind of interpretation. Those whose view of the prophecy extends wider, and who attach a larger meaning to the symbols of the beast and his image and his heads, will not be induced by such very uncertain speculations to set aside a primitive and as it appears to them thoroughly trustworthy tradition.

27. It may be observed that Lücke attempts to give an account of the origin of what he calls the Irenæan tradition, freely confessing that his proof (?) of the date is not complete without such an account. The character of the account he gives is well worth observing. When, he says, men found that the apocalyptic prophecies had failed of their accomplishment, they began to give a wider sense to them, and to put them at a later date. And having given this account, he attempts to vindicate it from the charge of overthrowing the authority of Scripture prophecy, and says that though it may not be as convenient as the way which modern orthodoxy has struck out, yet it leads more safely to the desired end, and to the permanent enjoyment of true faith.

28. With every disposition to search and prove all things, and ground faith upon things thus proved, I own I am quite unable to come to Lücke's conclusions, or to those of any of the maintainers of the Neronic or any of the earlier dates. The book itself, it seems to me, refuses the assignment of such times of writing. The evident assumption which it makes of long-standing and general persecution (ch. vi. 9) forbids us to place it in the very first persecution and that only a partial one: the undoubted transference of Jewish temple emblems to a Christian sense (ch. i. 20) of itself makes us suspect those interpreters who maintain the literal sense when the temple and city are mentioned: the analogy of the prophecies of Daniel forbids us to limit to individual kings the interpretation of the symbolic heads of the beast: the whole character and tone of the writing precludes our imagining that its original reference was ever intended to be to mere local matters of secondary import.

29. The state of those to whom it was addressed furnishes another powerful subsidiary argument in favour of the later date. This will be expanded in the next section.

30. These things then being considered,—the decisive testimony of primitive tradition, and failure of all attempts to set it aside,—the internal evidence furnished by the book itself, and equal failure of all attempts by an unwarrantable interpretation to raise up counter evidence, —I have no hesitation in believing with the ancient fathers and most competent witnesses, that the Apocalypse was written πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς, i. e. about the year 95 or 96 A.D.

SECTION III.

TO WHOM ADDRESSED.

1. The superscription of the book plainly states for what readers it was primarily intended. At the same time indications abound, that the whole Christian church was in view. In the very epistles to the seven churches themselves, all the promises and sayings of the Lord, ⌜though arising out of local circumstances, are of perfectly general application.⌟ And in the course of the prophecy, the wide range of objects embraced, the universality of the cautions and encouragements, the vast periods of time comprised, leave us no inference but this, that the book was intended for the comfort and profit of every age of the Christian church. In treating therefore the question at the head of this section in its narrower

and literal sense, I am not excluding the broader and general view. It lies behind the other, as in the rest of the apostolic writings. "These things," as the older Scriptures, "are written for our ensamples, upon whom the ends of the world are come:" or, in the language of the Muratori fragment on the Canon, "et Johannes enim in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit."

2. The book then was directly addressed to the seven churches of proconsular Asia. A few remarks must be made on the general subject of the names and state of these churches, before entering on a description of them severally.

3. First, as to the selection of the names. The number seven, so often used by the Seer to express universality, has here prevailed in occasioning that number of names to be selected out of the churches in the district. For these were not all the churches comprised in Asia proper. Whether there were Christian bodies in Colossæ and Hierapolis we cannot say. Those cities had been, since the writing of St. Paul's Epistle, destroyed by an earthquake, and in what state of restoration they were at this date, is uncertain. But from the Epistles of Ignatius we may fairly assume that there were churches in Magnesia and Tralles. The number seven then is representative, not exhaustive. These seven are taken in the following order: Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea. That is, beginning with Ephesus the first city in the province, it follows a line from South to North up to Pergamum, then takes the neighbouring city of Thyatira, and follows another line from North to South.

4. As regards the general state of these churches, we may make the following remarks:

We have from St. Paul, setting aside the Epistle to the Ephesians, not from any doubt as to its original destination, but as containing no local notices, and that to Philemon, as being of a private character,—three Epistles containing notices of the Christian churches within this district. The first in point of time is that to the Colossians (A.D. 61—63): then follow the two to Timotheus, dating from 67 to 68. It is important to observe, that all these Epistles, even the latest of them, the second to Timotheus, have regard to a state of the churches evidently preceding by many years that set before us in this book. The germs of heresy and error there apparent (see Vol. III. prolegg. ch. vii. § i. par. 12 ff.) had expanded into definite sects (ch. ii. 6, 15): the first ardour with which some of them had received and practised the Gospel, had cooled (ch. ii. 4, 5, iii. 2): others had increased in zeal for God, and were surpassing their former works (ch. ii. 19). Again, the days of the martyrdom of Antipas, an eminent servant of Christ, are referred back to some time past (ch. ii. 13).

5. It is also important to notice that Laodicea is described (ch. iii. 17) as boasting in her wealth and self-sufficiency. Now we know from Tacitus (see below, par. 13), that in the sixth year of Nero, or in the tenth, according to Eusebius (and apparently with more accuracy), Laodicea was destroyed by an earthquake, and recovered herself propriis opibus, without any assistance from the Head of the state. How many years it might take before the city could again put on such a spirit of self-sufficing pride as that shewn in ch. iii. 17, it is not possible to fix exactly : but it is obvious that we must allow more time for this than would be consistent with the Neronic date of the Apocalypse. This is confirmed when we observe the spiritual character given of the Laodicean church,—that of lukewarmness,—and reflect, that such a character does not ordinarily accompany, nor follow close upon, great judgments and afflictions, but is the result of a period of calm and prosperity, and gradually encroaching compromise with ungodliness.

6. I may further mention, that the fact of the relation here shewn to exist between John and the churches of proconsular Asia, points to a period wholly distinct from that in which Paul, or his disciple Timotheus, exercised authority in those parts. And this alone would lead us to meet with a decided negative the hypothesis of the Apocalypse being written under Nero, Galba, or even Vespasian. At the same time, see note on ch. ii. 20,—the mention of φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα there identifies the temptations and difficulties which beset the churches when the Apocalypse was written, with those which we know to have been prevalent in the apostolic age, and thus gives a strong confirmation of the authenticity of the book.

I now proceed to consider these churches one by one.

7. EPHESUS, the capital of proconsular Asia, has already been described and a sketch of its history given, in the Prolegg. to the Epistle to the Ephesians, Vol. III. prolegg. ch. ii. § ii. parr. 1—6. More detailed accounts are there referred to. The notes to the Epistle will in each case put the student in possession of the general character and particular excellencies or failings of each church, so that I need not repeat them here. In reference to the threat uttered by our Lord in ch. ii. 5, we may remark, that a few miserable huts, and ruins of great extent and massiveness, are all that now remains of the former splendid capital of Asia. The candlestick has indeed been removed from its place, and the church has become extinct. We may notice, that Ephesus naturally leads the seven, both as the metropolis of the province, and as containing that church with which the Writer himself was individually connected.

8. SMYRNA, a famous commercial city of Ionia, at the head of the bay named after it, and at the mouth of the small river Meles : from

which Homer, whose birthplace Smyrna, among other cities, claimed to be, is sometimes called Melesigenes. It is 320 stadia (40 miles) north of Ephesus. It was a very ancient city (Herod. i. 149): but lay in ruins, after its destruction by the Lydians (B.C. 627: cf. Herod. i. 16), for 400 years (till Alexander the Great, according to Pliny v. 31; Pausan. vii. 5. 1; till Antigonus, according to Strabo, l. xiv. p. 646). It was then rebuilt, 20 stadia from old Smyrna (Strabo, l. c.), and rose to be, in the time of the first Cæsars, one of the fairest and most populous cities in Asia (Strabo, ibid.). Modern Smyrna is a large city of more than 120,000 inhabitants, the centre of the trade of the Levant. The church in Smyrna was distinguished for its illustrious first bishop the martyr Polycarp, who is said to have been put to death in the stadium there in A.D. 166 (cf. Iren. Hær. iii. 3. 4, p. 176).

9. PERGAMUM (sometimes Pergamus), an ancient city of Mysia, on the river Caïcus, an ἐπιφανὴς πόλις (Strabo, l. xiii. p. 623). At first it appears to have been a mere hill-fortress of great natural strength; but it became an important city owing to the circumstance of Lysimachus, one of Alexander's generals, having chosen it for the reception of his treasures, and entrusted them to his eunuch Philetærus, who rebelled against him (B.C. 283), and founded a kingdom, which lasted 150 years, when it was bequeathed by its last sovereign Attalus III. (B.C. 133) to the Roman people. Pergamum possessed a magnificent library, founded by its sovereign Eumenes (B.C. 197—159), which subsequently was given by Antony to Cleopatra (Plut. Anton. c. 58), and perished with that at Alexandria under Caliph Omar. It became the official capital of the Roman province of Asia (Pliny, v. 33). There was there a celebrated temple of Æsculapius, on which see note, ch. ii. 13. There is still a considerable city, containing, it is said (Stuart, p. 450), about 3000 nominal Christians. It is now called Bergamah.

10. THYATIRA, once called Pelopia and Euippia (Plin. v. 31), a town in Lydia, about a day's journey south of Pergamum. It was perhaps originally a Macedonian colony (Strabo, xiii. p. 625). Its chief trade was dyeing of purple, cf. Acts xvi. 14 and note. It is said to be at present a considerable town with many ruins, called Ak-Hisar, and to contain some 3000 Christians.

11. SARDIS, the ancient capital of the kingdom of Lydia, lay in a plain between the mountains Tmolus and Hermus, on the small river Pactolus: 33 miles from Thyatira and 28 from Philadelphia by the Antonine Itinerary. Its classical history is well known. In the reign of Tiberius it was destroyed by an earthquake, but restored by order of that emperor, Tacit. Ann. ii. 47; Strabo xiii. p. 627. It was the capital of a conventus in the time of Pliny (v. 30); and continued a wealthy city to the end of the Byzantine empire. More than one Christian

council was held here. In the eleventh century Sardis fell into the hands of the Turks, and in the thirteenth it was destroyed by Tamerlane. Only a village (Sart) now remains, built among the ruins of the ancient city.

12. PHILADELPHIA, in Lydia, on the N.W. side of Mount Tmolus, 28 miles S.E. from Sardis. It was built by Attalus Philadelphus, King of Pergamum. Earthquakes were exceedingly prevalent in the district, and it was more than once nearly demolished by them: cf. Tacit. Ann. ii. 47; Strabo xiii. 628. It defended itself against the Turks for some time, but was eventually taken by Bajazet in 1390. It is now a considerable town named Allahshar, containing ruins of its ancient wall, and of about twenty-four churches.

13. LAODICEA, Laodicea ad Lycum, was a celebrated city in the S.W. of Phrygia, near the river Lycus. It was originally called Diospolis, and afterward Rhoas (Plin. v. 29): and the name Laodicea was owing to its being rebuilt by Antiochus Theos in honour of his wife Laodice. It was not far from Colossæ, and only six miles W. of Hierapolis. It suffered much in the Mithridatic war (Appian, Bell. Mithr. 20; Strabo xii. 578): but recovered itself, and became a wealthy and important place, at the end of the republic and under the first emperors. It was completely destroyed by the great earthquake in the reign of Nero: but was rebuilt by the wealth of its own citizens, without help from the state, Tacit. Ann. xiv. 27. Its state of prosperity and carelessness in spiritual things described in the Epistle is well illustrated by these facts. St. Paul wrote an Epistle to the Laodiceans, now lost. See Col. iv. 16, and Prolegg. to Vol. III. ch. xi. § iii. 2. It produced literary men of eminence, and had a great medical school. It was the capital of a conventus during the Roman empire. It was utterly ravaged by the Turks, and "nothing," says Hamilton, "can exceed the desolation and melancholy appearance of the site of Laodicea." A village exists amongst the ruins, named Eski-hissar.

14. See for further notices on the Seven Churches, Winer, RWB., and Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Geography: from which two sources the above accounts are mainly compiled. In those works will be found detailed references to the works of various travellers who have visited them. Also,

SECTION IV.

OBJECT AND CONTENTS.

1. The Apocalypse declares its own object (ch. i. 1) to be mainly prophetic; the exhibition to God's servants of things which must shortly come to pass. And to this by far the larger portion of the book is devoted. From ch. iv. 1 to xxii. 5, is a series of visions prophetic of things to come, or introducing in their completeness allegories which involve things to come. Intermixed however with this prophetic development, we have a course of hortatory and encouraging sayings, arising out of the state of the churches to which the book is written, and addressed through them to the church universal.

2. These sayings are mostly related in style and sense to the Epistles with which the book began, so as to preserve in a remarkable manner the unity of the whole, and to shew that it is not, as Grotius and some others have supposed, a congeries of different fragments, but one united work, written at one and the same time. The practical tendency of the Epistles to the Churches is never lost sight of throughout. So that we may fairly say that its object is not only to prophesy of the future, but also by such prophecy to rebuke, exhort, and console the Church.

3. Such being the general object, our enquiry is now narrowed to that of the prophetic portion itself: and we have to enquire, what was the aim of the Writer, or rather of Him who inspired the Writer, in delivering this prophecy.

4. And in the first place, we are met by an enquiry which it may be strange enough that we have to make in this day, but which nevertheless must be made. Is the book, it is asked, strictly speaking, a revelation at all? Is its so-called prophecy any thing more than the ardent and imaginative poesy of a rapt spirit, built up on the then present trials and hopes of himself and his contemporaries? Is not its future bounded by the age and circumstances then existing? And are not all those mistaken, who have attempted to deduce from it indications respecting our own or any subsequent age of the Church?

5. Two systems of understanding and interpreting the book have been raised on the basis of a view represented by the foregoing questions. The former of them, that of Grotius, Ewald, Eichhorn, and others, proceeds consistently enough in denying all prophecy, and explaining figuratively, with regard to then present expectations, right or wrong, all the things contained in the book. The latter, that of Lücke, De Wette, Bleek, Düsterdieck, and others, while it professes to recognize a certain kind of inspiration in the Writer, yet believes his view to have been entirely bounded by his own subjectivity and circum-

stances, denying that the book contains any thing specially revealed to John and by him declared to us; and regarding its whole contents as only instructive, in so far as they represent to us the aspirations of a fervid and inspired man, full of the Spirit of God, and his insight into forms of conflict and evil which are ever recurring in the history of the world and the Church.

6. I own it seems to me that we cannot in consistency or in honesty accept this compromise. For let us ask ourselves, how does it agree with the phænomena? It conveniently saves the credit of the Writer, and rescues the book from being an imposture, by conceding that he saw all which he says he saw: but at the same time maintains, that all which he saw was purely subjective, having no external objective existence: and that those things which seem to be prophecies of the distant future, are in fact no such prophecies, but have and exhaust their significance within the horizon of the writer's own experience and hopes.

7. But then, if this be so, I do not see, after all, how the credit of the Writer *is* so entirely saved. He distinctly lays claim to be speaking of long periods of time. To say nothing of the time involved in the other visions, he speaks of *a thousand years*, and of things which must happen at the end of that period. So that we must say, on the theory in question, that all his declarations of this kind are pure mistakes: and, in exegesis, our view must be entirely limited to the enquiry, not what is for us and for all the meaning of this or that prophecy, but what was the Writer's meaning when he set it down. Whether subsequent events justified his guess, or falsified it, is for us a pure matter of archæological and psychological interest, and no more.

8. If this be so, I submit that the book at once becomes that which is known as apocryphal, as distinguished from canonical: it is of no more value to us than the Shepherd of Hermas, or the Ascension of Isaiah: and is mere matter for criticism and independent judgment.

9. It will be no surprise to the readers of this work to be told, that we are not prepared thus to deal with a book which we accept as canonical, and have all reason to believe to have been written by an Apostle. While we are no believers in what has been (we cannot help thinking foolishly) called *verbal* inspiration, we are not prepared to set aside the whole substance of the testimony of the writer of a book which we accept as canonical, nor to deny that visions, which he purports to have received from God to shew to the Church things which must shortly come to pass, were so received by him, and for such a purpose.

10. Maintaining this ground, and taking into account the tone of the book itself, and the periods embraced in its prophecies, we cannot consent to believe the vision of the Writer to have been bounded by the

horizon of his own experience and personal hopes. We receive the book as being what it professes to be, a *revelation from God* designed *to shew to his servants things which must shortly come to pass*[3]. And so far from this word ἐν τάχει offending us, we find in it, as compared with the contents of the book, a measure by which, not our judgment of those contents, but our estimate of worldly events and their duration, should be corrected. The ἐν τάχει confessedly contains, among other periods, a period of a thousand years. On what principle are we to affirm that it does not embrace a period vastly greater than this in its whole contents?

11. We hold therefore that the book, judged by its own testimony, and with regard to the place which it holds among the canonical books of Scripture, is written with the object of conveying to the Church revelations from God respecting certain portions of her course even up to the time of the end. Whether such revelations disclose to her a continuous prophetic history, or are to be taken as presenting varying views and relations of her conflict with evil, and God's judgment on her enemies, will be hereafter discussed. But the general object is independent of these differences in interpretation.

12. The contents of the book have been variously arranged. It seems better to follow the plain indication of the book itself, than to distribute it so as to suit any theory of interpretation. We find in so doing, that we have,

I. A general introduction to the whole book, ch. i. 1—3:

II. The portion containing the Epistles to the seven churches, i. 4—iii. 22, itself consisting of

α. The address and preface, i. 4—8.

β. The introductory vision, i. 9—20

γ. The seven Epistles, ii. 1—iii. 22.

III. The prophetical portion, iv. 1—xxii. 5; and herein

α. The heavenly scene of vision, iv. 1—11.

β. 1. The sealed book, and the Lamb who should open its seven seals, v. 1—14.

2. The seven seals opened, vi. 1—viii. 5, wherein are inserted two episodes, between the sixth and seventh seals.

[3] Düsterdieck has stigmatized this view (Einl. p. 44) as that of *magical* inspiration, as distinguished from his own, which he designates as that of *ethical* inspiration. It is difficult to assign any meaning to these epithets at all corresponding to the nature of the case. Why that inspiration should be called *magical*, which makes the prophet the organ of communicating the divine counsels in symbolical language to the Church, it is difficult to say: and surely not less difficult to explain, how that inspiration can be called *ethical*, which makes him pretend to have received visions *from God*, which he has only imagined in his own mind.

a. the sealing of the elect, vii. 1—8.
b. the multitude of the redeemed, vii. 9—17.

γ. The seven trumpets of vengeance, introduced indeed before the conclusion of the former portion, viii. 2, but properly extending from viii. 6—xi. 19.

But here again we have two episodes, between the sixth and seventh trumpets,

a. the little book, x. 1—11.
b. the two witnesses, xi. 1—14.

δ. The woman and her three enemies, xii. 1—xiii. 18. And herein

a. the dragon, xii. 1—17.
b. the beast xii. 18—xiii. 10.
c. the second beast, or false prophet, xiii. 11—18.

ε. The introduction to the final triumph and the final vengeance, xiv. 1—20. And herein

a. the Lamb and his elect, xiv. 1—5.
b. the three angels announcing the heads of the coming prophecy:
1. the warning of judgments, xiv. 6, 7.
2. the fall of Babylon, xiv. 8.
3. the punishment of the unfaithful, xiv. 9—12.
4. a voice proclaiming the blessedness of the holy dead, xiv. 13.
c. the harvest (xiv. 14—16) and the vintage (xiv. 17—20) of the earth.

ζ. The pouring out of the seven last vials of wrath, xv. 1—xvi. 21.

η. The judgment of Babylon, xvii. 1—xviii. 24.

θ. The final triumph, xix. 1—xxii. 5. And herein

a. the church's song of praise, xix. 1—10.
b. the issuing forth of the Lord and His hosts to victory, xix. 11—16.
c. the destruction of the beasts and false prophet and kings of the earth, xix. 17—21.
d. the binding of the dragon, and the millennial reign, xx. 1—6.
e. the unbinding, and final overthrow, of Satan, xx. 7—10.
f. the general judgment, xx. 11—15.
g. the new heavens and earth, and glories of the heavenly Jerusalem, xxi. 1—xxii. 5.

IV. The conclusion, xxii. 6—21. See on all this the table at p. 260, in which the contents are arranged with a view to prophetic interpretation.

SECTION V.

SYSTEMS OF INTERPRETATION.

1. It would be as much beyond the limits as it is beside the purpose of these prolegomena, to give a detailed history of apocalyptic interpretation. And it would be, after all, spending much labour over that which has been well and sufficiently done already. For English readers, the large portion of Mr. Elliott's fourth volume of his Horæ Apocalypticæ which is devoted to the subject contains an ample account of apocalyptic expositors from the first times to the present: and for those who can read German, Lücke's Einleitung will furnish more critical though shorter notices of many among them[4]. To these works, and to others like them[5], I must refer my readers for any thing like a detailed history of interpretations: contenting myself with giving a brief classification of the different great divisions of opinion, and with stating the grounds and character of the interpretations adopted in the following Commentary.

2. The schools of apocalyptic interpretation naturally divide themselves into three principal branches:

α. The Præterists, or those who hold that the whole or by far the greater part of the prophecy has been fulfilled;

β. The Historical Interpreters, or those who hold that the prophecy embraces the whole history of the Church and its foes from the time of its writing to the end of the world:

γ. The Futurists, or those who maintain that the prophecy relates entirely to events which are to take place at or near to the coming of the Lord.

I shall make a few remarks on each of these schools.

3. α. The Præterist view found no favour, and was hardly so much as thought of, in the times of primitive Christianity. Those who lived near the date of the book itself had no idea that its groups of prophetic imagery were intended merely to describe things then passing, and to be in a few years completed[6]. The view is said to have been first promulgated in any thing like completeness by the Jesuit Alcasar, in his Vestigatio arcani sensus in Apocalypsi, published in 1614. He regarded

[4] It is to be regretted that Lücke should have performed this portion of his work so much in the spirit of a partisan, and not have contented himself with giving a résumé ab extra in the spirit of fairness, as Mr. Elliott has done. But his notices and remarks are very able and valuable.

[5] e.g. Dr. Todd on the Apocalypse, pp. 269 ff.: Mr. Charles Maitland's Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpretation, &c. Mr. Elliott has continued his notices down nearly to the present time in the appendix to his Warburtonian Lectures, pp. 510—566.

[6] Cf. Methodius, B. P. M. iii. 693: "Johannes non de præteritis, sed de iis quæ vel tunc fierent, vel quæ olim eventura essent, loquitur."

the prophecy as descriptive of the victory of the Church first over the synagogue, in chapters v.—xi., and then over heathen Rome, in chapters xii.—xix.: on which follows the triumph, and rest, and glorious close, chapters xx.—xxii. Very nearly the same plan was adopted by Grotius in his Annotations, published in 1644: and by our own Hammond in his Commentary, published in 1653: whom Le Clerc, his Latin interpreter, followed. The next name among this school of interpreters is that of Bossuet, the great antagonist of Protestantism. His Commentary was published in 1690. In the main, he agrees with the schemes of Alcasar and Grotius[7].

4. The præterist school of interpretation has however of late been revived in Germany, and is that to which some of the most eminent expositors of that nation belong[8]: limiting the view of the Seer to matters within his own horizon, and believing the whole denunciations of the book to regard nothing further than the destruction of Pagan and persecuting Rome.

5. This view has also found exponents in our own language. It is that of the very ample and laborious Commentary of Moses Stuart in America, and of Dr. Davidson and Mr. Desprez in England.

6. β. The continuous historical interpretation belongs almost of necessity to these later days. In early times, the historic material since the apostolic period was not copious enough to tempt men to fit it on to the symbols of the prophetic visions. The first approach to it seems to have been made by Berengaud, not far from the beginning of the twelfth century: who however carried the historic range of the Apocalypse back to the creation of the world[9]. The historic view is found in the fragmentary exposition of the Seals by Anselm of Havelsburg (1145): in the important exposition by the Abbot Joachim (cir. 1200)[1].

7. From Joachim's time we may date the rise of the continuous historic school of interpretation. From this time men's minds, even within the Romish church, became accustomed to the ideas, that the apocalyptic Babylon was in some sense or other not only Pagan but Papal Rome: and that Antichrist was to sit, whether as an usurper or not, on the throne of the Papacy.

8. I pass over less remarkable names, which will be found composing an interesting series in Mr. Elliott's history[2], noticing as I pass, that

[7] See Elliott, vol. iv. p. 480, and a very good description in Lücke, p. 540.
[8] e. g. Ewald, Lücke, De Wette, Düsterdieck.
[9] See Elliott, vol. iv. pp. 362 ff.
[1] Elliott, vol. iv. pp. 376—410: where see also a tabular view of Joachim's apocalyptic scheme.
[2] Vol. iv. pp. 416 ff.

such was the view held by the precursors and upholders of the Reformation: by Wicliffe and his followers in England, by Luther in Germany, Bullinger in Switzerland, Bishop Bale in Ireland; by Fox the martyrologist, by Brightmann, Pareus, and early Protestant expositors generally.

9. As we advance in order of time, the same view holds its ground in the main among the Protestant churches. It is, with more or less individual varieties and divergences, that of Mede (1630), Jurieu (1685), Cressener (1690), Vitringa (1705), Daubuz (1720), Sir Isaac Newton (first published in 1733, after his death; but belonging to an earlier date), Whiston (1706), and the Commentators further on in that century, Bengel and Bishop Newton,

10. Mr. Elliott very naturally makes the great French Revolution a break, and the beginning of a new epoch, in the history of apocalyptic interpretation. From it, the continuous historical view seemed to derive confirmation and consistency, and acquired boldness to enter into new details, and fix its dates with greater precision.

11. Some of the more marked upholders of the view since that great Revolution have been divided among themselves as to the question, whether the expected second advent of our Lord is to be regarded as preceding or succeeding the thousand years' reign, or millennium. The majority both in number, and in learning and research, adopt the premillenial advent: following, as it seems to me, the plain and undeniable sense of the sacred text of the book itself.

12. It is not the purpose of the present Prolegomena to open controversial dispute with systems or with individuals[3]. The following Commentary will shew how far our views agree with, how far they differ from the school of which I am treating. With this caution, I cannot refrain from expressing my admiration of the research and piety which have characterized some of the principal modern Protestant expositors of this school. I must pay this tribute more especially to Mr. Elliott, from whose system and conclusions I am compelled so frequently and so widely to diverge.

[3] The statement made above in the text will account for my not having noticed in detail, with a view to refutation, Mr. Elliott's work, "Apocalypsis Alfordiana," published since the first appearance of this volume. A careful perusal of that work has not altered my view on any of the points of interpretation whereon we differ. Its arguments are not formidable, consisting for the most part of confident re-assertion of the system which they uphold. In preparing the present edition of this volume I began by inserting in the notes elaborate answers to them: but I found that thus my pages became burdened with matter merely controversial, and moreover that I could not continue this course consistently with the unfeigned respect which I felt and wished to shew towards Mr. Elliott: the spirit of his book, which I forbear here from characterizing, rendering this wholly impossible.

13. γ. Our attention now passes to the Futurist school, consisting of those who throw forward the whole book, or by far the greater part of it, into the times of the great second Advent, denying altogether its historical significance.

14. Of these writers, some, who have been called the extreme futurists[4], deny even the past existence of the seven Asiatic churches, and hold that we are to look for them yet to arise in the last days: but the majority accept them as historical facts, and begin the events of the last days with the prophetic imagery in chap. iv. Some indeed expound the earlier seals of events already past, and then in the later ones pass at once onward to the times of antichrist.

15. The founder of this system in modern times (the Apostolic Fathers can hardly with fairness be cited for it, seeing that for them all was future) appears to have been the Jesuit Ribera, about A.D. 1580[5]. It has of late had some able advocates in this country. To it belong the respected names of Dr. Maitland, Dr. Todd, Mr. Burgh, Isaac Williams, and others.

16. I need hardly say that I cannot regard this scheme of interpretation with approval. To argue against it here, would be only to anticipate the Commentary. It seems to me indisputable that the book does speak of things past, present, and future: that some of its prophecies are already fulfilled, some are now fulfilling, and others await their fulfilment in the yet unknown future: but to class all together and postpone them to the last age of the world, seems to me very like shrinking from the labours which the Holy Spirit meant us, and invites us, to undertake.

17. In the exposition of the Apocalypse attempted in this volume, I have endeavoured simply to follow the guidance of the sacred text, according to its own requirements and the analogies of Scripture. I am not conscious of having any where forced the meaning to suit my own prepossession: but I have in each case examined, whither the text itself and the rest of Scripture seemed to send me for guidance. If a definite meaning seemed to be pointed at in such guidance, I have upheld that meaning, to whatever school of interpretation I might seem thereby for the time to belong. If no such definite meaning seemed to be indicated, I have confessed my inability to assign one, however plausible and attractive the guesses of expositors may have been.

18. The result of such a method of interpretation may be apparent want of system; but I submit that it is the only way which will conduct us safely as far as we go, and which will prevent us from wresting the

[4] e.g. the author of "The Jewish Missionary," and "The Sealed Book."

[5] Elliott, vol. iv. pp. 465 ff.

text to make it suit a preconceived scheme. This latter fault seemed to me so glaring and so frequent in our expositors of the historical school, and inspired me with such disgust, that I determined my own pages should not contain a single instance of it, if I could help it. And I venture to hope that the determination has been carried out.

19. The course which I have taken, that of following the text itself under the guidance of Scripture analogy, naturally led to the recognition of certain landmarks, or fixed points, giving rise to canons of interpretation, which I maintain are not to be departed from. Such are for instance the following:

20. The close connexion between our Lord's prophetic discourse on the Mount of Olives, and the line of apocalyptic prophecy, cannot fail to have struck every student of Scripture. If it be suggested that such connexion may be merely apparent, and we subject it to the test of more accurate examination, our first impression will I think become continually stronger, that the two, being revelations from the same Lord concerning things to come, and those things being as it seems to me bound by the fourfold ἔρχου, which introduces the seals, to the same reference to Christ's coming, must, corresponding as they do in order and significance, answer to one another in detail: and thus the discourse in Matt. xxiv. becomes, as Mr. Isaac Williams has truly named it, "the *anchor of apocalyptic interpretation:*" and, I may add, the touchstone of apocalyptic systems. If its guidance be not followed in the interpretation of the seals, if any other than our Lord is he that goes forth conquering and to conquer, then, though the subsequent interpretation may have occasional points of contact with truth, and may thus be in parts profitable to us, the *system* is an erroneous one, and, as far as it is concerned, the true key to the book is lost.

21. Another such landmark is found I believe in the interpretation of the *sixth seal:* if it be not indeed already laid down in what has just been said. We all know what that imagery means in the rest of Scripture. Any system which requires it to belong to another period than the close approach of the great day of the Lord, stands thereby self-condemned. I may illustrate this by reference to Mr. Elliott's continuous historical system, which requires that it should mean the downfall of Paganism under Constantine. A more notable instance of inadequate interpretation cannot be imagined.

22. Closely connected with this last is another fixed point in interpretation. As the seven seals, so the seven trumpets and the seven vials run on to the time close upon the end. At the termination of each series, the note is unmistakably given, that such is the case. Of the seals we have already spoken. As to the trumpets, it may suffice to refer to ch. x. 7, xi. 18: as to the vials, to their very designation τὰς ἐσχάτας,

and to the γέγονεν of ch. xvi. 17. Any system which does not recognize this common ending of the three, seems to me to stand thereby convicted of error.

23. Another such absolute requirement of the sacred text is found in the vision of ch. xii. 1 ff. In ver. 5, we read that the woman ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, καὶ ἡρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ. All Scripture analogy and that of this book itself (cf. ch. xix. 15) requires that these words should be understood of our incarnate Lord, and of no other. Any system seems to me convicted of error, which is compelled to interpret the words otherwise.

24. Another canon of interpretation has seemed to me to be deducible from the great care and accuracy with which the Seer distinguishes between the divine Persons and the ministering angels. Much confusion is found in the apocalyptic commentaries from this point not being attended to. "Is such or such an angel Christ Himself, or not?" is a question continually meeting us in their pages. Such a question need never to have been asked. ἄγγελος, throughout the book, is an *angel:* never our Lord, never one of the sons of men. This holds equally, I believe, of the angels of the seven churches, and of the various angels introduced in the prophetic vision.

25. Various other rules and requirements of the same kind will be found mentioned in the Commentary itself. It may be well to speak of some other matters which seem worthy of notice here.

26. The apocalyptic *numbers* furnish an important enquiry to every Commentator, as to their respective significance. And, in general terms, such a question can be readily answered. The various numbers seem to keep constant to their great lines of symbolic meaning, and may, without any caprice, be assigned to them. Thus *seven* is the number of perfection: seven spirits are before the throne (ch. i. 4; iv. 5): seven churches represent the church universal: the Lamb has seven horns and seven eyes (v. 6): in the several series of God's judgments, each of them complete in itself, each of them exhaustive in its own line of divine action, seven is the number of the seals, of the trumpets, of the thunders, of the vials.

27. *Four*, again, is the number of terrestrial extension. Four living-beings are the celestial symbols of creation (iv. 6 ff.): four angels stand on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of heaven (ch. vii. 1): four seals, four trumpets, four vials, in each case complete the judgments as far as physical visitations are concerned: four angels are loosed from the Euphrates to slay the destined portion out of all mankind (ix. 13 ff.), in obedience to a voice from the four corners of the altar: Satan deceives the nations in the four corners of the earth (xx. 8): the new Jerusalem lieth four-square, having all sides equal.

28. *Twelve* is the number especially appropriated to the Church, and to those appearances which are symbolically connected with her. Twice twelve is the number of the heavenly elders: twelve times twelve thousand, the number of the sealed elect: the woman in ch. xii. 1 has a crown of twelve stars: the heavenly city has twelve gates, at the gates twelve angels, and on them the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; also twelve foundations, and on them the names of the twelve Apostles: and its circumference (probably: see note, ch. xxi. 16) is twelve thousand stadii. Finally, in the midst of her the tree of life brings forth twelve manner of fruits.

29. The occurrence of aliquot portions of these numbers is also worthy of our attention. The half of seven, three and a half, is a ruling number in the apocalyptic periods of time. Three years and a half had been the duration of the draught prayed for by Elijah (see James v. 17, note: also Luke iv. 25); "a time, and times, and the dividing of time" was the prescribed prophetic duration of the oppression of the saints in Dan. vii. 25. Accordingly, we find in the Apocalypse (ch. xi. 2) that the two witnesses, one of whose powers is, to shut up heaven that there shall be no rain (xi. 6), shall prophesy 1260 days $= 3 \times 360 + 180 =$ three years and a half. And if this particular reminds us of Elijah, the other, the turning the water into blood and smiting the earth with plagues, directs our attention to Moses, whose testimony endured throughout the forty and two stations of the children of Israel's pilgrimage, as that of these witnesses is to endure forty and two months $= 3 \times 12 + 6$ months $=$ three years and a half. (Again, for three *days* and a half shall the bodies of these witnesses lie unburied in the street of the great city, after which they shall rise again.) The same period in days (1260) is the term during which the woman shall be fed in the wilderness (xii. 6). The same in months (42) is allotted (xiii. 5) to the power of the first wild-beast which ascended from the sea.

30. I have not pretended to offer any solution of these periods of time, so remarkably pervaded by the half of the mystic seven. I am quite unable to say, who the two witnesses are: quite unable, in common with all apocalyptic interpreters, to point out definitely any period in the history of the church corresponding to the 1260 days of ch. xii. 6, or any in the history of this world's civil power which shall satisfy the forty-two months of ch. xiii. 5. As far as I have seen, every such attempt hitherto made has been characterized by signal failure. One after another, the years fixed on for the consummation by different authors have passed away, beginning with the 1836 of Bengel: one after another, the expositors who have lived to be thus refuted have shifted their ground into the safer future.

31. It is not my intention to enter the lists on either side of the vexed

"year-day" question. I have never seen it proved, or even made probable, that we are to take a day for a year in apocalyptic prophecy: on the other hand I have never seen it proved, or made probable, that such mystic periods are to be taken literally, a day for a day. It is a weighty argument against the year-day system, that a period of "a thousand years" (xx. 6, 7) does occur in the prophecy: it is hardly a less strong one against literal acceptation of days, that the principles of interpretation given us by the Seer himself (xvii. 17) seem to require for the reign of the beast a far longer period than this calculation would allow. So that in the apparent failure of both systems, I am driven to believe that these periods are to be assigned by some clue, of which the Spirit has not yet put the Church in possession.

32. Still less can I offer any satisfactory solution of the prophetic number of the beast (xiii. 18). Even while I print my note in favour of the Λατεινός of Irenæus, I feel almost disposed to withdraw it. It is beyond question the best solution that has been given: but that it is not *the* solution, I have a persuasion amounting to certainty. It must be considered merely as worthy to emerge from the thousand and one failures strewed up and down in our books, and to be kept in sight till the challenge ὧδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν is satisfactorily redeemed.

33. On one point I have ventured to speak strongly, because my conviction on it is strong, founded on the rules of fair and consistent interpretation. I mean, the necessity of accepting literally the first resurrection, and the millennial reign. It seems to me that if in a sentence where two resurrections are spoken of with no mark of distinction between them (it is otherwise in John v. 28, which is commonly alleged for the view which I am combating),—in a sentence where, one resurrection having been related, "the rest of the dead" are afterwards mentioned,—we are at liberty to understand the former one figuratively and spiritually, and the latter literally and materially, then there is an end of all definite meaning in plain words, and the Apocalypse, or any other book, may mean any thing we please. It is a curious fact that those who maintain this, studious as they generally are to uphold the primitive interpretation, are obliged, not only to wrest the plain sense of words, but to desert the unanimous consensus of the primitive Fathers, some of whom lived early enough to have retained apostolic tradition on this point. Not till chiliastic views had run into unspiritual excesses, was this interpretation departed from[e].

34. It now remains that I say somewhat respecting my own view of the character and arrangement of the prophecy, which may furnish the

[e] The student will find a good account of the history of opinions on this subject in Herzog's Encyclopädie, art. Chiliasmus.

reader with a general idea of the nature of the interpretation given in the notes.

35. And first for the principles on which that interpretation is based. *a*) The book is a revelation given by the Father to Christ, and imparted by Him through His angel to St. John, to declare to His servants things which must shortly come to pass: in other words, the future conflicts and triumphs of His church; these being the things which concerned "His servants."

36. *β*) Of all these, the greatest event is His own coming in glory. In consequence, it is put forward in the introduction of the book with all solemnity, and its certainty sealed by an asseveration from the Almighty and everlasting God.

37. *γ*) Accordingly we find every part of the prophecy full of this subject. The Epistles to the Churches continually recur to it: the visions of seals, trumpets, vials, all end in introducing it: and it forms the solemn conclusion, as it did the opening of the book.

38. *δ*) But it was not the first time that this great subject had been spoken of in prophecy. The Old Testament prophets had all announced it: and the language of this book is full of the prophetic imagery which we also find in them, The first great key to the understanding of the Apocalypse, is, the analogy of Old Testament prophecy.

39. *ε*) The next is our Lord's own prophetic discourse, before insisted on in this reference. He himself had previously delivered a great prophecy, giving in clear outline the main points of the history of the church. In this prophecy, the progress of the Gospel, its hindrances and corruptions, the judgments on the unbelieving, the trials of the faithful, the safety of God's elect amidst all, and the final redemption in glory of His faithful people, were all indicated. There, they were enwrapped in language which was in great part primarily applicable to the great typical judgment on the chosen people—the destruction of Jerusalem. When this book was written, that event had taken place: completing the first and partial fulfilment of our Lord's predictions. Now, it remained for prophecy to declare to the church God's course of dealing with the nations of the earth, by which the same predictions are to be again fulfilled, on a larger scale, and with greater fulness of meaning.

40. It is somewhat astonishing, that many of those who recognize to the full the eschatological character of the prophetic discourse of our Lord, should have failed to observe in the Apocalypse the very same features of arrangement, and an analogy challenging continual observation.

41. *ζ*) In accordance with the analogy just pointed out, I conceive that the opening section of the book (after the vision in the introduc-

tion), containing the Epistles to the Churches, is an expansion of our Lord's brief notes of comfort, reproof, and admonition addressed to His own in the prophecy on the Mount of Olives and elsewhere in His prophetic discourses.

42. "[7]It reveals to us our Lord as present with His people evermore in the fulness of His divine Majesty as the Incarnate and glorified Son of God: present with them by His Spirit to sympathize, to sustain, to comfort, to reprove, to admonish, as their need requires: his eye evermore on every heart, his love ever ready to supply all their need.' The Epistles are no other than the expression of that special message of rebuke or encouragement which day by day in all ages the Lord sees to be needed, in one or other of its parts, by every Church, and every Christian, on earth. Every body of Christians, we are reminded, like every individual, has at each moment, its own definite religious character and condition: like Ephesus, sound, but with declining love and faith: like Smyrna, faithful in tribulation and rich in good works: like Pergamum, steadfast under open trial, but too tolerant of compromises with the world's ways: like Thyatira, diligent in well-doing, and with many signs of spiritual progress, yet allowing false teaching and corrupt practice to go unchecked: like Sardis, retaining the form of sound doctrine, but in practice sunk into a deep slumber threatening spiritual death: like Philadelphia, faithful to the Lord's word and name, loving Him though in weakness, and therefore kept in safety: or finally like Laodicea, 'lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot:' self-satisfied, because sunk too deep in spiritual sloth and indifference to be conscious of her poverty, and ready therefore to lose all without struggle or regret[8]."

43. This first section has set before us the Lord present with His church on earth; the next introduces us at once to His presence in heaven, and to the celestial scenery of the whole coming prophecy. It is to be noted that this revelation of God is as the God of His Church. The Father, seated on the Throne: the Lamb in the midst of the throne, bearing the marks of His atoning sacrifice: the sevenfold Spirit with His lamps of fire: this is Jehovah the covenant God of His redeemed. And next we have Creation, symbolized by the four living-beings—the Church, patriarchial and apostolic, represented by the twenty-four elders: and the innumerable company of angels, minister-

[7] I borrow the words of a MS. Lecture on the Apocalypse by an old and valued friend.

[8] It has been supposed by some (the first of whom apparently was the Abbot Joachim) that these Epistles are in themselves prophetic of various states of the church from the time of the Apocalypse to the final close of the dispensation. One of the principal among these is Vitringa, in whose Commentary, pp. 27 ff., will be found a full account, and elaborate defence of the view. I need not say that I myself cannot subscribe to it.

ing in their glory and might, now by one of them, now by another, throughout the course of the prophecy.

44. In the next section, the Lamb, alone found worthy, opens one after another the seals of the closed book or roll, so that, when they are all opened, it may be unrolled and read. One point I have urged in the following notes: viz., that the roll is never during the prophecy actually opened, nor is any part of it read. The openings of its successive seals are but the successive preparations for its contents to be disclosed: and as each is opened, a new class of preparations is seen in prophetic vision. When the seventh is loosed, and all is ready for the unfolding and reading, there is a symbolic silence, and a new series of visions begins.

45. As regards the seals themselves, the first four are marked off from the other three in a manner which none can fail to observe. They represent, I believe, Christ's victory over the world in His appointed way. We have Himself going forth to conquer, and in His train, the sword which He came to send on earth, the wars, famines, and pestilences, which He foretold should be forerunners of His coming. At each of these appearances, one of the living-beings who symbolize Creation echoes with his ἔρχου the sighs of the world for the manifestation of the sons of God. I conceive it to be a mistake, necessarily involved in the consecutive historical interpretation, but sometimes found where that is not, to interpret these four seals, as succeeding one another in time. All are co-ordinate, all are correlative.

46. Next to the sighs of Creation for the Lord's coming, we have those of His martyred saints, crying from under His altar. Then, at the opening of the sixth seal, we have reproduced the well-known imagery of our Lord's discourse and of the O. T. prophets, describing the very eve and threshold, so to speak, of the day of the Lord: the portents which should usher in His coming: but not that coming itself. For the revelation of this, the time is not yet. First, His elect must be gathered out of the four winds—the complete number sealed, before the judgments invoked by the martyred souls descend on the earth, the sea, the trees. First, the Seer must be vouchsafed a vision of the great multitude whom none can number, in everlasting glory. The day of the Lord's coming is gone by, and the vision reaches forward beyond it into the blissful eternity. Why? Because then, and not till then, shall the seventh seal, which looses the roll of God's eternal purposes, be opened, and the book read to the adoring Church in glory. Then we have the last seal opened, and the half-hour's silence—the "initium," as Victorinus sublimely says, "quietis æternæ."

47. Thus far the vision of the seals necessarily reached onward for its completion. But there is much more to be revealed. God's judgments

on the earth and its inhabitants are the subject of the next series of visions. The prayers of the martyred saints had invoked them: with the symbolizing therefore of the answer to these prayers the next section opens. Then follow the trumpet-blowing angels, hurting the earth, the trees, the sea, the rivers, the lights of heaven. And here again, as before, the first four trumpets complete these œcumenical judgments, and with the fifth the three woes on mankind begin. The previous plagues have affected only the accessories of life: the following affect life itself.

48. In these latter we have the strictest correspondence with the foregoing vision of the seals. Two of them are veritably plagues, the one of the locust, the other of the horsemen. After this sixth trumpet are inserted two episodical passages, the one a vision, the other a prophecy (see below): then, when the seventh is about to sound, the consummation of God's judgments passes unrecorded, as it did under the seals; and at the seventh trumpet, we have the song of thanksgiving and triumph in heaven. Such remarkable and intimate correspondence carries its own explanation: the two visions of the trumpets and seals run on to one and the same glorious termination: the former, in tracing the course of the world as regards the Church, the latter, in tracing God's judgments of vengeance on the ungodly dwellers on earth: for it is for this that the heavenly song at its conclusion gives thanks.

49. If now we turn to the two episodes between the sixth and seventh trumpets, we find them distinctly introductory to that section which is next to follow. A little book is given to the Seer, sweet to his mouth, but bitter in digestion, with an announcement that he is yet again to prophesy to many nations—that a fresh series of prophetic visions, glorious indeed but woeful, was now to be delivered by him.

50. These begin by the measurement of the temple of God—seeing that it is the Church herself, in her innermost hold, which is now to become the subject of the prophecy. The course of the two witnesses, recalling to us by their spirit and power Moses and Elias, is predicted: and during the prediction, one principal figure of the subsequent visions is by anticipation introduced: the wild-beast that cometh up out of the abyss. That this is so, is at once fatal in my estimation to the continuous historical interpretation.

51. The student will find that there is no explanation of the two witnesses in the ensuing Commentary. I have studied the various solutions, and I own that I cannot find any which I can endorse as being that which I can feel to be satisfactory. I have none of my own. I recognize the characters: but I cannot appropriate them. I do not feel it to be any reproach to my system, or any disproof of its substance, that there are this and other gaps in it which I cannot bridge over.

Nay, on the contrary, if it be a sound interpretation, there must be these: and to find events and persons which may fit the whole, ere yet the course of time is run, would seem to me rather writing a parody, than earnestly seeking a solution.

52. And now the seventh angel sounds; and as before at the opening of the seventh seal, the heavenly scene is before us, and the representatives of the church universal fall down and give thanks that God's kingdom is come, and the time of the dead to be judged. But though this series of visions likewise has been thus brought down to the end of the final consummation, there is more yet to be revealed; and in anticipation of the character of the subsequent visions, the temple of God in heaven is opened, and the pause between one and another series is announced, as before between the seals and the trumpets, and as after at the end of the vials, by thunders and lightnings and voices.

53. And now opens the great prophetic course of visions regarding the church. Her identification in the eyes of the Seer is first rendered unmistakable, by the scene opening with the appearance of the woman and the serpent, the enmity between him and her seed, the birth of the Man-child who should rule over the nations,—His ascension to heaven and to the throne of God. Here, at least, all ought to have been plain: and here again I see pronounced the condemnation of the continuous historical system.

54. The flight of the woman into the wilderness, the casting down of Satan from heaven, no longer to accuse the brethren there, his continued enmity on earth, his persecution of the remnant of the woman's seed, these belong to the introductory features of the great vision which is to follow, and serve to describe the state in which the Church of God is found during the now pending stage of her conflict.

55. What follows, carries out the description of the war made by the dragon on the seed of the woman. A wild-beast is seen rising out of the deep, uniting in itself the formerly described heads and horns of the dragon, and also the well-known prophetic symbols of the great empires of the world: representing, in fact, the secular powers antagonistic to the Church of Christ. To this wild-beast the dragon gives his might and his throne: and notwithstanding that one of its heads, the Pagan Roman Empire, is crushed to death, its deadly wound is healed, and all who are not written in the Lamb's book of life worship it.

56. The further carrying out of the power and influence of the beast is now set before us by the vision of another wild-beast, born of the earth, gentle as a lamb in appearance, but dragon-like and cruel in character. This second beast is the ally and servant of the former: makes men to worship its image and receive its mark, as the condition of civil rights and even of life itself. Here, in common with very many of the best

interpreters, I cannot fail to recognize the sacerdotal persecuting power, leagued with and the instrument of the secular: professing to be a lamb, but in reality being a dragon: persecuting the saints of God: the inseparable companion and upholder of despotic and tyrannical power. This in all its forms, Pagan, Papal, and in so far as the Reformed Churches have retrograded towards Papal sacerdotalism, Protestant also, I believe to be that which is symbolized under the second wild-beast.

57. Next, the apocalyptic vision brings before us the Lamb on Mount Sion with the first-fruits of His people, and the heavenly song in which they join,—as prefatory to the announcement, by three angels, of the prophecies which are to follow, so full of import to the people and church of God. These are, first, the proclamation of the everlasting Gospel as previous to the final judgments of God: next, the fall of Babylon, as an encouragement for the patience of the saints: third, the final defeat and torment of the Lord's enemies. After these is heard a voice proclaiming the blessedness of the holy dead. Then follow, in strict accord with these, four announcements, 1) the harvest and the vintage of the earth, and the seven last plagues, symbolized by the out-pouring of the vials: 2) the ample details of the fall and punishment of Babylon: 3) the triumph of the Church in the last defeat of her Lord's enemies: 4) the millennial reign, and finally, the eternity of bliss. But on each of these somewhat more must be said.

58. I have found reason to interpret the *harvest*, of the ingathering of the Lord's people: the *vintage*, of the crushing of His enemies: both these being, according to the usage of this book, compendious, and inclusive of the fuller details of both, which are to follow.

59. The vintage is taken up and expanded in detail by the series of the vials: seven in number, as were the seals and the trumpets before. These final judgments, specially belonging to the Church, are introduced by a song of triumph from the saints of both dispensations, and are poured out by angels coming forth from the opened sanctuary of the tabernacle of witness in heaven.

60. The course of these judgments is in some particulars the same as that of the trumpets. The earth, the sea, the rivers, the lights of heaven—these are the objects of the first four: but ever with reference to those who worship the beast and have his mark on them. At the fifth, as in each case before, there is a change from general to special: the throne and kingdom of the beast, the river Euphrates, these are now the objects: and the seventh passes off, as in each former case, to the consummation of all things.

61. Meantime, as so often before, anticipating hints have been given of new details belonging to the other angelic announcements. At the sixth vial, we have the sounds of the gathering of an approaching battle

of God's enemies against Him, and the very battle-field pointed out. After the seventh and its closing formula, Babylon comes into remembrance before God, to give her the cup of His vengeance. Thus then we pass to the second of the angelic announcements—the fall of Babylon. Here the Seer is carried in spirit into the wilderness, and shewn the great vision of the woman seated on the beast. I have entered in the Commentary into all the details of this important portion of the prophecy: and it is unnecessary to repeat them here. It may suffice to say, that the great persecuting city, the type of the union of ecclesiastical corruption with civil tyranny, is finally overthrown by the hands of those very kingdoms who had given their power to the beast, and this overthrow is celebrated by the triumphant songs of the Church and of Creation and of innumerable multitudes in heaven.

62. But here again, according to the practice of which I cannot too often remind the student, a voice from heaven announces the character of the new and final vision which is to follow: Blessed are they which are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. And now, in the prophetic details of the third of the previous angelic announcements, and of the proclamation of the blessedness of the holy dead, the great events of the time of the end crowd, in their dread majesty, upon us. First, the procession of the glorified Redeemer with the armies of heaven following Him, coming forth to tread the winepress of the wrath of Almighty God. Then the great battle of the Lord against His foes, the beast and the false prophet, leagued with the kings of the earth against Him. Then, the binding of the dragon, the old serpent, for a season. Then, the first resurrection, the judgment of the church, the millennial reign: as to which I have again and again raised my earnest protest against evading the plain sense of words, and spiritualizing in the midst of plain declarations of fact. That the Lord will come in person to this our earth: that His risen elect will reign here with Him and judge: that during that blessed reign the power of evil will be bound, and the glorious prophecies of peace and truth on earth find their accomplishment:—this is my firm persuasion, and not mine alone, but that of multitudes of Christ's waiting people, as it was that of His primitive apostolic Church, before controversy blinded the eyes of the Fathers to the light of prophecy.

63. But the end is not yet. One struggle more and that the last. At the end of the millennial period, Satan is unloosed, and the nations of the earth are deceived by him—they come up against and encircle the camp of the saints and the beloved city: and fire comes down out of heaven and consumes them: and the devil who deceived them is cast into the lake of fire. Then is described the general judgment of the dead, the destruction of death and Hades, and the condemnation of all whose names are not found written in the book of life.

64. Finally, in accord with the previous proclamation of the blessedness of the holy dead, the description of the heavenly Jerusalem forms the glorious close of the whole.

65. It remains that I say a few words in explanation of the annexed Table, which contains an arrangement of the Apocalyptic matter in accordance with the view upheld above.

66. In the upper part of the table, extending all across it, are specified the general subject of the book, printed in black, and the Epistles to the seven churches. Then follow, printed in red, the heavenly scenery and personages common to the whole following prophecy, till all the various visions merge, at the bottom of each column, in the new heavens and new earth, the description of which is again printed in red across the table beneath the columns.

67. The columns themselves contains the various visions, followed by the episodes which occur in them, in order: each in turn passing away into the great day of the Lord, and the events of the time of the end. Any one who has followed the Commentary, or even the epitome given in these Prolegomena, will have no difficulty in making use of the conspectus given in the table.

68. The words printed in thick type are intended to direct the reader's attention to their recurrence as furnishing landmarks, or tests of interpretation: e. g. the numbers, seven, four, twelve: the white horse and its Rider: the ruling the nations with a rod of iron, as unmistakably identifying the Man-child of ch. xii. with the Victor of ch. xix.: &c. &c.

69. I have now only to commend to my gracious God and Father this feeble attempt to explain the most mysterious and glorious portion of His revealed Scripture: and with it, this my labour of now eighteen years, herewith completed. I do it with humble thankfulness, but with a sense of utter weakness before the power of His Word, and inability to sound the depths even of its simplest sentence. May He spare the hand which has been put forward to touch His Ark: may He, for Christ's sake, forgive all rashness, all perverseness, all uncharitableness, which may be found in this book, and sanctify it to the use of His Church: its truth, if any, for teaching: its manifold defect, for warning. My prayer is and shall be, that in the stir and labour of men over His Word, to which these volumes have been one humble contribution, others may arise and teach, whose labours shall be so far better than mine, that this book, and its writer, may ere long be utterly forgotten.

ΑΜΗΝ ΕΡΧΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΕ ΙΗΣΟΥ.

I. III.

MUST SHORTLY

seven Churches of Asi

'E COMETH.

l ; a sharp two-edged s seven candlesticks are the seven Churches.
s to the Churches.

V.

d in heaven.

thereon : His glorio

me come lightnings a nd about the throne, four living-beings, full of
saying, Holy Holy Ho sitteth on the throne, the twenty-four elders
and the honour and the

is worthy to open it.

seven eyes, which are th eth on the throne. The four-and-twenty elders
emption. This is living ngs say Amen, and the four-and-twenty elders

II. XIV.

AND HER FOES.

n clothed with the sun, twelve stars, is with ch

gon with seven heads

hen born.

ho shall rule the natio

to God's throne. She flie

is nourished 1260 days

is Satan, cast down to t

he earth.

s mouth after the woman

the seed of the woman.

sea, with ten horns an

istics of Daniel's empires

nd his throne. One of

en worship it, and wond

y-two months. It bla

ll worship it except tho

of life. Its weapons

phet), with two horns lik

wonders, serving the fi

image, and receive its m

number may be calcula

the 144,000 virgins. Th

atory of the coming prop

ng Gospel to preach to

nts is come:

of Babylon (not yet de

ture punishment of

the number of his nam

dness of the holy dead

zements, we have comp

gathering of God's peopl

nishment of the wicked.

ast plagues, in which

D IS FULFILLED.

XIX. 11—21. XX.

Heaven opened : a white horse and his Rider, hful and True : with many crowns on, and names, and ne which none knew but Himself : clad in a vesture ed in blood : His name,

THE WORD OF GOD.

e armies of heaven follow Him on white horses, in pure linen. Out of His mouth comes a sharp sword, rike the nations : and He shall rule them with a of iron, and tread the winepress of the wrath of On His vesture and on His thigh a name written,

KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS.

angel standing in the sun cries to the birds to gather e great banquet of God.

e beast and the kings of the earth make war st the Rider on the white horse and His armies. beast and the false prophet are taken alive and into the lake of fire. The rest who received the k of the beast and the number of his name are with the sword of His mouth, and feed the birds their flesh.

An angel descends from heaven, having the key of pit and a chain, and binds Satan for a thousand rs.

vision of thrones, and those sitting on them, to whom ment is given : the souls of those who were beded for the witness of Christ and the word of God, those who had not worshipped the beast nor his ge, nor had received his mark : and they lived reigned with Christ a thousand years.

fter the thousand years, Satan is unbound, and deceives nations, gathering them to war. They surround the p of the saints and the beloved city. Fire comes down n heaven and destroys them. The devil is cast into the of fire.

great WHITE THRONE and ONE sitting on it, from m heaven and earth flee away.

HE DEAD, SMALL AND GREAT, STAND BEFORE GOD: BOOKS ARE OPENED: ALL ARE JUDGED ACCORDING THEIR WORKS.

eath and Hadés cast into the lake of fire, and all who not found written in the book of life.

XXII.

The tabernacle of God row nor crying nor pain. All things made new.
he names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Its street is pure gold.
es are never shut : th nter : but only those written in the Lamb's book
it each month, and its OD AND THE LAMB ARE IN IT. HIS
R THE LORD GOVER
BEHOLD, I COME
OME, LORD JESU

CHAPTER IX.

APPARATUS CRITICUS.

SECTION I.

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS REFERRED TO IN THIS VOLUME.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
A	A	A	Alexandrinus.	V.	*See Vol. I.*	A
B	B	—	Vatican, 1209.	IV.	*See Vol. I.*	B
—	—	B[1]	Basilianus, Vatican, 2066.	VIII.	Card. Quirini (for Wetstein), Tischendorf and Tregelles. Published by Tischendorf, and by Mai at the end of his edition of the Codex Vaticanus.	—
C	C	C	Ephræmi.	V.	*See Vol. I.*	C
D	—	—	Claromontanus[2].	VI.	*See Vol. II.*	—
H	—	—	Paris, Coisl. 202 A.	VI.	*See Vol. II.* Contains of this Vol. only Heb. ii. 11—16, iii. 13—18, iv. 12—15.	—
—	Hr	. .	*See* Heb. 179 *below.*			
K	K	—	Moscow Synod, 98.	IX.	*See Vol. II.*	—
L	L	—	Angelicus or Passionei.	IX.	*See Vol. II.*	—
M	—	—	Uffenbachianus.	X.	*See Vol. II.* (Def. Heb. iv. 3—xii. 20.)	—
P	P	P	St. Petersburg. Porphyrii[3].	VIII.	*See Vol. II.* (Def. Heb. xii. 9, 10; 1 Joh. iii. 19—v. 1; Jude 4—15; Rev. xvi. 12—xvii. 1, xix. 21—xx. 9, xxii—6—end.)	
ℵ	ℵ		Sinaiticus.	IV.	*See Vol. I.*	ℵ
			Frag. Mosquense.	VI?	Matthæi. Contains Heb. x. 1—7, 32—38.	—
[4]a	a	—	Lambeth, 1182.	XII.	Scrivener.	—
b	b	—	Lambeth, 1183.	1358	Scrivener.	—
[5]c	c	—	Formerly Lambeth, 1184.	XV.	Sanderson in Scrivener.	—

[1] In this edition we have distinguished this MS. from the preceding, by the use of a different type for the letter denoting it. The difference is further marked by quoting the cursive supplement to the great MS. uniformly as "Br," and no longer, with Tregelles, as "91."

[2] It seems no longer necessary to quote the Codex Sangermanensis ("E") side by side with this manuscript, as it has been clearly proved that the one is a transcript of the other.

[3] A few readings communicated by Dr. Tregelles were inserted in the third edition of the Apocalypse. [The whole of the Apocalypse has now (1871) been collated with Tischdf.'s ed. of the MS. in Mon. Sacra Inedit.. vol. vi., and the readings in the Epp. inserted from Tregelles' New Test.]

[4] Appendix to Mr. Scrivener's edn. of the "Codex Augiensis," Cambridge, 1859. It has not been thought worth while to encumber the page with every various reading found in these manuscripts; but whenever any variation of the uncials is mentioned, the testimony of these accurately-collated documents is added.

[5] A manuscript once in the possession of Professor Carlyle; returned to the Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1817.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
[6] d	d	—	Lambeth, 1185.	XV.	Scrivener	—
e	—	a	Lambeth, 1186.	XI.	Scrivener.	—
f	f	—	Theodori.	1295	Scrivener. Belonged to Pickering the publisher.	g
g	g	—	Wordsworth.	XIII.	Scrivener.	l
[7] h	h	b	Butler 2. Brit. Mus., Addl. 11837.	1357	Scrivener. (= Heb. 104, Cath. 91, Gosp. 201 below.)	m
—	j	—	Burney 48. Brit. Mus.	XIV.	Scrivener. Contains Catholic Epistles only. They are found at fol. 221 of the 2nd Vol. of a MS. of Chrysostom's homilies, but not in the same hand with them.	—
k	k	—	Trin. Coll. Camb. B. x. 16.	1316	Scrivener.	w
l	l	—	Chr. Coll. Camb. F. i. 13.	XII.	Scrivener. Mill (*Cant.* 2). (=Heb. 29, Cath. 24 below.)	—
—	—	c	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5678.	XV.	Scrivener. (= Apoc. 31 below.)	—
..	..	d	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5778.	XII.	Apoc., Scrivener. Epp., Mill (*Sin.*). (=Heb.34, Cath.28, Apoc.8 below).	—
..	..	e	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5613.	1407	Scrivener (in Apoc.) 1 Pet., 1 John v. collated by Griesb. (= Heb. 63, Cath. 60, Apoc. 29 below.)	—
m	m	f	The Leicester MS.	XIV.	Scrivener. (= Heb. 37, Cath. 31, Apoc. 14.) *See* 69, *Vol. I.*	69
n	n	—	Emm. Coll. Camb. i. 4. 35.	XII.	Scrivener. Mill (*Cant.* 3). (= Heb. 30, Cath. 53.)	—
o	o	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Mm. 6, 9.	XII or XIII.	Scrivener. Mill's *Hal.* (= Heb. 61 and 221, Cath. 61 and 111, Gosp. 40.)	v
—	—	g	PARHAM No. 17.	XII.	Scrivener.	—
—	—	h	Parham No. 2.	XIV.	Scrivener.	—
—	—	j	Brit. Mus., Addl. MS. No. 17469.	XIV.	Scrivener.	—
—	—	k	Liber Canonicus, No. 34.	1516	Scrivener.	—
..	..	l	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5537.	1087	Apoc., Scrivener. Epp., Mill (*Cov.* 2). (= Heb. 31., Cath. 25, Apoc. 7 below.) (Def. 1 Joh. v. 15—2 Joh. 6.)	—
..	..	m	Middlehill, Worcestersh. No. 1461 (formerly Meerman 118).	XI. or XII.	Apoc., Scrivener. (= Heb. 242, Cath. 178, Apoc. 87. Epp., inspected by Scholz?) (Def. Heb. ix. 3—x. 29; Ja. i. 1—5; iii. 6—iv. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 10—1 Joh. i. 1; iii. 13—iv. 2; Jude 16—end.)	—
—	—	n	Bodleian, Baroc. 4.	XV.	Scrivener.	—
1	1	—	Reuchlini. Basle, K. iii. 3 (late B. vi. 27).	X.	Wetstein, "bis atque accurate," Tregelles and Roth. in Gosp. (See below, Apoc. 15 note.)	—

[6] "Might almost be considered a series of fragments in several different hands." The Catholic Epistles are written by one scribe, the Epistle to the Hebrews by another.

[7] Formerly Cod. Prædicatorum S. Marci, 701. See Scrivener, Collation of MSS. of Gosp. p. xlv. Introd. to N. T. Criticism, p. 163.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
2	2	—	Basle (late B. ix. ult.).	XV.	Mill (*B* 2). The basis of Erasmus' 1st edn.	--
—	—	1	Reuchlini.	?	See note [8].	
3	3	—	Vienna, F.'s 15, K.'s 5.	XII.	Alter. Known as Corsendoncensis.	3
4	4	—	Basle (late B. x. 20).	XV.	Wetstein throughout Epp. Mill (*B* 3), in 1, 2, 3 Joh.	—
5	5	—	Paris, 106.	XII.	Stephens' δ'. Scholz.	5
6	6	—	Paris, 112.	XI.	Stephens' ε'.	6
7	—	—	Basle (late B. vi. 17).	X.	Readings given in Wetstein. Text surrounded by various Scholia from Thdrt., Gennad., Œc., Sevrn., &c. On parchment. (Ends Heb. xii. 8.)	—
(8)	. .	—		—	Stephens' ϛ' (= Cath. 50. *Identified by some with Heb.* 132, *Cath.* 113 *below*).	—
9	7	—	Paris, 102.	X.	Stephens' ι'. No lacunæ.	—
(10)	(8)	—	*Not identified.*	—	Stephens' ια'.	—
11	9	—	Camb. Univ. Lib. MS. Kk. 6. 4.	XI.	Stephens' ιγ'. Belonged to Vatablus. (Def. Heb. vii. 26—xi. 10; xi. 23—end.)	—
12	10	2	Paris, 237.	X.	Stephens' ιε'. Wetstein "de integro." Many additional readings in Scholz.	—
(13)				—	*See Vol. III.*	
(14)	. .	—	Jacobi Fabri Daventriensis.	XVI.	*See Vol. III.* (= Cath. 47.)	90
(15)	—	—	Amandi.	—	*See Vol. III.*	—
. .	11	—	Paris, 103.	X.	(= Heb. 140.) Reiche (in Heb.), Wetstein (in Cath.) Marg. Schol. (Def. Heb. xi. 35—end. Heb. xi. 35—xii. 1, supplied in xiv. or xv. cent.)	—
—	—	(3)	*Not identified.*	—	Stephens' ις'.	—
16	12	[9]4	Paris, 219.	XI.	Wetstein. Inspected by Reiche. Apocalypse re-examined, in certain places, by A. W. Grafton. Text mixed up with commentary, but easily distinguishable. Belonged to J. Lascaris.	—

[8] The only MS. of the Apocalypse (containing i. 1—xxii. 16, γενος του δαδ|) used by Erasmus for his first edition. It was found in the library at Mayhingen by Prof. Delitzsch of Erlangen, who published an account of its readings as compared with the texts of Erasmus and Tischendorf. This account has been incorporated in the digest, the only exception to its faithful reproduction being that palpable and undeniable clerical errors in the MS. have not been noticed. Such, e.g., are, λευῖκός for λευκός, xix. 11: ἀκάθησαν for ἐκάθισαν, xx. 4: καὶ κοσμημένην (accents *sic*), xxi. 2: εἰς αὐτοὺς αἰῶνας, xxii. 5. The text in the MS. is mixed up with the commentary of Andreas, who lived in the latter half of Cent. V. Its age is not definitely stated; but it bears marks of being copied from an earlier uncial MS. See Delitzsch, Handschriftliche Funde, pt. i. pp. 7—16 and pt. ii. pp. 1—21.

[9] The mss. (of the Apocalypse) themselves were consulted by me in nearly every place where in the last edition they were either cited e silentio or queried. Roughly speaking, each manuscript was examined in about 200 readings, one or two of them in

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
		(5)	Various readings given by Laurentius Valla.			
17	.8	—	Paris, 14. (Colb. 2844.)	XI.	Tregelles. *See* 33, *Vol. I.*	33
18	14	. .	Paris, Coisl. 199.	XI.	Wetstein. (= Apoc. 17 below.) A very few additional readings in Scholz. Apoc. re-examined.	35
—	15	—	Paris, Coisl. 25.	XI.	Wetstein. Scholia.	—
19	16	—	Paris, Coisl. 26.	XI.	Wetstein. Variorum Comm.	—
20	—	—	Paris, Coisl. 27.	X.	Wetstein. Varior. Comm. Mutilated.	—
21	17	. .	Paris, Coisl. 205.	XI.	Wetstein. (= Apoc. 19 below.) Apoc. re-examined. (Heb. xiii. 15—end of Ep. Apoc. i. 1—ii. 5, supplied in a recent hand.)	—
22	18	. .	Paris Coisl. 202 A.	XIII.	Wetstein. Variorum Comm. (= Apoc. 18 below.) Apoc. re-examined. Andreas' Comm.	—
23	19	—	Paris, Coisl. 200.	XIII.	Wetstein. Stephens θ'. "Continet totum N.T. præter Apoc. (nam in Catalogo hujus Bibliothecæ Apoc. pro. Ep. Paul. ponitur)." Wetstein.	38
24	. .	—	Bodleian, Misc. 136.	XII.	Occasionally cited by Wetstein. Ebnerianus. (= Cath. 48 below.)	105
25	20	—	Brit. Mus., King's Lib. 1. B. 1.	XIV.	Wetstein (Westmonasteriensis 935). Mutilated.	—
(26)	21	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Dd. 11. 90.	XIII.	Wetstein. Identified with Mill's *Lee.* Belonged to "Jo. Luke." (The whole of Heb. is lost.)	—
27	—	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Ff. 1. 30.	XI.	Catena chiefly from Photius.	—
. .	22	—	Brit. Mus., Addl. MS. 5115-7.	XII.	Inspected by Wetstein. "Lectt. ex 1 Tim. communicavit. Rev. Paulus" (Griesbach). Belonged to Meade, and then to Askew. (= Heb. 75 below.) Gospels written in 1326.	109
28	23	6	Bodleian, Baroc. 3.	XI.	Mill (*Baroc.*). Caspar Wetstein. (Def. 1 Pet. iii. 7—23.) Scholia, that on Apoc. edited by Cramer.	
(29)	(24)	—	*The same MS. as* "1" *above.*			
(30)	. .	—	*The same MS. as* "n" *above.*		(= Cath. 53.)	—
31	25	(7)	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "1" *above.*			
32	26	—	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5557.	XII.	Mill (*Cov.* 3).	—
33	27	—	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5620.	XV.	Mill (*Cov.* 4). No lacunæ (Griesb. Symb. Crit.). In Cath., either a transcript of 29, or derived from the same original.	—
34	28	(8)	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "d" *above.*			

very many more. ("4" and "9" were examined in about 182 places. "10" was collated up to ch. ii. 21, and consulted in the rest whenever there was reason to think that Mill had passed over any of the variations, the authorities for which were to be stated in the digest of this volume. "17" was examined in about 364 places; "18," in about 283; and "19," in about 220.) A. W. G. (note in 2nd edn.)

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
35	29	.—	Geneva, 20.	XII.	Mill (*Genev.*).	—
36	30	*9	Bodleian, Misc. 74.	XIII.	Mill (*Hunt.* 1). Apocalypse partially re-examined. Formerly known as Huntingdon 131.	—
—	—	*10	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Dd. 6. 69.	XIV.	Mill (*M.*). Apoc. re-examined. Marginal comm.	60
. .	. .	(11)	Petavii? *Situation unknown.*	?	Mill (*Pet.* 2). (= Heb. 45, Cath. 39.) (Def. Ja. i. 1—v. 17; 3 John 9—end of Jude.)	—
. .	. .	12	Vatican, Alex. 179.	—	Mill (*Pet.* 3). Zacagni. Birch. Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 46, Cath. 40.)	—
. .	. .	13	Frankfort on Oder. Seidel.	XI.	Middledorpf in Rosenmüller's Comm. Theol. Vol. 2. (= Heb. 48, Cath. 42.) (Def. 2 Pet. i. 1, 2; 1 Joh. v. 11—21.)	—
(37)	(31)	(14)	*The same MS. as* Heb. Cath. "m," Apoc. "f" *above.*			
38	32	—	Bodleian, Laud. 31 (late 715).	XIII.	Mill (*Laud.* 2). (Def. 2 Pet. iii. 2—18.)	51
39	33	—	Linc. Coll. Oxford, 82.	XI.	Mill (*Lin.* 2). (Entered among Latin MSS. in Coxe's Catalogue.) (Def. 2 Pet. i. 1—15.)	—
40	34	. .	Dublin, Montfort. MS.	XVI.	Barrett (App. to edn. of Z. of Gosp.) and Dobbin. (= Apoc. 92.) The Apocalypse was certainly transcribed from Cod. Leicestrensis. In this edn. therefore citations are almost wholly confined to the concluding portion, where "f" is defective.	61
—	—	15	Basle fragment, A. N. iii. 12.	—	Rev. iii. 3—iv. 8 written in cursive letters in the volume referred to as "E" in the Gospels[1].	—
41	35	—	Magd. Coll. Oxf., 9.	XI.	Mill (*Magd.* 1)	57
—	36	—	New Coll. Oxf., 58.	XIII.	Mill (*N.* 1). Edited by Cramer. Catena.	—
43	37	—	New Coll. Oxf., 59.	XIII.	Mill (*N.* 2). Marginal gloss.	—
44	38	—	Leyden, 77 Voss.	XIII.	Sarrau. Wetstein. Addl. readings in Dermout (Mill's *Pet.* 1). No lacunæ (Dermout). Belonged to Petau and to Vossius.	—
(45)	(39)	. .	*The same MS. as* Apoc. 11, *above.*			
46	40	. .	*The same MS. as* Apoc. 12, *above.*			
47	—	—	Bodleian, Roe 16.	XII.	Mill (*Roe* 2). Marginal Scholia. [Tregelles.]	—
. .	41	. .	Vatican, 2080.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 194, Apoc. 20.) Part of the last chapter of Apoc. transcribed by Blanchini.	175
48	42	. .	*The same MS. as* Apoc. 13, *above.*			
49	43	—	Vienna, L.'s 28, N.'s 300.	XII.	Alter. Mill's *Vien.*	76

[1] So Tischdf.; but Delitzsch states that it is in the cursive ms. "1" of the Gospels.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
(50)	..	—	*Situation unknown.*	—	A MS. brought from Rhodes, occasionally referred to by Stunica, one of the Complutensian editors. (= Cath. 52.)	—
(51)	(44)	..		—	*See Vol. III. and* Apoc. 5 *above.*	82
52	45	16	Hamburg	XV.	Bengel's Uffenbachianus, in his Apparatus Criticus. In Apoc. closely allied with our "1" = 7 above.	—
(53)	—	—	*Part of the MS. "M" above.*			
55	46	—	Munich, 375.	XI.	Bengel (Augsburg 6). Œc. comm.	—
(56)					*See Vol. III. note.*	
..	..	[2]17	*The same MS. as* Heb. 18, Cath. 14, *above.*			
..	..	[2]18	*The same MS. as* Heb. 22, Cath. 18, *above.*			
..	..	19	*The same MS. as* Heb. 21, Cath. 17, *above.*			
..	..	20	*The same MS. as* Cath. 41, *above.*			
—	—	[2]21	Vallicella Lib. Rome, D. 20.	XIV.	Uncited. Andreas' comm.	—
..	..	[2]22	Vallicella Lib. Rome, B. 86.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 204, Cath. 166.)	—
		(23)			See note [3].	
57	..	..	Vienna, L.'s 1, N.'s 23.	XIII.	Edited by Alter. (= Cath. 65, Apoc. 33.)	218
58	—	—	Vatican, 165.	XII.	Edited by Zacagni. Called Cryptoferratensis.	—
..	(47)	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. 14, *above.*			
..	48	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. 24, *above.*			
—	49	—	*Not known now.*	—	Wetstein (Andreæ Fæschii). Contains Cath. Epp. with Scholia of Sev., Ammon., Max.	92
..	(50)	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. [8], *above.*			
..	51	..	Paris, 56.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 133, Apoc. 52 below.) [Def. Apoc. xxii. 17—21.]	—
..	(52)	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. [50], *above.*			
..	(53)	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. Cath. "n" *above.*			

[2] Scholz's citations of these numbers are taken from Wetstein, and not from these mss. as would be inferred from his list. Wetstein's 21, 22 are two (supposititious ?) French mss. which appear in Bentley's specimen of the last chapter of Revelation in his proposals for a new edition of the Greek Testament.

[3] Scholz inserts here a MS. (Paris, Coisl. 200), which Wetstein says does not contain the Apocalypse. The Medicæan readings once designated by this number ought not to be reckoned as if they represented the variations of some one MS.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
..	54	—	Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, 4.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Known as San-Maglorianus. (= Heb. 180 below.)	48
—	(55)	—	*Not known now.*	—	A second copy of Ep. Jude, in the MS. numbered Heb. 14, Cath. 47, above.	—
59	—	—	Paris, Coisl. 204.	XI.	Inspected. Catena.	—
(60)					*See Vol. III. note.*	
..	..	24	Vatican, 2062.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Readings from the latter chapters of Apoc. given by Blanchini. (= Heb. 193, Cath. 160.) Apoc. follows Acts. (Def. Heb. ii. 1—end.)	—
..	..	25	Vatican, Palat. 171.	XIV.	Zacagni. Readings given in Amelotte's French version of the Apocalypse. Additional readings and corrections of ch. i. 1—iii. 9, given in Birch. (= Heb. 88, Cath. 77.)	149
—	—	26	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake [12. (1, Scholz)].	XI.	Caspar Wetstein (= lect. 57).	—
..	..	27	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake 34 [2, Scholz].	XI.	Caspar Wetstein. (= Heb. 244, Cath. 190.) 1 Joh. collated by Scholz. (Ja. and 1 Pet., no trace contained in the MS.)	no No.
—	—	(28)	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "n" *above.*			
..	56	—	Bodleian, Clarke 4.	XII.?	Date not given in the printed Cat. of Clarke's MSS. On parchment. Inspected by Scholz. (Omits Jude?) (= Heb. 227.)	—
..	57	.	Copenhagen, 1.	1278	Hensler. Cited by Bengel and Birch. (= Heb. 72.)	234
..	58	—	Bodleian, Clarke 9.	XIII.?	Date not given in Cat. On parchment. Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 224.)	
..	59	—	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5588.	XIII.	1 Pet. collated by Griesb. (= Heb. 62.)	—
..	60	29	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "e" *above.*			
(61)	(61)	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. Cath. "o" *above.*			
62	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 59 *above.*			
63	..	..	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "e" Cath. 60 *above.*			
65	62	—	Paris, 60.	XIV.	Inspected, and 1 Joh. v. collated by Griesbach.	—
(66)					*See Vol. III. note.*	
67	..	..	Vienna, L.'s 34, N.'s 302.	XII.	Alter and Birch. (= Cath. 66, Apoc. 34.) Collated by Alter with Apoc. 33. The readings inserted by a corrector are very valuable. Scholi a.	
68	63	—	Vienna, L.'s 35, N.'s 313.	XIII.	Alter and Birch.	—
69	64	—	Vienna, L.'s 36, N.'s 303.	XIII.	Alter and Birch.	—

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
. .	. .	30	Wolfenbüttel, xvi. 7.	XIV.	Knittel in Matthæi's Appendix. (= Heb. 74, Cath. 69.)	—
—	—	31)	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "ρ" *above.*			
—	—	32	Dresden, Loescheri.	XV.	Matthæi (t in Appendix).	—
. .	65	33	*The same MS. as* Heb. 57 *above.*			
. .	66	34	*The same MS. as* Heb. 67 *above.*			
—	—	35	Vienna, 248.	XIV.	Alter. Collated with Apoc. 33. Andr. comm. Some readings in Delitzsch.	—
—	—	36	Vienna, Koll. 26.	XIV.	Alter. Collated with Apoc. 33. Andr. comm.	—
70	67	—	Vienna, L.'s 37, N.'s 221.	1331	Alter and Birch.	—
71	—	—	Vienna, F.'s 19, K.'s 10.	XII.	Alter and Birch.	—
72	. .	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 57 *above.*			
73	68	—	Upsala, Sparwenfeld 42.	XI.	Aurivillius. Catena.	—
74	69	. .	*The same MS. as* Apoc. 30, *above.*			
75	. .	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 22, *above.*			
77	70	. .	Vatican, 360.	XI.	Inspected by Birch and Scholz. (= Apoc. 66.)	131
78	71	—	Vatican, 363.	XI.	Inspected by Birch and Scholz.	133
79	72	37	Vatican, 366.	XIII.	Inspected by Birch and Scholz.	—
80	73	—	Vatican, 367.	XI.	Birch, "per omnia contuli."	—
—	—	38	Vatican, 579.	XIII.	Birch. Re-collated for this volume by B. H. Alford.	—
83	—	—	Vatican, 765.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Comm. on marg.	—
84	—	—	Vatican, 766.	XII.	Inspected by Birch. Comm. on marg.	—
(85)	—	39	Vatican, 1136.	XII.	Birch (throughout Apoc.). (Does not contain Heb. Begins Apoc. iii. 8; but illegible to iv. 7.) Apoc. before Epp.	—
86	75	40	Vatican, 1160.	XIII.	Birch. "Apoc. accurate examinavi cætera cursim perlustrans."	141
87	76	—	Vatican, 1210.	XI.	"Ep. Jac., 1 et 2 Pet., 1 Joh. necnon 4 priora Cap. Ep. ad Ebræos exacte contuli." Birch.	142
88	77	. .	*The same MS. as* Apoc. 25, *above.*			
(89)	78	—	Vatican, Alex. 29.	XII.	Birch, "accurate exam." (Does not contain Heb.)	—
—	—	41	Vatican, Alex. 68.	XIV.	Birch (throughout Apoc.). Andr. comm.	—
90	79	—	Vatican, Urb. 3.	XI.	Inspected by Birch.	—
91	80	42	Vatican, Pio. 50.	XII.	Birch, "per omnia diligenter bis coll."	—
—	—	43	Barberini Lib. Rome, 23.	XIV.	Contains among other things a fragment of a catena upon the Apocalypse (ch. xiv. 17—xviii. 20). Collated by Birch.	—

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
—	81	—	Barberini Lib. Rome, 377.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Commentary.	—
92	82	44	Propaganda Lib. Rome, 250.	1274	Engelbreth in Birch. (Once *Borg.* 4.)	180
93	83	?	Naples i. B. 12.	XI.	Birch. Ja. i., ii. "per omnia contuli."	—
94	84	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 1.	X.	Inspected by Birch. Mutilated at end. Marginal commentary.	—
95	(85)	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 5.	XIII.	Inspected by Birch. Does not contain Cath. Epp. Thl.'s comm.	—
96	86	. .	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 20.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Margl. comm. (= Apoc. 75.)	—
97	87	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 29.	X.	Inspected by Birch.	—
98	88	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 31.	XI.	Inspected by Birch.	—
99	89	45	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 32.	XI.	Inspected by Birch; and Apoc. i.—iii. collated.	—
—	90	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, viii. 14.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Contains Ep. of Ja. with marginal scholia.	197
100	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, x. 4.	XII.	Inspected by Birch. Comm.	—
101	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, x. 6.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Comm.	—
102	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, x. 7.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Var. comm.	—
103	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence. x. 19.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Catena.	—
(104)	(91)	. .	*The same MS. as* Heb. Cath. "h." Apoc. "b" *above.*			201
105	92	—	Bologna, Can. Reg., 640.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz.	204
106	93	. .	St. Mark's Venice, 5	XV.	Rinck. (= Apoc. 88; Apoc. copied from 46 below.)	205
107	94	—	St. Mark's Venice, 6.	XV.	Rinck.	206
108	95	46	St. Mark's Venice, 10.	XV.	Rinck.	209
109	96	—	St. Mark's Venice, 11.	XIII.	Rinck.	—
110	—	—	St. Mark's Venice, 33.	XI.	Rinck. Comm.	—
111	—	—	St. Mark's Venice, 34.	XI.	Rinck. Comm.	—
112	—	—	St. Mark's Venice, 35.	XI.	Rinck. Comm. (Def. Heb. x. 25—end.)	—
. .	97	—	Wolfenbüttel, Gud. Gr. 104 A.	XII.	Cath., Langer in Griesbach (98). (= Heb. 241.) (Heb. inspected by Scholz.)	—
[4]113	98	—	(Moscow?)	XI.	Matthæi (a). Belonged to Matthæi himself.	—
114	99	—	Moscow, Synod. 5.	1445	Matthæi (c)	—
115	100	—	Moscow, Synod. 334.	XI.	Matthæi (d) Thl.'s comm.	—
116	101	—	Moscow, Synod. 333.	XIII.	Matthæi (f) Scholia.	—
(117)	(102)	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. Cath. "K" *above.*			
118	103	—	Moscow, Synod. 193.	XII.	Matthæi (h). A volume of scholia with texts on margin.	—
120	104	47	Dresden, Cod. Matth.	XI.	Matthæi (k).	241

[4] Rinck uses this number for St. Mark's Venice, 36.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
121	105	48	Moscow, Synod. 380.	XII.	Matthæi (l).	242
122	106	—	Moscow, Synod. 328.	XI.	Matthæi (m).	—
123	—	—	Moscow, Synod. 99.	XI.	Matthæi (n).	—
—	—	49	Moscow, Synod. 67.	XV.	Matthæi (o). Andr. comm.	—
—	—	50	Moscow, Synod. 206.	XII.	Matthæi (p).	—
?	(107)	—	Dresden, 252.	XV.	Matthæi (19). See App. to Joh. (Gosp.) p. 378. A Euchologium containing amongst other N. T. lections Heb. ii. 2—10; 11—18; vii. 26—viii. 2; xiii. 17—21; Ja. v. 10—20 (10—16 a 2nd time); 2 Pet. i. 10—19; 1 Joh. iv. 12—19. This MS. ought to be entered amongst the lectionaries (ev. 57).	—
125	—	—	Munich, 504.	1387	Inspected by Scholz.	—
126	—	—	Munich, 455.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. Prob. copied from same MS. as preceding.	—
128	. .	. .	Munich, 211.	XI.	Scholz says, "Coll. integer fere cod.," but it is only cited occasionally. (=Cath. 179, Apoc. 82.) Some readings in Apoc. given by Delitzsch.	—
129	—	—	Munich, 35.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Thl.'s comm. (so Hardt.)	—
130	. .	—	*The same MS. as Cath. 54, above.*			
. .	[5]108	—	Escurial χ. iv. 17.	XI.	No published collation of the Epistles. (= Heb. 228.)	226
. .	[5]109	—	Escurial χ. iv. 12.	XIV.	No published collation of the Epistles. (= Heb. 229.)	227
. .	(110)	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Nn. 5. 27.	—	A folio copy of the Greek Bible printed "Basileæ per Joan. Hervagium 1545." A few notes are written on the margin. (= Heb. 222).	241
. .	([6]111)	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. Cath. "o" *above.*			
. .	([6]112)	—	*The MS. numbered* Heb. 11. Cath. 9, *above.*			
131	. .	—	Paris, Coisl. 196.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. (=Cath. 182.)	330
132	113	51	Paris, 47.	1364	Reiche).	18
133	. .	52	*The same MS. as* Cath. 51, *above.*			

[5] These appear to be the MSS. spoken of by Rev. Edw. Clarke in his "Letters concerning the Spanish Nation," 4to, London, 1763, p. 133. "I took down two of the oldest MSS. of the Epistles which I could find in the Escurial. . . . Both concur word for word in this reading, *Ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κ.τ.λ.*" (This passage was kindly pointed out to me by Dr. Tregelles. A. W. G.)

[6] See Vol. III., note.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
134	114	—	Paris, 57.	XIII.	Reiche.	—
(135)	115	—	Paris, 58.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. [Does not contain Heb.]	—
136	116	53	Paris, 59.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
137	117	(54)	Paris, 61.	XIII.	Reiche (Epp.); who states that it does not contain the Apocalypse.	263
138	118	55	Paris, 101.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
139	119	56	Paris, 102 A.	X.	Inspected by Scholz. Reic he.	—
140	. .	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 11, *above.*			
141	120	—	Paris, 103 A.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. (Def. 1 Joh. ii. 11—iii. 3; iii. 24—v. 14; 2 Joh.; 3 Joh. 11—end of Jude.)	—
142	121	—	Paris, 104.	XIII.	"Coll. max. cod. pars," Scholz.	—
143	122	—	Paris, 105.	XIV.	"Coll. max. cod. pars," Scholz. (Contains of Cath. Epp. only the follg. fragments: 1 Pet. ii. 20—iii. 2; iii. 17—end of 2 Pet.; 1 Joh. i. 1—iii. 5; iii. 21—v. 9[7]; 2 Joh. 8—3 Joh. 10; Jude 7—end.)	—
144	123	—	Paris, 106 A.	XIV.	"Coll. max. cod. pars," Scholz. Scholia. (Def. 1 Pet. i. 9—ii. 7.)	—
148	—	—	Paris, 111.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
149	124	57	Paris, 124.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
150	125	—	Paris, 125.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
151	—	—	Paris, 126.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
—	—	58	Paris, 19.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
—	—	59	Paris, 99 A.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
152	—	60	Paris, 136 A.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Contains (only?) Heb. Apoc.	—
153	126	—	Paris, 216.	X.	Inspected by Scholz and Reiche. Scholia.	—
154	127	—	Paris, 217.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz and Reiche. Thdrt.'s comm.	
155	128	—	Paris, 218.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Catena.	—
156	129	—	Paris, 220.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm., text often omitted.	—
—	130	—	Paris, 221.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Catena. (Def. 2 Pet. i. 14—end; 1 Joh. iv. 11—Jude 3.)	—
157	—	—	Paris, 222.	XI.	"Coll. magna codicis pars," Scholz.	—
158	131	—	Paris, 223.	1045	Inspected by Scholz and Reiche. Catena.	—
. .	132	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. 131, *above.*			
—	—	61	Paris, 491.	XIII.	A defective copy of the Apoc. among various works of Bas. Thdrt. Max.	
—	—	62	Paris, 239, 240.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Andr. comm.	—
—	—	63	Paris, 241.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Andr. comm.	—
159	—	64	Paris, 224.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Areth. comm.	—
160	—	—	Paris, 225.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Fragments with Thl.'s comm.	—
163	—	—	Paris, 233.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. Contains Heb. i.—viii. with cat.	

[7] So Scholz: but on 1 John v. 7, he speaks of "122" as "*hoc loco mutilus.*"

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
. .	167	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. 185, *above.*			
205	168	—	Vallicella Lib., Rome, F. 18.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
206	169	—	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. v. 29.	1344	Inspected by Scholz.	—
207	—	—	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. v. 32.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
208	—	—	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. viii. 55.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Thdrt.'s comm.	—
—	—	72	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. iv. 8.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Andr. comm.	—
—	—	73	Corsini Lib Rome, 838.	XVI.	Andr. comm.	—
. .	170	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. 186, *above.*			
209	171	—	} Two MSS. in the Library of the	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
210	172	—	} Collegio Romano	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
(211)	(173)	—	Naples (no number).	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. *Apparently the same as* Heb. 93, Cath. 83, *above.*	—
212	174	—	Naples, 1. C. 26.	XV.	Scholz (magna pars).	—
213	—	—	Barberini Lib. Rome, 29.	1338	Inspected by Scholz. Scholia.	—
215	. .	74	*The same MS. as* Cath. 140, *above.*			
. .	. .	75	*The same MS. as* Heb. 96, Cath. 86, *above.*			
. .	. .	76	*The same MS. as* Heb. 183, Cath. 147, *above.*			
—	—	77	Laur. Lib., Florence, vii. 9.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. Areth. comm.	—
. .	—	78	*The same MS. as* Heb. 197, *above.*			
—	—	79	Munich, 248, Codex Syrleti.	XVI.	F. Sylburg 1596 in ed. of Andr. comm. Some readings in Delitzsch. (Copied from the same MS. as Andr.a?)	—
—	—	80	Munich, 544.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. (The same MS. as Andr.p?)	—
—	—	81	Munich, 23.	XVI.	Theod. Peltanus 1547. Andr. comm.	—
216	175	—	Mon. of S. Bas. Messana, 2.	XII.	(Inspected by Munter?)	—
217	—	—	Palermo.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (Def. Heb. ii. 9—end.)	—
218	176	—	Syracuse.	XII.	Inspected by Munter.	421
219	177	—	Leyden, Meerman, 116.	XII.	Dermout. (Def. 1 John iv. 20—end; 2, 3 John; Jude.)	122
. .	178	. .	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "m" *above.*			
. .	179	82	*The same MS. as* Heb. 128, *above.*			
. .	180	—	Strasburg, Molsheimensis.	XII.	Various readings communicated to Scholz. (= Heb. 238.)	431
220	181	—	Berlin, Dicz. 10.	XV.	Pappelbaum. (Def. Heb. i. 1—9.)	400

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
⁶(221)	..	—	*The same MS. as* Heb. Cath. "o" *above.*			
(222)	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. (110) *above.*			
(223)	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. (152) *above.*			
224	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 58, *above.*			
⁶(225)	..	—	*The MS. numbered* Heb. 11, Cath. 9, *above.*			
⁶(226)	—	—	*The MS. numbered* Heb. 27, *above.*			
227	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 56, *above.*			
228	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 108, *above.*			
229	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 109, *above.*			
	..	83	*The same MS. as* Heb. 170, Cath. 135, *above.*			
230	..	84	*The same MS. as* Cath. 150, *above.*			
..		} —	Two MSS. in a Monastery on the Island of Patmos.	XII.	} Inspected by Scholz (= Heb. 243.)	—
..	182a			XIII.		
231	183	—	Gr. Mon. Jerusalem, 8.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
232	184	85	Gr. Mon. Jerusalem, 9.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
233	185	—	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 1.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
234	186	—	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 2.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	457
235	187	86	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 10.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	462
236	188	—	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 15.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
..	..	(87)	*The MS. designated* Apoc. "m" *above.*			
..	..	88	*The same MS. as* Heb. 106, Cath. 93, *above.*			
237	189	89	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 20.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	466
238	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 180, *above.*			
239	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 141, *above.*			
240	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 153, *above.*			
241	..	—	*The same MS. as* Cath. 97, *above.*			
242	..	..	*The same MS. as* Apoc. "m" *above.*			
243 }	..	—	*The same MSS. as* Cath. 182, *above.*			
243A }						

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
244	190	. .	*The same MS. as* Apoc. 27, *above.*			
245	191	—	Ch.Ch. Oxf., Wake 38 [3, Scholz].	XII.	(Inspected by Scholz?) Catena.	—
246	192	—	Ch.Ch. Oxf., Wake 37. [4, Scholz].	XI.	(Inspected by Scholz?)	—
8-pe	8-pe	—	St. Petersburg, xi. 1. 2. 230.	XII.	Muralto.	8-pe
—	—	90	Synod Lib., Moscow, Cod. Matth.	X.	Matthæi (a). (Scholz's (50².)	—
—	—	(91)	The cursive portion of Vatican 1209.	XVI.	Mico for Bentley. (Printed in App. to Woide's edn. of Cod. Alex.) Some readings, and a transcript of Rev. xxii. 17–21, by Brun in Delitzsch. *Cited as* Br.	
. .	. .	92	*The same MS. as* Heb. 40, Cath. 34, *above.*			

The following is a List of Lectionaries.

	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information
lect-1	Leyden, 243. Scaligeri.	XI.	Wetstein and Dermout. Contains . . . Heb. ix. 11—24; 1 Pet. i. 1—ii. 3; ii. 17—25; iii. 8—18; iv.; 1 Joh. i. 1—9; Jude 1—6. (= ev-6)
lect-2	Brit. Mus., Cotton. Vesp. B. 18.	XI.	"Contains the portions of Acts and Epp. appointed to be read throughout the whole year. Casley collated it in 1735, and Wetstein inserted his extracts." (Michaelis.) Mutilated at beg. and end.
lect-3	Bodleian, Baroc. 202?	995	(Quoted by Mill. Heb. x. 22, 23 qu.?)
lect-4	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5731.	XIV.	Griesbach. Contains the following fragments:—Heb. i. 1—12; ii. 2—10; id. 11—18; vii. 26—viii. 2; ix. 1—7; xi. 9, 10; id. 32—40; xiii. 17—21. (= Gosp. 117)
lect-5	Bodleian, Cromwell. 11. (Olim 226.) A liturgy book, containing 5thly (pp. 149—290), εὐαγγελοαποστόλων τῶν μεγάλων ἑορτῶν.	1225	Griesbach, who says "Variantes lectiones collegi e . . . . Heb. i. 1—12; iv. 14—v. 6; xi. 24—26; xi. 32—xii. 2."
lect-6	Göttingen (C. de Missy).	XV.	Matthæi (v.). See his appendix to Thess. Contains a large number of the usual lections, but not that which includes 1 Joh. v. 6—8.
lect-7	Copenhagen, 3.	XV.	Hensler in Birch. Not quoted at all in Epp. Cath. (= ev-44)
lect-8	Propaganda Lib., Rome, 287.	XI.	Birch. Contains Ja. v. 10—20. (= ev-37)
lect-9	Paris, 32.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-84)
lect-10	Paris, 33.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-85)
lect-11	Paris, 104	XII.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-12	Paris, 375.	1022	Scholz. An important MS. (= ev-60)
lect-13	Moscow, Synod. 4.	X.	Matthæi (b)[6].
lect-14	Moscow, Synod. 291.	XII.	Matthæi (e)[6].
lect-15	Moscow, Typogr. 31.	1116	Matthæi (tz). Contains besides O. T. lections, only 3 pericopæ of 1 Joh. but not iv. 20 (or v. 5) to v. 21.
lect-16	Moscow, Synod. 266.	XV.	Matthæi (ξ) } Do not contain the 1 Joh. v. pericopa. (=ev-52)
lect-17	Moscow, Synod. 267.	XV.	Matthæi (χ) } Do not contain the 1 Joh. v. pericopa. (=ev-53)
lect-18	Moscow, Synod. 268.	1470	Matthæi (ψ) } Do not contain the 1 Joh. v. pericopa. (=ev-54)
lect-19	Moscow, Typogr. 47.	XVII.	Matthæi (ω). Contains Ja. v. 10—16; v. 7—18; 1 Joh. iv. 12—19; Ja. v. 10—20; 2 Pet. i. 10—19. (= ev-55)
lect-20	Moscow, Typogr. 9.	XVI.	Matthæi (16). Contains Heb. i. i—12. (=ev-56)
lect-21	Paris, 294.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-83)
lect-22	Paris, 304.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-23	Paris, 306.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz.

[6] These contain the lection from 1 John v., but not the received gloss.

	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.
lect-24	Paris, 308.	XIII.	Mostly O. T. lections; only three in 1 Joh.
lect-25	Paris, 319.	XI.	1 Pet. ii. iii. collated by Scholz.
lect-26	Paris, 320.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Mutilated.
lect-27	Paris, 321.	XIII.	1 Joh. collated by Scholz. Defective.
lect-28	Bodleian, Selden 2.	XV.	Griesbach. (= ev-26)
lect-29	Paris, 370.	XII.	Some lections from Gospp. and Epp., esp. Heb. (= ev-94)
lect-30	Paris, 373.	XIII.	
lect-31	Paris, 276.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-82)
lect-32	Paris, 376.	XIII.	Entered in list of MSS. of Gospels as 324. Inspected by Scholz.
lect-33	Paris, 382.	XIII.	"Cursim coll. magna codicis pars," Scholz.
lect-34	Paris, 383.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-35	Paris, 324	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (ev-92)
lect-36	Paris, 326.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. (ev-93)
lect-37	Riccardi Lib., Florence, 84.	XV.	*See* 368. *Vol. I.*
lect-38	Vatican, 1528.	XV.	
lect-39	Vatican, Ottob. 416.	XIV.	(ev-1333)
lect-40	Barberini, Lib., Rome, 18.	XIV.	Some parts of Cent. X.
lect-41	Barberini, Lib., Rome (no number).	XI.	The first 114 leaves are lost.
lect-42	Vallicella Lib., Rome, C. 46.	XVI.	
lect-43	Riccardi Lib., Florence, 2742	?	(Inspected by Scholz?)
lect-44	Glasgow (Missy BB).		Manuscript collations by Missy were
lect-45	Glasgow (Missy CC).	1199	once in Michaelis' possession.
lect-46	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 63.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-47	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 72.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (ex-104)
lect-48	Laur. Lib., Florence, 2742.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (ev-112)
lect-49	Mon. St. Saba, nr. Jerus., 16.	XIV.	(Inspected by Scholz?
lect-50	St. Saba, 18.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-51	St. Saba, 26.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-52	St. Saba (no number).		Inspected by Scholz.
lect-53	St. Saba (no number).	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. (ev-160.)
lect-54	St. Saba (no number).	XIII.	
lect-55	Trèves Cathedral Lib., Codex S. Simeonis.	X.	Edited by Steininger. Contains 1 Pet. i. 3—9, 13—19, ii. 11—24; 1 Joh. iii. 21—iv. 6, iv. 11—16, id. 20—v. 5. (=ev-179)
lect-57	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake [12 (1, Scholz)].	XI.	(= 26 Apoc.)
lect-58	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake [35 ?].	1172	

SECTION II.

ANCIENT VERSIONS REFERRED TO IN THIS VOLUME.

vss. the versions in general.

vulg. the Latin VULGATE.

The following manuscripts are cited when they differ from the Clementine edition:—

am. amiatinus, written about A.D. 541. Tischendorf has edited it, and cousiders it the oldest and most valuable extant.

demid. demidovianus. Published by Matthæi. Written in the XIIth century.

fuld. fuldensis. Readings given by Lachmann. Written in the VIth century.

harl. harleiaaus, No. 1772. Collation given by Griesbach Symb. Crit.

lips-4., lips-5., lips-6. } three manuscripts of the Apocalypse belonging to the University of Leipzig. Readings given by Matthæi.

lux. luxoviensis. A lectionary cited by Mabillon and Sabatier.

tol. toletanus. A collation was published by Blanchini in his "Vindiciæ Can. Script."

The OLD LATIN Version in use before Jerome's revision is known from the following documents:—

In the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, from the copy written side by side with the Greek of MS. D. Cited as D-lat when either the Latin words are quoted or the Greek and Latin are at variance.

In the *Third Epistle of John*, from the Latin of Codex Bezæ (D. of the Acts) of which a fragment is extant containing "qui malefacit," ver. 11 to end. Cited as D-lat.

In the *Epistle of James*, and beginning of 1 *Peter*, from two manuscripts:—

corb. Corbeiensis. Published by Martianay in 1695 from the MS. cited in the Gospels as lat-*ff*¹.

vind. Vindobonensis. A few palimpsest fragments of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, copied by Tischendorf. Contains Ja. i. 1—5, iii. 13—18, iv. 1, 2, v. 19, 20, and 1 Pet. i. 1—12.

In the *Apocalypse*, the citations from Primasius are the chief representatives of the old text.

spec. denotes the Latin readings contained in Mai's "Speculum."
latt. denotes the consent of the Latin versions.

Syr. The Peschito (or simple) SYRIAC version. Supposed to have been made as early as the *second century*[9].

syr. The later or Philoxenian version. Cent. V. Revised by Thomas of Harkel, A.D. 616.

syr-dd. (*in the Apocalypse*) a version of the Apocalypse published by De Dieu in 1627 from a MS. in the Leyden Library. Tregelles says, "It is possibly not really an ancient work; though its age is wholly uncertain, and its internal character and the nature of its text, as well as the want of all external credentials, place it indefinitely low as to critical value."

syrr. denotes the consent of the Syriac versions.

copt. the COPTIC or Memphitic Egyptian version.
sah. the Thebaic or Sahidic Egyptian version.
basm. the Bashmuric Egyptian version[1].
coptt. denotes that the Egyptian versions agree in supporting a given reading.
copt-wilk. Wilkins' edition of the Coptic version.
copt-schw. that of Schwartze.
copt-dz. Codex Diez, written about the *tenth century*.
sah-ming. Mingarel's; sah-mnt, Munter's edition of the Thebaic. sah-woide, the MS. of the Thebaic published in the appendix to Woide's edition of the Codex Alexandrinus.

goth. the GOTHIC version: made from the Greek by Ulphilas about the middle of the *fourth century*.

æth. the ÆTHIOPIC version: assigned to the *fourth century*.
æth-rom. the edition given in the Roman polyglott.
æth-pl. Pell Platt's edition.

arm. the ARMENIAN version: made in the *fifth century*.
arm-usc. arm-zoh. the editions of Uscan and Zohrab respectively.

[9] The Peschito does not contain 2 Pet., 2, 3 John, or Jude; they have been added in modern editions from a later Syriac version found by Pococke in a ms. in the Bodleian. This is cited as "syr-pk."

[1] This version follows sah so closely as to have no independent critical value except where sah is not extant. (See Treg. in Horne, vol. iv. p. 299.)

SECTION III.

FATHERS AND ANCIENT WRITERS CITED IN THE DIGEST TO THIS VOLUME.

(N.B.—The abbreviation is designated by the thick type. In the remainder of the word or sentence *Latin* writers are described in Italics.)

Ambr*ose, Bp. of Milan*, A.D. 374—397
Amphilochius, Bp. of Iconium, 374
Andreas, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Cent^y. VI., cited as **Andr-a** from Cod. Augustanus, twelfth century; **Andr-b**, from Cod. Bavaricus, sixteenth century (Delitzsch); **Andr-p**, from Cod. Palatinus, fifteenth century; and **Andr-coisl**, Cod. Coislinianus, No. 223, tenth century (see Tischdf.)
Andreas of Crete, 635
Ansb*ert, Ambrose, d.* 767
Antiochus of Ptolemais, 614
Antonius Monachus, b. 251, d. 356
Arethas, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Cent^y. X.[1]
Athanasius, Bp. of Alexandria, 326—373
Aug*ustine, Bp. of Hippo*, 395—430
Basil, Bp. of Cæsarea, 370—379
Bede, *the Venerable*, 731
Cassian*us, Cent^y. V.*
Cæsarius of Constantinople, 368
Cæs*arius, Episc.* **Arel***atensis*, 502—544
Cassiod*orus*, b. 479, d. 575
Chrom*atius, Bp. of Aquileia*, 402
Chronicon Paschale, Cent^y. VII.
Chrysostom, Bp. of Constantinople, 397—407; **Chr-mss** as cited by Tischdf. from Matthæi; **-montf**, from Montfaucon; **Chr-wlf**, Wolfenbüttel ms. of Chr. written in the sixth century.
Clement of Alexandria, fl. 194
Clement, Bp. of **Rome**, 91—101
Cosmas Indicopleustes, 535
Cypr*ian, Bp. of Carthage*, 248—258
Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria, 412—444
Cyril, Bp. of **Jerusalem**, 348—386
Damascenus, Johannes, 730
"**Dialogi** de **Trinitate**," variously ascribed to Ath Thdrt Max
Didymus of Alexandria, 370
Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria, 247—265
Ephrem the Syrian, b. 299, d. 378
Epiphanius, Bp. of Salamis in Cyprus, 368—403
Epistle of the Church of Lyons
Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea, 315—320
Euthalius, Bp. of Sulci, 458
Euthymius Zigabenus, 1116
Fast*idius, Bp. in Britain*, 430
Faustin*us*, 383
Firm*icus, Julius F. Maternus*, 345
Fulg*entius, Bp. in Africa*, 508—533
Gelasius of Cyzicum, fl. 476
Gild*as*, fl. 581
Glycas of Sicily, 1120

[1] Respecting the difficulties at present besetting the question of Arethas' text, see Delitzsch, Handschriftliche Funde, ii. p. 26 ff.

Haymo, *Bp. of Halberstadt*, 841—853
Hesychius of Jerusalem, Cent^y. IV. or VI.
Hil*ary*, *Bp. of Poictiers*, 354—368
Hippolytus, disciple of Irenæus, Bp. of Portus, 220
Idac*ius*, *the name under which Vig. published his work* "de Trinitate."
Irenæus, Bp. of Lyons, 178. Generally cited (as **Iren-int** or **Iren-lat**) from a Latin translation old enough to have been used by Tertullian.
Isidore of Pelusium, 412
Jer*ome*, fl. 378—420
Leo, *Bp. of Rome*, 440—461
Lucif*er*, *Bp. of Cagliari*, 354—367
Macarius of Egypt, 301—391
Mart*in*, *Bp. of Rome*, 649—655
Max*imus* **Taur***inensis*, 430—466
Maximus Confessor, fl. 630—662
Meletius, Bp. of Antioch, 381
Methodius, fl. 290—312
Nazianzenus, Gregory, fl. 370—389
Nilus of Constantinople, end of Cent^y. IV.
Novat*ian*, 251
Nyssa, Gregory, Bp. of, 371
Oecumenius, Bp. of Tricca in Thrace, Cent^y. XI. ?
Opt*atus*, fl. 364—375
Origen, b. 185, d. 254
Oros*ius*, 416
Orsiesius the Egyptian, 345
Pac*ianus*, *Bp. of Barcelona*, 370
Pel*agii Ep. ad Demetr.* 417 ?
Peter, Bp. of Alexandria, 300—311
Philas*trius*, *Bp. of Brescia*, fl. 380
Philo Carpasius, Cent^y. V.
Phœb*adius*, *Bp. of Agen*, cir. 350—390
Photius, Bp. of Constantinople, 858—891
Polycarp, Bp. of Smyrna, d. 169
Primas*ius*, Cent^y. VI.
Proclus, Bp. of Constantinople, 434
Procopius of Gaza, 520
"*De* **Promiss***ionibus dimid. temp.*"
"**Quæst***iones ex vet. et nov. Testt.*" *Printed among the works of Aug.*
Ruf*inus of Aquileia*, 397
Salv*ianus*, 440
Sedul*ius*, 430
Severus of Antioch, Cent^y. VI.
"*De* **Sing***ularitate* **Cler***icorum.*" *Among Cypr's works.*
Socrates of Constantinople, 440
Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius.
Tert*ullian*, 200
Theodore, Bp. of **Mopsuestia**, 399—428
Theodore of the **Studium**, 795—826
Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrus, 420—458
Theophylact, Abp. of Bulgaria, 1071
Tich*onius*, 390
Timothy, Bp. of Alexandria, 380
Titus, Bp. of **Bostra**, cir. 360—371
Victor of Antioch, 401
Vict*or* **Vit***ensis*, *an African Bp.*, *Cent^y. V.*
Victorin*us*, 380
Vict*or*, *Bp. of* **Tun***is*, 565
Vigil*ius of Thapsus*, 484
"*De* **Vocat***ione gentium.*"
Zeno, *Bp. of Verona*, 362—380

To this list it may be useful to add the following ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE DIGEST:

aft, after.
al, alii.
appy, apparently.
bef, before.
beg, beginning.
comm, commentary—when appended to the name of a Father, denotes that the reading referred to is found in the body of his commentary, and not in the text (txt) printed at the head of the commentary. This last is often very much tampered with.
corr, corrector. corrd, corrected.
ctra, contra.
def, defective.
ed or edn, edition.
elsw, elsewhere.
elz, elzevir edition of the Greek Test.
e sil, e silentio collatorum.
exc, except.
expr, expressly.
follg or flg, the following words.
gr, Greek. gr-lat-ff, Greek and Latin Fathers.
ins, insert—"ins *και* AB" means that the MSS. A and B insert *και*.
int, interpreter or interpretation—appended to the name of a Father, means that the citation is made from a translation, not from the original.
marg, margin.
om, omit—"om *και* AB" means that the MSS. A and B omit the *και* given in the text or inserted by other MSS.
Ps, Pseudo—used in citing the spurious works ascribed to Ath. and other Fathers.
pref, prefix.
rec, the *textus receptus*, or received text of the Greek Testament. This is used when Steph and elz agree.
rel, reliqui—means that all the other manuscripts named on the margin have the reading to which it is appended[a].
simly, similarly.
Steph, Stephens' Greek Testament.
transp, transpose.

[a] rel-scr, occasionally used in the Apocalypse, means 'the rest of the mss. collated by Scrivener.'

txt, text—when followed by a list of MSS., versions, &c., means that the reading adopted in this edition is supported by those MSS., versions, &c. (See also under comm above.)

ver, verse.

vss, versions.

vv, verses.

The figures 2, 3, &c., inserted *above* the line to the right hand, imply a second, third, &c., hand in a MS. Thus B^1 means the original scribe of B; C^a, the first corrector of C; C^2, the second; D^r, a recent scribe in D, by whom corrections were made or parts not originally in the MS. supplied.

The same figures *below* the line, imply *recurrence* of the reading 2, 3, &c. times in the author mentioned; e.g. Aug_I, $Orig_6$, Bas_3:[4] similarly are used the words sæpe, aliq or alic (aliquoties or alicubi), ubique.

Words printed in the digest in the larger type used for the text itself are to be taken as of equal authority with the reading printed in the text: the place in the text where such readings occur being indicated by an asterisk.

SECTION IV.

LIST AND SPECIFICATION OF EDITIONS OF OTHER BOOKS QUOTED, REFERRED TO, OR MADE USE OF IN THIS VOLUME.

(N.B.—Works mentioned in the lists given in the Prolegomena to the previous volumes are not here again noticed.)

ALTER, F. C., Novum Testamentum ad Codicem Vindobonensem græce expressum, varietatem lectionis addidit, Vienna 1787.

AMBROSE ANSBERT (+ 767) in S. Johannis Apocalypsin. Printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum maxima, vol. xiii. pp. 403 ff.

AUBERLEN, Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis in ihren gegenseitigen Verhältniss betrachtet, u.s.w., Basel 1854.

BARKER, Rev. W. G., Friendly Strictures on certain portions of the Rev. E. B. Elliott's Horæ Apocalypticæ, London 1847.

BEDE, Opp. ed. Colon. 1688.

BENGEL, Erklärung der Offenbarung Joh. u.s.w., Stuttgart 1740 (cited second-hand).

Idem, Apparatus Criticus, Tubingen 1673.

[4] -2-mss. appended to the name of a Father means that the reading cited is contained in two mss. of that Father.

Chr-5-mss_3 means that in 5 mss. of Chrysostom the reading cited occurs 3 times.

BIRCH, Andreas, Variæ Lectiones ad Textum Apocalypseos, 8vo. Copenhagen 1800.

BIRKS, T. R., Outlines of Unfulfilled Prophecy, London 1854.

BLEEK, Der Brief an die Hebräer erläutert u.s.w., 3 vols., Berlin 1828—1840.

BOSSUET, L'Apocalypse, avec unė Explication. Œuvres, ed. Versailles 1815, tom. 3.

BRIGHTMANN, Commentary on the Apocalypse, Lond. 1616.

CATENA in Epistolas Catholicas. Accesserunt Œcumenii et Arethae Commentarii in Apocalypsin ad fidem Codd. MSS. Edidit J. A. Cramer, S. T. P., Aulae Novi Hospitii Principalis, Oxon. 1840.

DAUBUZ, Perpetual Commentary on the Apocalypse, fol. Lond. 1720.

DELITZSCH, Prof. F., Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer, Leipzig 1857.

Idem, Haudschriftliche Funde, erstes Heft: die erasmischen Entstellungen des Textes der Apokalypse, nachgewiesen aus dem verloren geglaubten Codex Reuchlins, Leipzig 1861.

Idem, Handschriftliche Funde, zweites Heft: neue Studien über den Codex Reuchlins u. neue Textgeschichtliche Aufschlüsse über die Apokalypse aus den Bibliotheken in München, Wien, Rom, u.s.w.: mit Beiträgen von S. P. Tregelles, Leipzig 1862.

DE WETTE, Exegetisches Handbuch u.s.w. (see previous volumes.)

DIETLEIN, Der zweite Brief Petri u s.w.

DÜSTERDIECK, Dr. Friedr., Die drei johanneischen Briefe: mit einem vollständigen theologischen Commentare, 2 voll., Göttingen 1852-1854.

Idem, Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die Offenbarung Johannis (being the sixteenth portion of Meyer's Commentary on the New Test.), Göttingen 1859.

EBRARD, Dr. J. H. A., Der Brief an die Hebräer (being the second part of the fifth vol. of Olshausen's Biblischer Commentar), Königsberg 1850.

Idem, Die Briefe Johannis (being the fourth part of the sixth vol. of the same), Königsberg 1859.

Idem, Die Offenbarung Johannis (being the seventh vol. of the same), Königsberg 1853.

ELLIOTT, Rev. E. B., Horæ Apocalypticæ, 4 voll. Fourth edit. Lond. 1851.

Idem, The Destinies and Perils of the Church as predicted in Scripture, being the Warburtonian Lectures from 1849 to 1853. One of the Appendices is on the present state of the controversy on apocalyptic interpretation. London 1859.

ERDMANN, Primæ Joannis Epistolæ argumentum, nexus et consilium, Berolini 1855.

ESTIUS, Guil., Annotationes in præcipua ac difficiliora S.S. loca. fol., Paris 1683.

EVANGELIUM (Das) DES REICHS (anonymous), Leipzig 1859.

EWALD, Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis exegeticus et criticus, Lipsiæ 1828.

FAIRBAIRN, Pat., D.D., Prophecy viewed in respect to its distinctive nature, its special function, and proper interpretation, Edinburgh 1856.

FORD, Henry, Appendix ad Editionem N. T. Græci e Cod. MS. Alexandrino descripti, a C. G. Woide, folio, Oxford 1799.

GLOSSA ORDINARIA (i. e., Walafrid Strabo, in 850), from the Biblia Maxima (St. Augustine's College Library, Canterbury).

GRÄBER, Herm. Joh., Versuch einer historischen Erklärung der Offenbarung des Johannes, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Auslegungen von Bengel, Hengstenberg u. Ebrard, Heidelberg 1857.

GREGORY OF NYSSA, cited by the Abbé Migne's pages in his edition of the Fathers.

GROTIUS (cited from the Critici Sacri).

HAMMOND (see former voll.).

HENGSTENBERG, Prof., Die Offenbarung des h. Johannes, u.s.w., 2 voll. Berlin 1849—1850.

HUNTINGFORD, Rev. E., The voice of the last Prophet, a practical interpretation of the Apocalypse, London 1858.

HUTHER, Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die drei Briefe des Johannes (being the fourteenth portion of Meyer's Commentary), Göttingen 1855.

Idem, Krit.-exeget. Handb. über den 1 Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas, u. den 2 Brief des Petrus (being the twelfth portion of the same), Göttingen 1852.

Idem, Krit.-exeget. Handb. über den Brief des Jakobus (being the fifteenth portion of the same), Göttingen 1858.

JOACHIM, Abbas, Expositio magni Prophetæ Abbatis Joachimi (1186) in Apocalypsin, Venet. 1527.

KUINOEL, Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebræos, Lipsiæ 1831.

LEIGHTON, Archbp., A practical Commentary on the first Epistle general of St. Peter, in his works, 2 voll., London 1828.

LÜCKE, Dr. Friedr., Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Literatur, Bonn 1832 ; 2nd edition, 1852.

Idem, Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelist Johannes (vol. iii. containing the Epistles), Bonn 1856.

LÜNEMANN, DR. Gottlieb, Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Hebräerbrief (being the thirteenth portion of Meyer's Commentary), Göttingen 1855.

MAITLAND, Charles, The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation: with its History down to the present time, London 1849.

MATTHÆI, C. F., Apocalypsis Græce et Latine ex codicibus nunquam antea examinatis, Rigae 1785.

MEDE, Clavis Apocalyptica, and commentary following; in his works, Cambridge 1677.

MICHAELIS, J. D., Introduction to the New Testament, translated from the 4th edn. of the German, and considerably augmented with notes explanatory and supplemental by Herbert Marsh, B.D., Fellow of St. John's Coll. Cambridge, Cambridge 1793.

NEWTON, B. W., Thoughts on the Apocalypse, London and Plymouth 1844.

OOSTERZEE, Dr. J. J., Christus unter den Leuchtern, u.s.w., Leipzig 1854.

OWEN, Dr. John, An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with preliminary Exercitations, 4 voll., London 1840.

RAMPF, Dr., Der Brief Judä u.s.w., historisch, kritisch, exegetisch betrachtet (Roman Catholic), Sulzbach 1854.

REICHE, J. G., Codicum MSS. N. T. Græcorum aliquot insigniorum in Bibl. Regia Parisiensi asservatorum Nova Descriptio et cum textu vulgo recepto Collatio, præmissis quibusdam de neglecti codicum MSS. N. T. studii causis observationibus, Göttingen 1847.

REVELATION (The) of Jesus Christ, explained agreeably to the analogy of Holy Scripture: and the interpretation of its symbols. By a Clergyman, London 1850.

RIEHM, Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes, Ludwigsburg 1858.

SANDER, Commentar zu den Briefen Johannis, Elberfeld 1851.

SCOTT, W. H., The Interpretation of the Apocalypse and the chief prophetical Scriptures connected with it, London 1853.

STEIGER, W., Der erste Brief Petri mit Berücksichtigung des ganzen biblischen Lehrbegriffs ausgelegt, Berlin 1832.

STERN, Prof., Commentar über die Offenbarung des Apostel Johannes (Roman Catholic), Schaffhausen 1854.

STIER, Dr. Rudolf, Der Brief an die Hebräer u.s.w., Halle 1842.

Idem, Der Brief Jakobi u.s.w., Barmen 1845.

Idem, Der Brief Judä, des Bruders des Herrn, Berlin 1850.

Idem, Die Reden des Herrn Jesu vom Himmel her (forming a supplement to the Reden Jesu), Barmen 1859.

Idem, Die Reden der Engel in heiliger Schrift, Barmen 1861.

STUART, Prof. Moses, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Henderson's Edition, London 1856.

Idem, A Commentary on the Apocalypse, London 1850.

THOLUCK, Dr. A., Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer. 3rd edition, Hamburg 1850.

TODD, Dr. J. H., Six Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the Apocalypse of St. John, preached before the University of Dublin, at the Donnellan Lecture, Dublin 1846.

TREGELLES, Dr. S. P., The Book of Revelation in Greek, edited from ancient authorities, with a new English version and various readings, London 1844.

TRENCH, Archbp., Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia, London 1861.

VICTORINUS of Pettau (cir. 300), Comm. in Apocalypsin: in Migne's Patrologia Latina, vol. v.

VITRINGA Campegius, Ἀνάκρισις Apocalypseos Johannis Apostoli, &c., Leucopetræ 1721.

WEISS, Dr. Bernhard, Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff, Berlin 1855.

WILLIAMS, Isaac, The Apocalypse, with notes and reflections, London 1852.

WOODHOUSE, Dean, The Apocalypse, or Revelation of St. John, translated, with notes, critical and explanatory, London 1805.

WORDSWORTH, Bishop, Lectures on the Apocalypse, Critical, Expository, and Practical, delivered before the University of Cambridge, being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1848, London 1849.

Idem, the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the original Greek (the last portion, containing the general Epistles and the Book of Revelation), London 1860.

EPISTLES

OF

ST. JOHN AND ST. JUDE: AND THE REVELATION.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

I. 1 [a] Πολυμερῶς καὶ [b] πολυτρόπως [c] πάλαι ὁ θεὸς [d] λα-

a here only †. (-ρής, Wisd. vii. 22.)

b here only †. οὗτος ὁ πόλεμος τοῖς πάθεσι ποικίλος, κ. ταῖς τύχαις πολυτροπώτατος, Plut. C. Mar. p. 424 C. c Matt. xi. 21. Mark xv. 44. Luke x. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 19. 2 Pet. i. 9. Jude 4 only. Isa. xxxvii. 26 only. d of divine revelations, ch. ii. 2, 3. iii. 5. v. 5. xi. 18. Luke i. 45, 70. xxiv. 25. Acts iii. 21, 24. vii. 6, 38, 44. viii. 26. x. 7. xxiii. 9. see also ch. vii. 14. ix. 19. xii. 24, 25. xiii. 7. never in St. Paul.

Title. Steph *η προς εβραιους επιστολη παυλου*, simly a h k o: elz *η προς εβρ. επιστ.*, with g l: *εγραφη απο ιταλιας δια τιμοθεου η προς εβρ. επιστ. εκτεθεισα ως εν πινακι* M: *του αγιου κ. πανευφημου αποστ. παυλ. επιστ. πρ. εβρ.* L: [*παυλ. επ. πρ. εβρ.* P:] *προς εβραιους* ABℵ C(in subscr) [D(at head of pages)] K-marg m n 17 [47] fuld coptt.

Chap. I. 1—II. 18.] After manifold revelations in former times, God has now revealed Himself to us in His Son (i. 1—4), who is greater than the angels, the dispensers of the law (i. 4—14; inference, ii. 1—4), though for a time he was made lower than the angels, and subjected to sufferings, in order to be, as our High Priest, our reconciler to God (ii. 5—18). And herein (i. 1—4), *introduction and statement of position.*

We may notice, 1. The opening of this Epistle without any address, or mention of the Author. Various reasons have been assigned for this, and inferences drawn from it (see Prolegg.). Some have said that the matter to be treated was so weighty, that the Writer merged altogether his own personality, and trusted to the weight of his subject to gain him a hearing. But, as Ebrard remarks, this would not account for entire omission of the name of the man and his standing. He therefore imagines that another shorter letter of a more private nature must have accompanied this. But we may reply, that this idea derives no countenance from the phænomena of the Epistle itself, containing as it does at the end private notices which might well have been dispensed with, if such a commendatory Epistle had accompanied it. We must therefore deal with this circumstance without any such hypothesis to help us. On the supposition of the Pauline authorship, some account may be given of it,—viz. that the name of the Apostle was concealed, from the nature of the relations between himself, and those to whom he was writing (see this hypothesis examined in the Prolegomena). And on the idea of Pauline *superintendence*, it would obviously admit of the same solution. 2. The carefully balanced and rhetorical style in which the Epistle begins, characteristic indeed of its whole diction (see Prolegg.), but especially marking this first period (vv. 1—4). The clauses are joined by close grammatical and rhetorical dependence: there is no anacoluthon, no carelessness of construction, but all is most carefully and skilfully disposed.

1.] In many portions (for the usage of πολυμερῶς and of its cognate adj. *πολυμερής*, we have two passages of Maximus Tyrius, in which *πολύτροπος* is also conjoined with it: Dissert. xvii. 7, *τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ δύο ὀργάνων ὄντων πρὸς σύνεσιν, τοῦ μὲν ἁπλοῦ, ὃν καλοῦμεν νοῦν, τοῦ δὲ ποικίλου καὶ πολυμεροῦς καὶ πολυτρόπου, ἃς αἰσθήσεις καλοῦμεν*: and ib. vii. 2, *οὐθὲν δεῖ τῆς πολυμεροῦς ταύτης κ. πολυτρόπου μούσης τε καὶ ἁρμονίας*: also ib. xxxix. 2, *τὸ πολυμερὲς καὶ πολύφωνον τοῦ τῶν σωμάτων πολέμου, ἃς καλοῦμεν νόσους*: Plut. de Virt. Mil. p. 757 D, *ποικίλον τι δρᾶμα κ. πολυμερές*: id. de Invid. et Odio, p. 537 D, *τοῦ Θεοσίτου ὁ ποιητὴς τὴν μὲν τοῦ*

λήσας [e] τοῖς [e] πατράσιν [f] ἐν τοῖς [b] προφήταις [g] ἐπ' [h] ἐσχά-

ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

e = Luke i. 72. xi. 48. John vi. 31. Acts iii. 13 al. fr. absol., John vi. 58. vii. 22. Acts vii. 10. xiii. 32. xxvi. 6. Rom. ix. 5. xi. 28. xv. 8. 2 Pet. iii. 4 only. f 3 Kings xxii. 38. g gen., Mark ii. 26. Luke iii. 2. iv. 27. Acts xi. 28. 1 Tim. vi. 13. h constr. (see note), 1 Pet. i. 20. Num. xxiv. 14. Deut. iv. 30. Dan. viii. 19, 23 x. 14.

σώματος κακίαν πολυμερῶς καὶ περιοδευμένως ἐξεμόρφωσε, τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἤθους μοχθηρίαν συντομώτατα κ. δι' ἑνὸς ἔφρασεν. Aristotle (in Stephanus, but without a reference) has πολυμερέστατος πάντος, also De Part. Anim. iv. 7. 1, τῶν ὀστρακοδέρμων οὐκ ἔστι τὸ σῶμα πολυμερές, and Plato, Tim. Locr. p. 98 D, ὕδατος στοιχεῖον πολυμερέστατον. Hesychius interprets the adj. εἰς πολλὰ μεριζόμενον; and the adverb, πολυσχεδῶς. Hence we may gather the meaning to be 'in many portions,' or 'parts,' manifoldly as regards the *distribution*. "Non enim omnia, nec eadem, omnibus prophetis revelata sunt, sed quasi partibus mysteriorum distributis: alia aliis inspirata. Exempli caussa; Jesaiæ, partus virginis et passio Christi: Danieli, tempus adventus ejus: Jonæ, ejusdem sepultura: Malachiæ, adventus præcursoris. Ac rursum aliis plura, aliis pauciora." Estius. πολυμερῶς says Thdrt., τὰς παντοδαπὰς οἰκονομίας σημαίνει. So that "*at sundry times*" is not an accurate rendering: nor can it be said as by the schol. in ms. 113, cited by Bleek (τὸ πολυμερῶς τὸ διάφορον τῶν καιρῶν αἰνίττεται, καθ' οὓς ἕκαστός τις τῶν προφητῶν μερικήν τινα ἐνεχειρίζετο οἰκονομίαν), Calvin, Bleek, Lünemann, al., to *express* the meaning: *time* is a historical condition of the sequence of parts,—*persons to whom*, an anthropological condition,—but it does not follow that '*at sundry times*,' or '*to sundry persons*,' gives the force of '*in divers parts*:' because it might be the same thing which was revealed again and again. This revelation in portions, by fragments, in and by various persons, was necessarily an imperfect revelation, to which the one final manifestation in and by One Person is properly and logically opposed, without any ἐφάπαξ or ἁπλῶς as Tholuck seems to desiderate in the apodosis) **and in divers manners** (ἄλλως γὰρ ὤφθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ, κ. ἄλλως τῷ Μωυσῇ, κ. ἑτέρως Ἡλίᾳ, κ. ἄλλως τῷ Μιχαίᾳ. καὶ Ἡσαΐας δὲ κ. Δανιὴλ κ. Ἰεζεκιὴλ διάφορα ἐθεάσαντο σχήματα. Thdrt. Bleek remarks that in Num. xii. 6–8, the diversity of manner of revelation is recognized: dreams and visions being set beneath that open speaking, mouth to mouth, which the Lord used towards His servant Moses. Wetst. cites a remarkable parallel from Eustathius, where, speaking of Odysseus, he says, πολυτρόπως ἀνεγνωρίσθη πᾶσιν οἷς ἦλθεν εἰς γνῶσιν, μηδενὸς ἀναγνωρισμοῦ συμπεσόντος ἑτέρῳ ἀναγνωρισμῷ τὸ σύνολον· ἄλλως γὰρ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ, ἑτέρως τῇ Εὐρυκλείᾳ, ἑτέρως τοῖς δούλοις, ἄλλον δὲ τρόπον τῷ Λαέρτῃ, καὶ ὅλως ἀνομοίως ἅπασι. See also ref. It will be seen, that I cannot agree with Chrys. and many others in regarding the two adverbs as a mere rhetorical redundance—τουτέστι διαφόρως. Both set forth the imperfection of the O. T. revelations. They were various in nature and in form: fragments of the whole truth, presented in manifold forms, in shifting hues of separated colour: Christ is the full revelation of God, Himself the pure light, uniting in His one Person the whole spectrum: see below on ἀπαύγασμα. Kypke, Bleek, and others, have pointed out the mistake of Lambert Bos (Observ. Misc. p. 109), who imagined, from the passage of Max. Tyr. Diss. vii. 2, cited above, that these words were originally applied to music) **in time past** (generally interpreted of the O. T. period, ending with Malachi. But, as Ebrard well observes, there is no need for cutting off the period there. In the interim between Malachi and the Writer's time, though the O. T. canon was closed, we cannot say that God's manifold revelations of Himself had absolutely ceased. Nay, strictly speaking, the Baptist himself belonged to the former, though he pointed on to the latter period. No doubt Bleek is right in denying that he was here in the Writer's view, and in maintaining that the period of former revelations is here regarded as distinct from the final Christian one: but for all that, we must not put an artificial terminus where he puts none) **God having spoken** (see the usage of λαλεῖν in this sense in reff. and Bleek, p. 12) **to the fathers** (see usage in reff. It is evident from this term being common to the Writer and his readers, where no reference is made to Jews in the context (as in Rom. ix. 5 al.), that he was writing as a Jew and to Jews. **οἱ πατέρες**, "qui in carne et in fide nos genuere." Ps.-Anselm) **in** (not = διά, though it includes it. The readers of Vol. III. of this work need hardly be reminded that such a rendering of ἐν has never been acquiesced in by me. Nor can I concede to any number of Commentators that, as Primasius here,—"Præpositio pro alia præpositione sæpe accipitur, sicut in multis locis epistolæ invenitur his præpositionibus indifferenter uti." Nor again

του τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, [2] *ὃν* [1] *ἔθηκεν* [1 = Rom. iv. 17, from Gen. xvii. 5. 1 Tim. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 6. Jer. i. 5.]

Chap. I. 1. rec *εσχατων*, with c l [47] hal[1] D-lat syrr [æth] $Orig_1$ $Orthod_1$ Ps-Ath_1 [$Marcell_2$ Tit-$bostr_1$] Cyr-jer_1 : txt ABDKLM[P]ℵ rel vulg copt [arm] $Orig_1$ Eus_2 Ath_1 Did_2 Chr[-mss_3 $Thdrt_2$ Damasc] Cyr_4 $Phot_1$.

must we bring in the convenient solution of Hellenism, when we find the same usage in Greek classical writers, and the same inadequacy of explanation of it. In such expressions as λαλεῖν ἐν, viewed irrespectively of the idea of Beza, "Deum quasi prophetis ipsis insidere," the ἐν designates the *element in which* the λαλεῖν takes place, and holds therefore its own proper force. That we may be sometimes compelled by English idiom to render it '*by*,' is possible, though I do not at present recall any instance: certainly such an one does not occur here, where the contrast is much weakened by making it instrumental, instead of conditional. It may be well to state, that this merging of the proper force of prepositions is not confined to those who deal with Greek as a dead language. Chrys. here says, *ἐν υἱῷ, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ φησι . . . . ὁρᾷς ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἐν, διά ἐστι*: similarly Œc., Thl., Primasius (above), and in modern times Luther, Calvin, Grot., al., Reiche, Thol., Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. On the other hand, Thos. Aquinas (in Bl.: "Quod prophetæ non ipsi loquuti sunt ex se, sed Deus loquutus est in eis"), Beza (see above), Gerhard, Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, Owen, Wolf, Bengel ("Ergo Deus ipse erat *in* prophetis: tum maxime in Filio. Rex mortalis loquitur *per* legatum: non tamen in legato"), Uhland, Bleek, De W., Lünemann, al. Erasm.-Schmid, al. take *ἐν προφήταις* to mean, "in the prophetic writings:" but for this there seems no ground, and thus the antithesis would be marred.

The sense contended for above agrees with the expressions of Philo, e. g. De Præm. et Pœn. § 9, vol. ii. p. 417, *ἑρμηνεὺς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης, ἔνδοθεν ὑπηχοῦντος τὰ λεκτέα τοῦ θεοῦ.* See also De Monarch. i. 9, pp. 221 f.: De Spec. Leg. § 8, p. 343: Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 53, vol. i. p. 511: all these are cited in Bl.) **the prophets** (to be taken here apparently in the wider sense,—as including not only those whose inspired writings form the O. T. canon, but all who were vehicles of the divine self-manifestation to the fathers. Thus Enoch in Jude 14 is said *προφητεῦσαι*. Moses is of course included, and indeed would on any view be the *chief* of those here spoken of, seeing that by him the greater part of God's revelation of Himself to the fathers was made), —**at the end of these days** (see var. read. In order to understand this expression, it will be well to call to mind certain Jewish modes of speaking of time. The Rabbis divided the whole of time into הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, *αἰὼν οὗτος*, and הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, *αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος*, or *μέλλων*. There has been much learned dispute as to the exact limits of these two:—whether the days of the Messiah, יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ, were counted in the former or in the latter. Bleek, aft. Witsius, Rhenferd, and Schöttg., has given Rabbinical passages favouring both views. A safe inference from the whole seems to be, that the days of the Messiah were regarded as a period of transition from the former to the latter,—His appearance, as the ushering in of the termination of *αἱ ἡμέραι αὗται*, the beginning of the end,—and His second coming in glory as the *συντέλεια τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων* or *τοῦ αἰῶνος (τούτου)*. And with this, N. T. usage agrees,—see ref. 1 Pet., also James v. 3: Jude 18: 2 Pet. iii. 3. Thus *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμ. τούτων* would mean, 'at the end of *this age*,' in the technical sense of these words as signifying the whole world-period, the 'terminus ad quem' of which is the general Resurrection. And thus is the manifestation of Christ in the flesh ever spoken of, and especially in this Epistle: cf. ch. ix. 26; and notes on ch. ii. 5; vi. 5. See, on the whole, Bleek's note; and Stuart's, who however has mistaken the meaning, in rendering "*during the last dispensation*," and making *τούτων* to import that the period had already *begun*. It is not of a beginning, but of an *expiring* period, the Writer is speaking. The ancient expositors principally use these words as ground of *consolation*—*ἐν τούτῳ αὐτοὺς διανίστησι λέγων ὅτι ἡ συντέλεια ἐγγύς. ὁ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι καταμαλακισθείς, ἐπειδὰν ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἀγῶνος τὸ τέλος, ἀναπνεῖ μικρόν.* Thl. aft. Chr.) **spake** (not "*hath spoken*:" the *ἔσχατον* is looked back on as a definite point, at which the divine revelation took place. The attention of the readers is thus directed not so much to the present state in which they are, as to the act of God towards them. Thus, as almost always, the distinction between the aor. and perfect is important) **unto us** (i. e. all who have heard that voice, or to whom it is to be announced. There is no distinction between those who received God's revelation immediately from the Son, and those who received it mediately through others. To

[j] κληρονόμον πάντων, [k] δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς [l] αἰῶνας,

ABDK LMPℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

j Matt. xxi. 38 ||. Rom. iv. 13. Tit. iii. 7. ch. vi. 17. xi. 7. James ii. 5. Mic. i. 15. 17. Sir. xxxvi. 17.
k = John i. 3. Col. i. 16.
l = ch. xi. 3. 1 Tim. i.

2. rec *τους αιωνας* bef *εποιησεν* (*corrn for mistaken emphasis: see note*), with D·KL[P] rel syr [arm $Orig_1$ Did_2 Bas_1] $Cyr\text{-}jer_1$ Chr Cyr_1 $Thdrt_2$ [Damasc]: txt ABD[1.3]Mℵ m 17 latt Syr copt [æth $Orig_1$] Eus_2 Ath_1 $Tit\text{-}bostr_1$ Cyr_2 [$Ambr_1$].

this latter number belonged the Writer himself, cf. ch. ii. 3) **in** (see above) **his Son** (υἱῷ without the art. is to be noted, and has been variously explained. The omission would not at any time surprise us after a preposition; but here after ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, we should expect, as an antithesis, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. Hence we must seek a reason beyond that usual idiomatic omission. Emphatic position will often dispense with the art.: and this may be alleged here. But even thus we do not get at the final cause. If the position of υἱῷ, whenever anarthrous, is emphatic *to this extent*, it must be for some reason still latent. Some have suggested official denomination, making υἱός into a quasi-proper name. But this again is only an introduction to the final reason. *Why* is such an anarthrous name here used, as designating our Lord? And thus we come to the word itself, as we must do in all such cases, for our account of the idiom. And that account here seems to be found in the peculiar and exclusive character of that relation to God, which υἱός expresses. We may say, that Jesus is '*the Son of God:*' by this is definitely enough expressed the fact, and the distinction from other sons of God implied: but we may also say that He is 'Son of God:' and we thus give the predicate all fulness of meaning and prominence, and even more emphatically and definitely express the exclusive character of His Sonship. And by this anarthrous appellation does the Writer frequently speak of Him: e. g. ch. vii. 28, ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν κ.τ.λ. . . . . ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον, υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον: see also iii. 6; v. 8; vii. 8. Nor is the usage confined to him: cf. John x. 36; xix. 7, and in the case of υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, v. 27. So far is this or any other usage of the art. from being "arbitrary," as Stuart here maintains. I will quote his sentence for a caution to tiros: "After all the rules which have been laid down respecting the insertion or omission of the article in Greek, and all the theories which have been advanced, he who investigates for himself, and is guided only by *facts*, will find not a little that is arbitrary in the actual use of it. The cases are certainly very numerous, where Greek writers insert or reject it at pleasure." The direct contrary of this assertion is the fact, and cannot be too much impressed on every Greek Testament student. The rules respecting the art. are rigid, and are constantly observed; and there is no case of its omission or insertion in which there was not a distinct reason in the mind of the Writer,—usually, but not always, discernible by the patient and accurate scholar among ourselves. In this particular case our language, though it allows the predicate in the nominative, 'Son of God,' to be used anarthrously, does not allow it to be so used with a preposition, nor in the objective case: so that we are here obliged to take refuge in the nearly equivalent, though not so accurate '*in His Son.*' To render it '*in a Son*' would be directly to contravene the logical account of the anarthrousness of the predicate. We might periphrase, 'in Him who was Son of God.' We now pass off into a description of the dignity, and person, and work, of this Son of God: which description ends in asserting and proving Him to be higher than angels, the loftiest of created beings),

2.] **whom He constituted** (aor., not perfect, referring, as also ἐποίησεν, to the ἐν ἀρχῇ—the date of the eternal counsel of God. τίθημι with this double accusative is commonly reputed a Hebraism. But as Bleek remarks, our Epistle is singularly free from Hebraistic constructions, and there is in fact no reason whatever for deducing our present expression from such a source. Elsner gives from Xen. de Rep. Lac. p. 684, θεὶς τοὺς γέροντας κυρίους τοῦ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγῶνος: Arrian. Epict. p. 264, τοιοῦτόν σε θῶμεν πολίτην κορωθίων: Eur. Hec. 722: and Bleek from Xen. Cyr. iv. 6. 2, ὥσπερ ἂν εὐδαίμονα πατέρα παῖς τιμῶν τιθείη) **heir** (ἔθηκε κληρονόμον, τουτέστι τοῦτον κύριον ἁπάντων ἐποίησεν . . . τῷ δὲ τοῦ κληρονόμου ὀνόματι κέχρηται δύο δηλῶν, καὶ τὸ τῆς υἱότητος γνήσιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναπόσπαστον. Chrys.: and so Thl. "Convenienter statim sub Filii nomen memoratur hæreditas." Bengel. That κληρ. is not equivalent to κύριον simply, is plain: the same expression could not, as Bleek well remarks, have been used of the Father. It is in virtue of the Sonship of our Lord that the Father constituted Him heir of all things, before

[3] ὃς ὢν [m] ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ [n] χαρακτὴρ τῆς [o] ὑπο-

m here only †. Wisd. vii. 26 only. ἀπαύγ. τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, Clem. 1 ad Cor. 36. n here only. Lev. xiii. 28. 2 Macc. iv. 10 only. o 2 Cor. ix. 4. xi. 17. ch. iii. 14. xi. 1 only. Deut. i. 12.

the worlds began. "In Him also," says Delitzsch, "culminates the fulfilment of the promise given to the seed of Abraham, *τὸ κληρονόμον εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου*." See below. See for St. Paul's use of the word and image, reff.: and Gal. iv. 7) **of all things** (neuter: *τουτέστι, τοῦ κόσμου παντός*, Chr. And we cannot give this a more limited sense, nor restrict it to this world; especially as the subsequent portion of the chapter distinctly includes the angels in it. It is much disputed whether this heirship of Christ is to be conceived as belonging to Him essentially in his divine nature, or as accruing to Him from his work of redemption in the human nature. The Fathers, and the majority of the moderns, decide for the latter alternative. So Chrys., and even more emphatically Thdrt.: *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος ἤρξατο, καὶ τὰ ταπεινότερα πρῶτον λέγων οὕτως ἅπτεται μειζόνων. κληρονόμος γὰρ πάντων ὁ δεσπότης χριστὸς οὐχ ὡς θεός, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπος. ὡς γὰρ θεός, ποιητής ἐστι πάντων· ὁ δὲ πάντων δημιουργὸς φύσει πάντων δεσπότης*. And so the Socinian and quasi-Socinian interpreters, arriving at the same view by another way, not believing the præexistence of Christ. But it is plain that such an interpretation will not suit the requirements of the passage. For this humiliation of his, with its effects, first comes in at the end of ver. 3. All this, now adduced, is referable to his essential Being as Son of God; not merely in the Godhead before his Incarnation, but also in the Manhood after it, which no less formed a part of His 'constitution' by the Father, than his Godhead itself. So that the *ἔθηκεν*, as observed above, must be taken not as an appointment in prospect of the Incarnation, but as an absolute appointment, coincident with the *σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, belonging to the eternal Sonship of the Lord, though wrought out in full by his mediatorial work. Delitzsch contends for its exclusive application to the exaltation of Christ in his historical manifestation, beginning with the creation of the world: but I cannot see that he has proved his point), **by whom** (see ref. John: as His acting Power and personal instrument: so Thl., aft. Chrys.: *ἐπειδὴ δὲ αἴτιος ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ υἱοῦ, εἰκότως καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων· διὰ τοῦτό φησι, δι' οὗ. ὁ πατὴρ γὰρ δοκεῖ ποιεῖν, ὁ τὸν ποιήσαντα υἱὸν γεννήσας*. The idea of Grotius, fortified by a misrendering of Beza's, Rom. vi. 4,—that "*δι' οὗ*, *per quem*, videtur hic recte accipi posse pro *δι' ὅν*, *propter quem*," is only worth recording, to make us thankful that the labours of the great scholars of Germany have brought in a day when it no longer needs refutation) **He also made** (*created*. According to the ancient arrangement of the words, adopted in the text, the word brought into emphasis by *καί* is not *τοὺς αἰῶνας*, but *ἐποίησεν*. And so Bengel, "Emphasis particulæ *kai*, *et*, cadit super verbum *fecit*, hoc sensu: Filium non solum definiit hæredem rerum omnium, ante creationem: sed *etiam fecit* per eum sæcula") **the ages** (the meaning of **τοὺς αἰῶνας** has been much disputed. The main classes of interpreters are two. 1. Those who see in the word its ordinary meaning of "*an age of time*:" 2. those who do not recognize such meaning, but suppose it to have been merged in that of "*the world*," or "*the worlds*." To (1) belong the Greek Fathers: Chrys. (see however note on ch. xi. 3), Thdrt. (*τοῦτο δηλωτικὸν τῆς θεότητος. οὐ μόνον γὰρ αὐτὸν δημιουργόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀΐδιον ἔδειξεν· ὁ γὰρ αἰὼν οὐκ οὐσία τίς ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἀνυπόστατον χρῆμα, συμπαρομαρτοῦν τοῖς γεννητὴν ἔχουσι φύσιν. καλεῖται γὰρ 'αἰὼν' καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου συστάσεως μέχρι τῆς συντελείας διάστημα*. This he then supports by Matt. xxviii. 20: Ps. lxxxix. 8, LXX: Eph. i. 21; ii. 7; and concludes, *αἰὼν τοίνυν ἐστὶ τὸ τῇ κτιστῇ φύσει παρεζευγμένον διάστημα. τῶν αἰώνων δὲ ποιητὴν εἴρηκε τὸν υἱόν, ἀΐδιον αὐτὸν εἶναι διδάσκων, καὶ παιδεύων ἡμᾶς ὡς ἀεὶ ἦν παντὸς οὑτινοσοῦν ὑπερκείμενος χρονικοῦ διαστήματος*), Thl. (*ποῦ δέ εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν; αὐτὸς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησε, καὶ πῶς ἦν αἰὼν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν αὐτός;*), Œc. &c., and Thom. Aquin., and Heinsius. On the other hand, (2) is the view of the majority of Commentators. It is explained and defended at length by Bleek, none of whose examples however seem to me to be void of the same ambiguity which characterizes the expression here. The Jews, it appears, came at length to designate by their phrase הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה (see above on *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου κ.τ.λ.*), not only the present age, but all things in and belonging to it—and so of the "future age" likewise. He produces a remarkable instance of this from Wisd. xiii. 9, *εἰ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσαν εἰδέναι, ἵνα δύνωνται στοχάσασθαι τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸν τούτων* (of the things in the world) *δεσπότην πῶς τάχιον οὐχ εὗρον;* He therefore would regard *τοὺς αἰῶνας* as strictly parallel with *πάντα* above, and would interpret, "Whom He has constituted lord,

= here only (see note). Num. xi. 14. Deut. i. 9.

στάσεως αὐτοῦ, [p] φέρων τε [q] τὰ πάντα τῷ [r] ῥήματι τῆς

ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

q = Rom. xi. 36. 1 Cor. viii. 6. xi. 12. xv. 28. Eph. iii. 9. Phil. iii. 21. Col. i. 16, 17, 20. iii. 11. 1 Tim. vi. 13. ch. ii. 8, 10. Rev. iv. 11. Job viii. 3. r = ch. xi. 3. see Eph. v. 26. dat., 1 Cor. ix. 7. xi. 5. 2 Cor. i. 15 al.

3. for φερων, φανερων B[1](Tischdf expr: txt B[3], but former reading restored in 13th cent).

possessor and ruler over all, over the whole world, even as by Him He has made all, the universe." And nearly so Delitzsch, Ebrard, and Lünemann: these two latter adding however somewhat, inasmuch as they take it of all this state of things constituted in time and space. Ebrard says: Die ewige Selbst-offenbarung Gottes in sich, durch das ewige Aussprechen seiner Fülle im ewigen persönlichen Wort, das Gott zu sich (Joh. i. 1) redet, und im Wehen des Ewigen Geistes, bildet den Grund und somit das Ewige (nicht zeitliche) Prius der vom Willen des Dreieinigen ausgehenden Offenbarung seiner in einer Sphäre, die nicht ewig, sondern zeitlich räumlich, nicht Gott, sondern Creatur ist. And this last view I should be disposed to adopt, going however somewhat further still: for whereas Ebrard includes in *τοὺς αἰῶνας* God's revelation of Himself in a sphere whose conditions are Time and Space, and so would understand by it all things existing under these conditions, I would include in it also *these conditions themselves*,—which exist not independently of the Creator, but are His work—*His* appointed conditions of all created existence. So that the universe, as well in its great primæval conditions,—the reaches of Space, and the ages of Time, as in all material objects and all successive events, which furnish out and people Space and Time, God made by Christ. It will be plain that what has been here said will apply equally to ch. xi. 3, which is commonly quoted as decisive for the *material* sense here. Some (Schlichting, al.) have endeavoured to refer *τοὺς αἰῶνας*, 3. to the new or spiritual world, or the ages of the Messiah, or of the Christian Church: principally in the interests of Socinianism: or, 4. as Sykes and Pyle, to the various dispensations of God's revelation of Himself: or even, 5. as Fabricius (Cod. Apocr. i. p. 710, Bl.), to the Gnostic æons, or emanations from the Divine Essence, and so to the higher spiritual order of beings, the angels. Against all these, besides other considerations, ch. xi. 3 is a decisive testimony). It will be seen by consulting the note on John i. 1, how very near the teaching of Philo approached to this creation of the universe by the Son. See, among the quotations in my Vol. I. Edn. 6, p. 679, especially those from Philo, vol. i. p. 106: and that in p. 681 from ib. p. 162. See Isa. ix. 6 Heb. and LXX-Aℵ.

3.] "The Son of God now becomes Himself the subject. The 'verbum finitum' belonging to the relative ὃς is not found till *ἐκάθισεν* at the end of the verse. But the intermediate participial clauses do not stand in the same relation to the main sentence. The first members, *ὢν ἀπαύγασμα . . . δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*, still set forth those attributes of the Son of God which are of a permanent character, and belonging to Him before the Incarnation: whereas the following member, the last participial clause, stands in nearer relation to the main sentence, expressing as it does the purification of mankind from sin, wrought by the incarnate Son of God, as one individual historical event,—as the antecedent of that exaltation of Him to the right hand of God, which the main sentence enounces." Bleek. **Who** (the ὃς represents, it will be evident, rather the præ-existent than the incarnate Logos. But it is perhaps a mistake to let this distinction be too prominent, and would lead to the idea of a change having taken place in the eternal relation of the Son to the Father, when He subjected himself to the conditions of space and time. Even then He could say of himself, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*. See Ebrard's note), **being** (cf. *ὑπάρχων*, Phil. ii. 6, also of His præ-existent and essential being. This comparison seems decisive against Hofmann, who (Schriftbeweis, i. 140 ff.) takes *ὤν* and *φέρων* according to his theory that all the attributes of the Son of God spoken of in the N. T. are adduced in connexion with and as manifested by His work of Redemption. See against this view Delitzsch, h. l. p. 7. But it must also be remembered that *ὤν* and *φέρων* are *present* participles. They must not be rendered *utpote qui*, or *cum esset* and *ferret*, but kept to their essential and timeless senso,—'*being*,' and '*bearing*') **the brightness** (*effulgentia*, not "*repercussus*, qualis est in nube quæ dicitur *παρήλιος*," as Grot., Calv. ("splendor ex illius lumine refulgens,—refulgentia"), al. This latter would be legitimate, but does not seem to have been the ordinary usage. Bl. cites from Philo de Concupiscent. § 11, vol. ii. p. 356, *τὸ δὲ ἐμφυσώμενον* (Gen. ii. 7) *δῆλον ὡς αἰθέριον ἦν πνεῦμα καὶ εἰ δή τι αἰθερίου πνεύματος κρεῖττον, ἅτε τῆς*

δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, [st] καθαρισμὸν τῶν [s] ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος

s = 2 Pet. i. 9. Job vii. 21. (see note.) Lev. xiv. 32.
t as above (s). Luke ii. 22. v. 14 ‖ Mk. John ii. 6. iii. 25 only.

rec aft *αυτου* ins *δι' εαυτου* (*probably a gloss: see note*), with D³KLM rel syrr Ath₁ Chr₁ [Thdrt Damasc-txt] Aug₁; *δι' αυτου* D¹ Thdrt(*τὸ Δι' αὑτοῦ δασέως ἀναγινώσκειν προσήκει ἀντὶ τοῦ Δι' ἑαυτοῦ*); *per quem* copt, *et per quem* æth: om ABD²[P]ℵ 17 [47] vulg arm Ps-Ath₁ Cyr-jer₁ Cyr₁ [Dial₁ Euthal-ms] Damasc₁-comm₁ Sedul Cassiod₁. rec *ποιησαμενος* bef *των αμαρτιων* (*appy to bring the accus nearer the verb, esp as ημων also intervened*), with KL rel syr Chr Thdrt [Damasc₁-txt₁]: txt ABDM[P]ℵ m 17 [47] latt [arm] Ath₁ Ps-Ath₁ Cyr-jer₁ Cyr Did₁ Damasc-comm [Aug]. rec aft *αμαρτιων* ins *ημων* (*prob doctrinal corrn to shew that they were not his own. So Bleek*), with D³KL m [17. 47] syr [arm] Ath₁ Ps-Ath Chr Thdrt [Damasc$_{h.l.}$]: *υμων* ℵ³: om ABD¹M[P]ℵ¹ rel latt Syr copt æth Ath₁ Cyr-jer₁ Did₁ Cyr[-p₂] Damasc₁ Aug Sedul Cassiod₁.

μακαρίας καὶ τρισμακαρίας φύσεως ἀπαύγασμα,—where the sense clearly is, that the breath breathed into man was as it were a *ray* of the divine nature itself. See also id. de Opif. Mund. § 51, vol. i. p. 35; de Plant. Noë, § 12, p. 154. Cf. Wisd. vii. 26, where wisdom is called an *ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς ἀϊδίου*. And this (which, as Delitzsch remarks, is represented by the *φῶς ἐκ φωτός* of the Church) seems to have been universally the sense among the ancients: no trace whatever being found of the meaning '*reflexion*.' Nor would the idea be apposite here: the Son of God is, in this his essential majesty, the expression, and the sole expression, of the divine Light,—not, as in his Incarnation, its reflexion. So Thdrt.: *τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι, καὶ σὺν τῷ πυρί ἐστι· καὶ αἴτιον μὲν ἔχει τὸ πῦρ, ἀχώριστον δέ ἐστι τοῦ πυρός. . . . . καὶ τῷ πυρὶ δὲ ὁμοφυὲς τὸ ἀπαύγασμα· οὐκοῦν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί.* (Cf. Athanasius contra Arianos Orat. i. (ii.) § 12, vol. ii. (Migne) p. 328: *τίς οὕτως ἐστὶν ἀνόητος, ὡς ἀμφιβάλλειν περὶ τοῦ ἀεὶ εἶναι τὸν υἱόν; πότε γάρ τις εἶδε φῶς χωρὶς τῆς τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος λαμπρότητος;*) And Thl.: *καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῷ ἀπαυγάζοντι συνεμφαίνεται. οὔτε γὰρ ἥλιος ὠράθη ποτὲ χωρὶς ἀπαυγάσματος· οὔτε πατὴρ νοεῖται χωρὶς υἱοῦ. ὅταν οὖν ἀκούσῃς τῶν Ἀρειανῶν λεγόντων, ὅτι εἰ ἐκ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός, λοιπὸν ὕστερος αὐτοῦ· ἀντίθες αὐτοῖς, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου, καὶ οὐχ ὕστερον αὐτοῦ. ἅμα γὰρ ἥλιος, ἅμα ἀπαύγασμα.* And Origen, tom. xxxii. in Joann. § 18, vol. iv. p. 450: *ὅλης μὲν οὖν οἶμαι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπαύγασμα εἶναι τὸν υἱόν, κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα Παῦλον Ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης· φθάνειν μέντοι γε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος τούτου τῆς ὅλης δόξης μερικὰ ἀπαυγάσματα ἐπὶ τὴν λοιπὴν λογικὴν κτίσιν· οὐκ οἶμαι γάρ τινα τὸ πᾶν δύνασθαι χωρῆσαι τῆς ὅλης δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπαύγασμα, ἢ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.* Hesychius gives as the meaning of *ἀπαύγασμα*, *ἡλίου φέγγος*: and the MS. Lexicon of Cyril, *ἀκτὶς ἡλίου ἡ πρώτη τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς ἀποβολή*. See also Clem.-rom. in reff. and several other authorities cited in Bleek) **of His glory** (not simply *His light*: nor need *ἀπαύγασμα* be confined to such literal sense: cf. Clem.-rom. as above. His glory, in its widest and amplest reference. It has been attempted to give to *ἀπ. τῆς δόξης* the meaning *splendor gloriosus*, and to make *αὐτοῦ* below refer, not to the Father, but to *ἀπαύγασμα*. But to this Bleek answers after Seb.-Schmidt, that *ἀπαύγασμα* never is found without a genitive of the *ἀπαυγαζόμενον*, which genitive here can be no other than *τῆς δόξης* (*αὐτοῦ*, i.e. *τοῦ θεοῦ*). Again, Owen (vol. i. p. 85 f.) supposes the Shechinah to be alluded to; —Akersloot, the Urim and Thummim. It is hardly probable that in a preliminary description, couched in the most general and sublime terms, any such particular allusion should be intended. Notice again the anarthrous predicate, to which the same remarks will apply as to *υἱῷ* above.

Delitzsch remarks, Es ist kein Nimbus um Gott, welchen hier *δόξα* genannt wird, sondern die übersinnliche geistige Feuer und Lichtnatur Gottes selber, welche er, um sich vor sich selbst offenbar zu werden, aus sich heraussetzt) **and impress** ("*figura*," vulg.: "figure," Wiclif and Rheims: "very image," Tyndal and Cranmer: "ingraved forme," Geneva: "express image," E. V. The word *χαρακτήρ*, which by formation would be the stamp or die itself on which a device *χαράσσεται*, and which stamps it on other things, never appears to bear this meaning, but always to be taken for the impression itself so stamped. Thus Æsch. Suppl. 279, *Κύπριος χαρακτὴρ τ' ἐν γυναικείοις τύποις εἰκὼς πέπληκται τεκτόνων πρὸς ἀρσένων.* Aristot. Œc. ii. p. 689, *ἀνενεχθέντος δὲ τοῦ ἀργυρίου ἐπικόψας χαρακτῆρα*: id. Pol. i. 6, where *χαρακτῆρα ἐπιβάλλειν* is to stamp coin, and it is said, *ὁ γὰρ χαρακτὴρ ἐτέθη τοῦ πόσου σημεῖον.* Diod. Sic. xvii. 66,

[u] ἐκάθισεν [uv] ἐν [v] δεξιᾷ τῆς [w] μεγαλωσύνης [x] ἐν [x] ὑψηλοῖς, ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

u Eph. i. 20. ch. viii. 1. x. 12. xii. 2 only. ἐκ δεξ., Matt. xxi. 23 ‖. Mark xvi. 19. Sir. xii. 12. 1. 1 Pet. iii. 22 only. Ps. xv. 11. see Mark xvi. 5. lxxviii. 11 al. x here only. see note. v as above (u). Rom. viii. 34. Col. iii. w ch. viii. 1. Jude 25 only. 2 Kings vii. 21, 23. Ps.

τάλαντα χρυσοῦ, χαρακτῆρα δαρεικὸν ἔχοντα. Hence the word is taken, 1. generally for any fixed and sharply marked lineaments, material or spiritual, by which a person or an object may be recognized and distinguished. Herod. i. 116, *ὁ χ. τοῦ προσώπου.* Diod. Sic. i. 82, *τοὺς τῆς ὄψεως χαρακτῆρας*, the lines of the countenance. Lucian, de Amoribus, p. 1061, calls mirrors *τῶν ἀντιμόρφων χαρακτήρων ἀγράφους εἰκόνας*, and ib. p. 1056, *ἧς ὁ μὲν ἀληθῶς χ. ἄμορφος.* Demosth. (in Stephan.), *ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἐσόπτροις ὁ τῆς ὄψεως, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὁμιλίαις ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς χαρακτὴρ βλέπεται.* Philo, de Mund. Opif. § 4 (vol. i. p. 4), *τοὺς χαρακτῆρας ἐνσφραγίζεσθαι*, to impress on the mind the lines and forms of an intended city: id. Legg. Allegor. i. § 18 (vol. i. p. 55), *ὁ τῆς ἀρετῆς χαρακτήρ, οἰκεῖος ὢν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ*: id. de Mundi Opif. § 23 (p. 15), *τὴν δὲ ἐμφέρειαν* (the likeness of man to God) *μηδεὶς εἰκαζέτω σώματος χαρακτῆρσιν*, ib. § 53 (p. 36), *τῆς ἑκατέρου φύσεως* (viz. of God and the creation) *ἀπεμάττετο* (scil. man, while he was alone) *τῇ ψυχῇ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας*:—and, 2. of the objects themselves, on which the features of another are expressed,—which bear its peculiar image, so that they appear as if taken off from it by impression of a die. So Philo, Quod Det. Potiori Ins. § 23 (vol. i. p. 217), designates the *πνεῦμα* imparted by God to man *τύπον τινὰ καὶ χαρακτῆρα θείας δυνάμεως*, Moses naming the same *εἰκών*, to shew *ὅτι ἀρχέτυπον μὲν φύσεως λογικῆς ὁ θεός ἐστι, μίμημα δὲ καὶ ἀπεικόνισμα ἄνθρωπος*: De Plant. Noë, § 5 (p. 332), he says, Moses named the rational soul *τοῦ θείου καὶ ἀοράτου εἰκόνα, δόκιμον εἶναι νομίσας οὐσιωθεῖσαν κ. τυπωθεῖσαν σφραγῖδι θεοῦ, ἧς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστιν ὁ ἀΐδιος λόγος.* Here the *λόγος* is designated as the impress of the seal of God, by the impression of which in like manner on the human soul, this last receives a corresponding figure, as the image of the unseen and divine. Compare also Clem.-rom. ad Cor. c. 33, *αὐτὸς ὁ δημιουργὸς κ. δεσπότης ἁπάντων . . . τὸν . . . ἄνθρωπον ταῖς ἰδίαις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀμώμοις χερσὶν ἔπλασεν, τῆς ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνος χαρακτῆρα.* Hence the usage of *χαρακτήρ* here will be easily understood." Bleek: see also the word in Palm and Rost's Lex. *καθ' ἑαυτὸν γάρ, φησίν, ὑφέστηκεν, ὅλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ δεικνὺς πατέρα. τοὺς γὰρ πατρικοὺς περίκειται χαρακτῆρας. τούτῳ ἔοικε τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον εἰρημένον, ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμέ, ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα μου.* Thdrt.) **of His substance** (substantial or essential being: "*substance*," Wicl., Tynd., Cranm., Rheims: "*person*," Geneva, and E. V.: Wesen, Luther, &c., De Wette, Bleek, al.: das der Erscheinung unterliegende Wesen, der Wesensgrund, Delitzsch. The various meanings of *ὑπόστασις* are well traced by Bleek, from whom, as so often in this Epistle, I take the account. Etymologically, the word imports the lying or being placed underneath: and this is put in common usage for, 1. *substratum* or *foundation—fundamentum.* Diod. Sic. i. 66, *ὑπόστασις τοῦ τάφου*: id. xiii. 82, *κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ὑποστάσεως*: Ezek. xliii. 11, *κ. διαγράψεις τὸν οἶκον κ. τὰς ἐξόδους αὐτοῦ κ. τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ*: Ps. lxviii. 2, *ἐνεπάγην εἰς ἰλὺν βυθοῦ κ. οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπόστασις.* Nearly connected with this is, 2. *establishment*, or the state of being established: hence—α. *firmness*,—to which idea the word approaches in the last citation: but especially in reference to firmness of spirit, confidence: see more on ch. iii. 14,—β. *substantial existence, reality*, in contradistinction to that which exists only in appearance or idea: Aristot. de Mundo iv. 19, *τῶν ἐν ἀέρι φαντασμάτων τὰ μέν ἐστι κατ' ἔμφασιν, τὰ δὲ καθ' ὑπόστασιν*: Artemidor. Oneirocrit. iii. 14, *φαντασίαν μὲν ἔχειν πλούτου, ὑπόστασιν δὲ μή*: Diog. Laert. ix. 91, *ζητεῖται δ' οὐκ εἰ φαίνεται ταῦτα, ἀλλ' εἰ καθ' ὑπόστασιν οὕτως ἔχει*: id. vii. 135, *καὶ κατ' ἐπίνοιαν καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν.* Hence—γ. generally, *consistence* or *existence.* So Philo, de Incorrupt. Mund. § 18, vol. i. p. 505, *αὐγὴ ὑπόστασιν ἰδίαν οὐκ ἔχει, γεννᾶται δ' ἐκ φλογός*: Ps. xxxviii. 5, *καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασίς μου ὡσεὶ οὐθὲν ἐνώπιόν σου*: Ps. lxxxviii. 47, *μνήσθητι τίς ὑπόστασίς μου* (in both places for the existence of man, Heb. חֶלֶד: hence also, as *ὕπαρξις*, for *possessions* or *goods*, as Deut. xi. 6: Jer. x. 17). Hence also—δ. it imports the *especial manner of being*, the *peculiar essence* of an object. Thus 1 Kings xiii. 21, *τῇ ἀξίνῃ κ. τῷ δρεπάνῳ ὑπόστασις ἦν ἡ αὐτή*: Wisd. xvi. 21, *ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὑπόστασίς σου* (τ. θεοῦ) *τὴν σὴν γλυκύτητα πρὸς τέκνα ἐνεφάνισε.* And this last seems to be the best meaning in our place: His *essential being*, His *substance.* For in regarding the history of the word, we find that the well-known theological meaning '*person*'

4 [y] τοσούτῳ [z] κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, [y] ὅσῳ

y constr., ch. vii. 20, 22 reff.
z = Paul, never (1 Cor. xii. 31 rec.), but ch. vi. 9. vii. 7, 19, 22. viii. 6 bis. ix. 23. x. 34. xi. 16, 35, 40. xii. 24 only. Judg. viii. 2 al.

4. [τοσουτων P.] om των B.

was not by any means generally received during the first four centuries. We have it indeed in Origen, tom. ii. in Joann. § 6, vol. iv. p. 61 (ἡμεῖς μέντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν πατέρα, κ. τὸν υἱόν, κ. τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, κ.τ.λ.): but the usage is by no means constant. The Nicene council itself uses ὑπόστασις and οὐσία in the same sense, and condemns the deriving the Son ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας from the Father (cited in Bleek, p. 60, note): and so usually (in the genuine works: e. g. Ep. ad Afros, c. 4, vol. ii. (Migne) p. 714: ἡ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστί, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαινόμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν. . . . ἡ γὰρ ὑπόστασις καὶ ἡ οὐσία ὕπαρξίς ἐστιν. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ὑπάρχει. See Gieseler, Kirchengesch. i. pt. 2, p. 63) Athanasius. The fact was, that the Easterns most commonly used ὑπόστασις to designate the three separate Persons (cf. e. g. Chrys. de Sacerdot. iv. 4, vol. i. p. 410 A, τὴν μὲν θεότητα πατρὸς κ. υἱ. κ. ἁγ. πν. μίαν ὁμολογοῦντας, προστιθέντας δὲ καὶ τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, &c., and especially Basil, whom Gieseler regards as the representative of this view: Ep. 236. 6, vol. iv. p. 363, οὐσία κ. ὑπόστασις ταύτην ἔχει τὴν διαφοράν, ἣν ἔχει τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον. See other passages in Gieseler, ubi supra) in distinction from Sabellianism, which acknowledged three πρόσωπα, but not three ὑποστάσεις, i. e. self-subsisting personalities: whereas the Westerns continued to regard ὑπόστασις as = οὐσία, and assumed but one ὑπόστασις: and the Western bishops, assembled with Athanasius at the council of Sardica in 347, distinctly pronounced the assumption of three hypostases heretical, i. e. Arian. Their words, as cited by Suicer from Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. ii. 6, are very decisive: τὸ τῶν αἱρετικῶν σύστημα φιλονεικεῖ, διαφόρους εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις τοῦ πατρός, κ. τοῦ υἱοῦ, κ. τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, κ. εἶναι κεχωρισμένας. ἡμεῖς δὲ ταύτην παρειλήφαμεν κ. δεδιδάγμεθα, κ. ταύτην ἔχομεν τὴν καθολικὴν παράδοσιν κ. πίστιν κ. ὁμολογίαν, μίαν εἶναι ὑπόστασιν, ἣν αὐτοὶ οἱ αἱρετικοὶ οὐσίαν προσαγορεύουσι, τοῦ πατρός, κ. τοῦ υἱοῦ, κ. τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Subsequently however to this, in the Synod assembled at Alexandria in 362, at which Athanasius, and bishops of Italy, Arabia, Egypt, and Libya were present, the Easterns and Westerns agreed, on examination of one another's meaning, to acknowledge one another as orthodox, and to allow indifferently of the use of τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις signifying 'Persons,' and μία ὑπόστασις signifying 'substance,' 'essence,' οὐσία. The Epistle from this synod to the bishops of Antioch is among the works of Athanasius, vol. ii. p. 615 ff., and is a very interesting document. But it attempted conciliation in vain, the Miletian schism at Antioch, which began on this point, having been confirmed and perpetuated by external causes. See on the whole subject, Bleek's note: Jerome, Epist. 15 (al. 57) ad Damasum, § 4, vol. i. p. 40; and on the use made of this description by orthodox and heretics in early times, Bleek, Chrys. in loc.: Calvin's note, where he gives some excellent cautions against the speculative pressing of each expression: "Nam hoc quoque notandum est, non hic doceri frivolas speculationes, sed tradi solidam fidei doctrinam. Quare debemus in usum nostrum hæc Christi elogia applicare, sicuti ad nos relationem habent." On all grounds it will be safer here to hold to the primitive meaning of the word, and not to introduce into the language of the apostolic age a terminology which was long subsequent to it), and (τε couples closely clauses referring to the same subject, and following as matter of course on one another) upholding (we have this sense of φέρειν in reff. and in the later Greek writers, e. g. Plut. Lucull. 6, φέρειν τὴν πόλιν. So in Latin, Val. Max. xi. 8. 5, "humeris gestare salutem patriæ:" Cic. pro Flacco, c. 38, "quam (remp.) vos universam in hoc judicio vestris humeris . . . . judices, sustinetis:" Senec. Ep. 31, "Deus ille maximus potentissimusque vehit omnia." But the usage is principally found in the Rabbinical writings, as appears from the extracts in Schöttgen,—e. g. Sohar Chadasch, fol. ix. 1, "Creator benedictus portans omnes mundos robore suo (סובל כל העלמות בכחו)," &c. Chrys. says, φέρων, τουτέστι κυβερνῶν, τὰ διαπίπτοντα συγκρατῶν: and so Thl.: "Sursum tenet, ne decidant, et in nihilum revertantur," Ps.-Anselm) the universe (the same πάντα as designated by πάντων above: not that the art. expressly refers back to that word, for τὰ πάντα is the ordinary expression for the aggregate of all things. The meaning attempted to be given by some Socinian expositors, "the whole kingdom of grace," is wholly beside the purpose: see reff., esp. Col. i. 17, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συν-

[a] διαφορώτερον [b] παρ' αὐτοὺς [c] κεκληρονόμηκεν [d] ὄνομα.

ABDK LMP℞ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

a compar., ch. viii. 6 only. = Gen. i. 27. Symm., ἐν εἰκόνι διαφόρῳ (for θεοῦ). b = Luke iii. 13. ch. iii. 3. ix. 23. xii. 24 al. (see note.) c = ver. 14. ch. vi. 12. xii. 17. Matt. xxv. 34. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. xv. 50. 1 Pet. iii. 9 al. Isa. lxv. 9. Sir. iv. 13. d = Phil. ii. 9, 10.

ἔστηκεν: Job viii. 3, ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας: Rev. iv. 11, ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα) **by the word** (*expressed command:* cf. ch. xi. 3, πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ) **of his** (Whose? His own, or the Father's? The latter is held by Cyril-alex. contra Julian. viii. vol. ix. p. 259 c, ὡς γὰρ ὁ πάνσοφος γράφει Παῦλος· φέρει τὰ π. ἐν τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυν. αὐτοῦ, τοῦ πατρός. And so Grot., al. But Chrys., Thdrt., Thl., and the great body of Commentators understand αὐτοῦ to refer to the Son. That it may do so, it is not necessary to write αὑτοῦ, as is done in the cursive mss. (the uncial MSS. being mostly without accents) and in many modern editions. Bleek in his note (vol. i. p. 69) makes it probable that the abbreviated writing αὑτοῦ for ἑαυτοῦ had not been adopted in the days of the N. T. Even if it had, his rule seems a good one;—that αὑτοῦ should never be written unless in cases where, if speaking in the 1st or 2nd person, we should use ἐμαυτοῦ or σεαυτοῦ,—i. e. never except where emphatic. Now here, supposing the words *addressed to* the Son, σοῦ and not σεαυτοῦ would evidently be the word used: and consequently in expressing the same sentence in the 3rd person, αὐτοῦ, not αὑτοῦ (ἑαυτοῦ) ought to be written. The interpretation therefore is independent of this distinction. But the question recurs, which is the right one? The strict parallelism of the clauses would seem to require, that αὐτοῦ here should designate the same person, as it does before, after τῆς ὑποστάσεως. But such parallelism and consistency of reference of demonstrative pronouns is by no means observed in the N. T., e. g. Eph. i. 20, 22, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ (of the Father), ... καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (of the Son). In every such case the reference must be determined by the circumstances, and the things spoken of. And applying that test here, we find that in our former clause, ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τ. δόξης κ. χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, it is quite out of the question that αὐτοῦ should be reflective, referring, as it clearly does, to another than the subject of the sentence. But when we proceed to our second clause, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥ. τ. δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, we find no such bar to the ordinary reflective sense of αὐτοῦ, but every reason to adopt it as the most obvious. For we have here an action performed by the Son, who φέρει τὰ πάντα. Whereby? τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ: where we may certainly say, 1. that had another than the subject of the sentence been intended, such intention would have been expressed: and, 2. that the assertion would be after all a strange and unexampled one, that the Son upholds all things by the word of the Father's power. So that, on all accounts, this second αὐτοῦ seems better to be referred to the Son) **power** (not to be weakened into the comparatively unmeaning τῷ ῥήματι αὐτοῦ τῷ δυνατῷ. His Power is an inherent attribute, whether uttered or not: the ῥῆμα is that utterance, which He has been pleased to give of it. It is a "powerful word," but much more is here stated—that it is the word of, proceeding from, giving utterance to, His power), **having made** (the vulg. "*faciens*" is an unfortunate mistranslation, tending to obscure the truth of the completion of the one Sacrifice of the Lord. The words δι' ἑαυτοῦ can hardly be retained in the text, in the face of their omission in the three most ancient MSS., joined to their internal character as an explanatory gloss. Dr. Bloomfield's strong argument in their favour, that they "are almost indispensable," in fact, pronounces their condemnation. The hypothesis of homœoteleuton suggests itself: but it is hardly likely in so solemn an opening passage, and weighs little against the probability the other way. Meanwhile, the gloss is a good and true one. It was δι' ἑαυτοῦ, in the fullest sense) **purification of sins** (as Bleek observes, there is no occasion to suppose the genitive here equivalent to ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, seeing that we may say καθαρίζονται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as we read, Matt. viii. 3, ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα. Sin was the great uncleanness, of which He has effected the purgation: the disease of which He has wrought the cure. This καθαρισμός must be understood by the subsequent argument in the Epistle: for that which the Writer had it in his mind to expand in the course of his treatise, he must be supposed to have meant when he used without explanation a concise term, like this. And that we know to have been, the purifications and sacrifices of the Levitical law, by which man's natural uncleanness in God's sight was typically removed, and access to God laid open to him. Ebrard's note here is so important that, though long, I cannot forbear inserting it:—"καθαρίζειν answers to the Heb. טִהַר, and its ideal explanation must be sought in the meaning which suits the Levitical

[5] Τίνι γὰρ εἶπεν [e] ποτὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων [f] Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ

e = 1 Cor. ix. 7. ver. 13.
f Acts xiii. 33. ch. v. 5. Psa. ii. 7.

5. των αγγελων bef ποτε D[1] o [Syr].

cleansing in the O. T. cultus. Consequently, they are entirely wrong, who understand *καθαρίζειν* of moral amelioration, and would so take *καθαρισμὸν ποιεῖν* in this place, as if the author wished to set forth Christ here as a moral teacher, who by precept and example incited men to amendment. And we may pronounce those in error, who go so far indeed as to explain the *καθαρισμός* of the propitiatory removal of the guilt of sin, but only on account of later passages in our Epistle, as if the idea of scriptural *καθαρισμός* were not already sufficiently clear to establish this, the only true meaning. The whole law of purification, as given by God to Moses, rested on the assumption that our nature, as sinful and guilt-laden, is not capable of coming into immediate contact with our holy God and Judge. The mediation between man and God present in the most holy place, and in that most holy place separated from the people, was revealed in three forms; α. in sacrifices, β. in the Priesthood, and γ. in the Levitical laws of purity. Sacrifices were (typical) acts or means of propitiation for guilt; Priests were the agents for accomplishing these acts, but were not themselves accounted purer than the rest of the people, having consequently to bring offerings for their own sins before they offered for those of the people. Lastly, Levitical purity was the condition which was attained, positively by sacrifice and worship, negatively by avoidance of Levitical pollution,—the condition in which the people was enabled, by means of the priests, to come into relation with God 'without dying' (Deut. v. 26); the result of the cultus which was past, and the postulate for that which was to come. So that that which purified, was sacrifice: and the purification was, the removal of guilt. This is most clearly seen in the ordinance concerning the great day of atonement, Levit. xvi. There we find those three leading features in the closest distinctive relation. First, the sacrifice must be prepared (vv. 1—10): then, the high priest is to offer for his own sins (vv. 11—14): lastly, he is to kill the sin-offering for the people (ver. 15), and with its blood to sprinkle the mercy-seat and all the holy place, and cleanse it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel (ver. 19); and then he is symbolically to lay the sins of the people on the head of a second victim, and send forth this animal, laden with the curse, into the wilderness. For (ver. 30) 'on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord.' In the atonement, in the gracious covering (יְכַפֵּר, ver. 30) of the guilt of sin, consists *purification* in the scriptural sense. (And so also were those who had become levitically unclean, e.g. lepers, Levit. xiv., cleansed by atoning sacrifices.) So that an Israelitish reader, a Christian Jew, would never, on reading the words *καθαρισμὸν ποιεῖν*, think on what we commonly call 'moral amelioration,' which, if not springing out of the living ground of a heart reconciled to God, is mere self-deceit, and only external avoidance of evident transgression: but the *καθαρισμός* which Christ brought in would, in the sense of our author and his readers, only be understood of that gracious atonement for all guilt of sin of all mankind, which Christ our Lord and Saviour has completed for us by His sinless sufferings and death: and out of which flows forth to us, as from a fountain, all power to love in return, all love to Him, our heavenly Pattern, and all hatred of sin, which caused His death. To speak these words of Scripture with the mouth, is easy: but he only can say Yea and Amen to them with the heart who, in simple truthfulness of the knowledge of himself, has looked down even to the darkest depths of his ruined state, natural to him, and intensified by innumerable sins of act,—and, despairing of all help in himself, reaches forth his hand after the good tidings of heavenly deliverance." It is truly refreshing, in the midst of so much unbelief, and misapprehension of the sense of Scripture, in the German Commentators, to meet with such a clear and full testimony to the truth and efficacy of the Lord's great Sacrifice. And I am bound to say that Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, and Delitzsch, recognize this just as fully: the two former however referring on further in the Epistle for the explanation of the expression, and holding it premature to specify or explain it here. Observe now again, before passing on, the mistake of the vulgate in rendering *ποιησάμενος* "*faciens*." The purification is *completed*, before the action next described takes place: this all seem to acknowledge here, and to find an exception to the ordinary rule that an aorist participle connected with an aorist verb, is contemporary with it. The reason seems to be principally pragmatic—that such session could not well be brought in until such purification

g = Rom. xv. 10, 11, 12. 1 Cor. iii. 20. ch. ii. 13 bis. x. 30. σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε; καὶ [g] πάλιν [h] Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ ABDK LMPℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

h 2 Kings vii. 14. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Rev. xxi. 7.

om αυτω ℵ[1] (supplied by ℵ-corr[1]).

had been accomplished: see above), **sat down** (καθίζω is always used intransitively in this Epistle, and always of this act of Christ. In fact it is always intransitive in the N. T., except in the two places, 1 Cor. vi. 4, τούτους καθίζετε, and Eph. i. 20, καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ) **on the right hand** ('*in the right hand*,' scil. *portion* or *side*. The expression comes doubtless originally from Ps. cx. (cix.) 1, cited below. Bleek, in the course of a long and thorough discussion of its meaning as applied to our Lord, shews that it is never used of his præ-existent coequality with the Father, but always with reference to His exaltation in his humanity after his course of suffering and triumph. It is ever connected, not with the idea of His equality with the Father and share in the majesty of the Godhead, but with His state of waiting, in the immediate presence of the Father, and thus highly exalted by Him, till the purposes of his mediatorial office are accomplished. This his lofty state is, however, not one of quiescence; for (Acts ii. 33) He shed down the gift of the Spirit, —and (Rom. viii. 34) He maketh intercession for us: and below (ch. viii. 1 ff.) He is, for all purposes belonging to that office, our High Priest in Heaven. This '*sitting at the right hand of God*' is described as lasting until all enemies shall have been subdued unto Him, i. e. until the end of this state of time, and His own second coming: after which, properly and strictly speaking, the state of exaltation described by these words shall come to an end, and that mysterious completion of the supreme glory of the Son of God shall take place, which St. Paul describes, 1 Cor. xv. 28. On the more refined questions connected with the expression, see Delitzsch's and Ebrard's notes here) **of majesty** (μεγαλωσύνη, said to belong to the Alexandrine dialect, is often found in the LXX, and principally as referring to the divine greatness: see reff.) **on high** (*in high places*, i. e. *in heaven*. Cf. Ps. xcii. 4, θαυμαστὸς ἐν ὑψηλοῖς ὁ κύριος, and cxii. 5, ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν: and the singular ἐν ὑψηλῷ, Isa. xxxiii. 5: ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ, Isa. xxxii. 15: Jer. xxxii. (xxv.) 30. In the same sense we have ἐν ὑψίστοις, Luke ii. 14; xix. 38: Job xvi. 20: ἥλιος ἀνατέλλων ἐν ὑψίστοις κυρίου, Sir. xxvi. 16: and ἐν τοῖς ὑψ., Matt. xxi. 9: Mark xi. 10. Cf. Ebrard: "HEAVEN, in Holy Scripture, signifies never unbounded space, nor omnipresence, but always either the starry firmament, or, more usually, that sphere of the created world of space and time, where the union of God with the personal creature is not severed by sin,—where no Death reigns, where the glorification of the body is not a mere hope of the future. Into that sphere has the Firstling of risen and glorified manhood entered, as into a place, with visible glorified Body, visibly to return again from thence." There is a question whether the word should be joined with ἐκάθισεν, or with τῆς μεγαλωσύνης: which again occurs at ch. viii. 1, where we have ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. The strict grammarians contend for the connexion with the verb, on account of the omission of the art. τῆς. But the order of the words in both places makes the other connexion the more natural; and no scholar versed in N. T. diction will object to it. Cf. τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα, Eph. vi. 5, and note, also John vi. 32. The omission of the art. here gives majesty and solemnity—its insertion would seem to hint at other μεγαλωσύναι in the background).

4.] **having become** (γενόμενος, distinct from ὢν ver. 3: that, importing His essential, this, His superinduced state. This is denied by Chrys. (τὸ γενόμενος ἐνταῦθα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθείς, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ἐστίν), Thl. (but not very clearly: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδειχθείς· ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονε· τουτέστιν ἐντιμότερός μου ἀπεδείχθη· οὐ γὰρ δὴ περὶ οὐσιώσεως ἐνταῦθα λέγει), Estius ("Significatur tum Christum angelis majorem effectum, i. e. excrevisse super angelos in hominum estimatione et fide, postquam cœpit sedere ad dexteram Dei"): but they certainly are wrong. For we are now, in the course of the enunciation,—which has advanced to the main subject of the argument, the proving of the superiority of the New Covenant,—treating of the post-incarnate majesty of the Son of God. He WAS all that has been detailed in ver. 3: He made purification of sins, and sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high, and thus BECAME this which is now spoken of. This is recognized by Thdrt., but in a form not strictly exact: κ. τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον εἴρηκεν· ὡς γὰρ θεός, ποιητὴς ἀγγέλων κ. δεσπότης ἀγγέλων· ὡς δὲ ἄνθρωπος, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν κ. τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάβασιν κρείττων ἀγγέλων ἐγένετο· ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐλάττων ἦν ἀγγέλων

[1] *εἰς πατέρα καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι* [1] *εἰς υἱόν;* [6] *ὅταν δὲ πάλιν*

1 = (chiefly in citations) Matt. xix. 5 (from Gen. ii. 24). xxi. 42 al., from Ps. cxvii. 22. ch. viii. 10.

διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου (ch. ii. 9). *ὥσπερ τοίνυν ἐλάττων ἦν ἀγγέλων ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐπειδὴ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἀθάνατον ἔχουσι φύσιν, αὐτὸς δὲ τὸ πάθος ὑπέμεινεν, οὕτω μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάβασιν κρείττων ἀγγέλων ἐγένετο.* To this Bleek very properly objects, that the making this exaltation belong only to Christ's human nature, and supposing Him to have while on earth possessed still the fulness of the majesty of his Godhead, is not according to the usage of our Writer, nor of the N. T. generally, and in fact induces something like a double personality in the Son of God. The Scriptures teach us, that He who was with God before the creation, from love to men put on flesh, and took the form of a servant, not all the while having on Him the whole fulness of his divine nature and divine glory, but having really and actually emptied himself of this fulness and glory, so that there was not only a hiding, but an absolute *κένωσις*, a putting off, of it. Therefore His subsequent exaltation must be conceived of as belonging, not to his Humanity only, but to the entire undivided Person of Christ, now resuming the fulness and glory of the Godhead (John xvii. 5), and in addition to this having taken into the Godhead the Manhood, now glorified by his obedience, atonement, and victory. See Eph. i. 20—22: Phil. ii. 6—9: Acts ii. 36: 1 Pet. iii. 21, 22. Œcumenius, as an alternative, has given this well: *ἢ τὸ γενόμενος οὐκ ἐπὶ σαρκὸς ἐκλάβοις, ἵνα μὴ διαιρεῖν νομισθῇς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει προσκυνουμένου, καὶ μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.* The Son of God before his Incarnation was Head *over* Creation; but after his work in the flesh He had become also Head *of* Creation, inasmuch as his glorified Body, in which He triumphs sitting at God's right hand, is itself created, and is the sum and the centre of creation) **so much** (reff. Bleek cites from Philo, *νομίζοντες ὅσῳ θεὸς ἀνθρώπων διαφέρει κατὰ τὸ κρεῖττον, τοσούτῳ καὶ βασιλείας ἀρχιερωσύνην.* Leg. ad Cai. § 36, vol. ii. p. 586. In the classics, the idiom is common enough: see Palm and Rost's Lex. It is wholly unknown to the writings of St. Paul) **better than** (the usual word of general and indefinite comparison in our Epistle, whether of Christian with Jewish (ch. vii. 19, 22; viii. 6; ix. 23), heavenly with earthly (x. 34; xi. 16; xii. 24), eternal with temporal (xi. 35): see also vi. 9; vii. 7; xi. 40. It is used only three times by St. Paul, and never (unless 1 Cor. xii. 31 rec. be counted) in this sense: but thirteen times in this Epistle. "The Greeks used *οἱ κρείττονες*, to signify superhuman beings, gods and demi-gods," Bl. So on *κρείττονας*, Æsch. fragm. Ætn. 2, Hesych. λέγει, *τοὺς ἥρωας. καὶ οἱ θεοὶ δέ.* See also Eurip. Orest. 709: Plato, Sophist. p. 216 (cir. init.): and Philo above) **the angels** (of God: the heavenly created beings; afterwards, ver. 14, called *λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα.* All attempts to evade this plain meaning are futile; and proceed on ignorance of the argument of our Epistle, and of the Jewish theology: see some such noticed in Bleek. But *why* should the angels be here brought in? and why should the superiority of the Incarnate Son of God to them be so insisted on and elaborated? Bl. gives a very insufficient reason, when he says that the mention of God's throne brought to the Writer's mind the angels who are the attendants there. The reason, as Ebrard remarks, lies far deeper. The whole O. T. dispensation is related to the N. T. dispensation, as the angels to the Son. In the former, mankind, and Israel also, stands separated from God by sin; and angels, divine messengers (cf. "the angel of the covenant"), stand as mediators between man and God. And of these there is, so to speak, a chain of two links: viz. Moses, and the angel of the Lord. The first link is a mere man, who is raised above his fellow-men by his calling, by his office, the commission given to him,—and brought nearer to God; but he is a sinner as they are, and is in reality no more a partaker of the divine nature than they are. The second link is the angelic form in which God revealed himself to his people, coming down to their capacity, like to man, without being man. So that Godhead and Manhood approximated to one another; a man was commissioned and enabled to hear God's words: God appeared in a form in which men might see Him: but the two found no point of contact; no real union of the Godhead and the Manhood took place. Whereas in the Son, God and the Manhood not only approximated, but became personally one. God no longer accommodates Himself to the capacities of men in an angelophany or theophany, but has revealed the fulness of His divine nature in the man Jesus,—in that He, who was the *ἀπαύγασμα* of His glory, became man. The argument of the Writer necessarily then leads him to shew how *both* Mediators, the angel of the O. T. covenant, and Moses, found their

[k] εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν [l] πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν [m] οἰκουμένην, λέγει

k (see note) = here only. (elsw. Luke only, exc. John xviii. 16.) l Matt. i. 25 v. r. Luke ii. 7. Rom. viii. 29. Col. i. 15, 18. ch. xi. 28. xii. 23. Rev. i. 5 only. absol., here only. prob. from Ps. lxxxviii. 27. (-κια, ch. xii. 16.) m see esp. Acts xvii. 31. Ps. xcvi. 4.

higher unity in Christ. First, he shews this of the angel or angels (for it was not always one individual angelic being, but various) by whom the first covenant was given: then of Moses, ch. iii. iv. This first portion is divided into two: vv. 4—14, in which he shews that the Son, as the eternal Son of God, is higher than the angels (see the connexion of this with the main argument below): then, after an exhortation (ii. 1—4) founded on this, tending also to impress on us the superior holiness of the N. T. revelation, the second part (ii. 5—18) in which he shews that in the Son, the manhood also is exalted above the angels (mostly from Ebrard)), **in proportion as** (see above) **he hath inherited** (as his own (γνήσιον): the word **κεκληρονόμηκεν** being perhaps chosen in reference to the O. T. prophecies, which promised it to Him: see below. The *perfect* is important, as denoting something belonging to His present and abiding state, not an event wholly past, as ἐκάθισεν above, indicating the first 'setting himself down:' though that word might also be used of a permanent state of session, as in κεκάθικεν, ch. xii. 2) **a more distinguished** (or **more excellent**, as E. V. This sense of **διάφορος** is confined to later writers, as Polybius and Plutarch: e. g. Polyb. vi. 23. 7, ἔχει δ' αὕτη (ἡ μάχαιρα) κέντημα διάφορον. So also Symm. in reff. The comparative is found only, besides ref., in Sextus Empir. Phys. i. 218, ὁ δ' Αἰνησίδημος διαφορώτερον ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἔχρητο ταῖς περὶ τῆς γενέσεως ἀπορίαις. For the construction, see below on **παρά**) **name** (to be taken in its proper sense, not understood, with Beza, Calov., al., to mean precedence or dignity; as ver. 5 shews: whence also we get an easy answer to the enquiry, *what name* is intended: viz. that of **υἱός**, in the peculiar and individual sense of the citation there. The angels themselves are called "*sons of God,*" Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7: Dan. iii. 25, and Gen. vi. 2 (notwithstanding Ebrard's denial of this sense: see Delitzsch in loc., Jude 6, note, and Proleg. to Jude, § v. 11); but the argument here is, that the title 'SON OF GOD' is bestowed on Him individually, in a sense in which it never was conferred upon an angel. This view is far more probable than that of Bleek, who thinks that the Writer used only the LXX, in which ἄγγελοι θεοῦ stands in all these places except Gen. vi. 2, and there in the alex. MS. and Philo: and that he interpreted Ps. xxviii. 1; lxxxviii 6, of other than the angels. To say nothing of *à priori* considerations, the canon to be followed in such cases is clearly never to suppose partial knowledge in a sacred writer, except where the nature of the case compels us in common honesty so to do: and here that canon is not applicable. See as a parallel, Phil. ii. 9 ff. Still it must be remembered, as Delitzsch beautifully remarks, that the fulness of glory of the peculiar name of the Son of God is unattainable by human speech or thought: it is, Rev. xix. 12, an ὄνομα ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός. And all the citations and appellations here are but fragmentary indications of portions of its glory: are but beams of light, which are united in it as in a central sun. Der überengelische Name selber, den der auf dem Wege der Geschichte zu Gottes Thron Emporsteigende auf immer zu eigen bekommen, liegt jenseit der begrifflich zersplitternden Sprache der Menschen. Die folgenden Schriftworte sind nur wie aufwärts weisende Fingerzeige, die uns ahnen lassen, wie herrlich er ist. *Since when* has Christ in this sense inherited this name? The answer must not be hastily made, as by some Commentators, that κεκληρονόμηκεν implies the glorification of the humanity of Christ to that Sonship which He before had in virtue of his Deity: e. g. Œc. (altern.): ἡ κληρονομία κυρίως τῶν προσηκόντων γίνεται, ἀλλ' οὐ τῶν ἠλλοτριωμένων· ἐκληρονόμησεν οὖν, ὅπερ ἄνωθεν ἐνῆν τῷ λόγῳ, τοῦτο πανταχόθεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ προληφθεῖσα σάρξ. τί δέ ἐστι τοῦτο; τὸ υἱός,—τὸ λέγεσθαι τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν πατέρα αὐτῆς,—τὸ γεγέννηκά σε. Evidently so partial a reference cannot be considered as exhausting the sense of the Writer. Nor again can we say that it was at the time of His incarnation, though the words of the angel in Luke i. 35, τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ, seem to favour such a reference: for it was especially at His incarnation, that He was made a little *lower than the angels*, ch. ii. 9. Rather would the sense seem to be, that the especial name of SON, belonging to Him not by ascription nor adoption, but by his very Being itself, has been ever, and is now, His: *inherited* by Him, "quâ γνήσιον," as Chrys. says: the O. T. declarations being as it were portions of the instrument by which this inheritance is assured to Him, and by the citation of which it is proved.

[n]Καὶ [o]προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. [7] καὶ

n Psa. xcvi. 7. also Deut. xxxii. 43 Ed-vat. (υἱοὶ θ. AB). o w. dat., Matt. ii. 2, 8, 11. John iv. 21, 23. Rev. iv. 10 al. Ps. xxviii. 2.

Observe, that the κρείττων γενόμενος is not *identical with* the κεκληρονόμηκεν, but *in proportion to* it: the triumphant issue of his Mediation is consonant to the glorious name, which is His by inheritance: but which, in the fulness of its present inconceivable glory (see above), has been put on and taken up by Him in the historical process of his mediatorial humiliation and triumph) **than** (this construction of a comparative with παρά is never found in St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 5, is a somewhat doubtful exception, and ἄλλος παρά occurs 1 Cor. iii. 11), but often in this Epistle; and once in St. Luke (reff.). It occurs in Esdr. iv. 35, ἡ ἀλήθεια . . . . ἰσχυροτέρα παρὰ πάντα: and in Thuc. i. 23: Herod. vii. 103) **they.** 5—13.] *Proof from Scripture of this last declaration.* 5.] **For** (substantiation of διαφορώτερον κεκλ. ὄνομα) **to whom of** (among) **the angels did He** (God, the subject of vv. 1, 2; as the subsequent citation shews) **ever say** (this citation from Ps. ii., has brought up in recent German Commentators the whole question of the original reference of that Psalm, and (as in Bleek) of O. T. citations in the N. T. altogether. These discussions will be found in Bleek, De Wette, and Ebrard. The latter is by far the deepest and most satisfactory: seeing, as he does, the furthest into the truth of the peculiar standing of the Hebrew people, and the Messianic import of the theocracy. Those who entirely or partially deny this latter, seem to me to be without adequate means of discussing the question. Ebrard's view is, that the Psalm belongs to the reign of David. The objection, that ver. 6 will not apply to David's anointing, inasmuch as that took place at Bethlehem in his boyhood, he answers, by regarding that anointing as connected with his establishment on Mount Zion, not as having locally taken place there, but as the first of that series of divine mercies of which that other was the completion. (Even Hupfeld gives up this objection.) He further ascribes the Psalm to that portion of David's reign when (2 Sam. viii.) Hadadezer, and many neighbouring nations, were smitten by him: which victories he looked on as the fulfilment to him of Nathan's prophecy, 2 Sam. vii. 8—17. In that prophecy the offspring of David is mentioned in the very words quoted below in this verse, and in terms which, he contends, will not apply to Solomon, but must be referred to the great promised Seed of David. He regards this triumphant occasion as having been treated by the royal Psalmist as a type and foretaste of the ultimate ideal dominion of the 'Son of David' over the kings of the earth. But I must refer the reader to his long note, which is well worth reading: and to Bleek's, in which are several suggestions, valuable as notices of the way in which the present and the future, the political and Messianic ideas, are intermingled in the Psalms. See also Delitzsch, h. l. Even Hupfeld, who denies Messianic reference wherever he can, is obliged to acknowledge that the Psalm "probably applies to no particular king, but is a glorification of the theocratic kingdom in general, with poetic reference to the universal dominion promised to it:" and confesses, that this is in fact the Messianic idea. He also connects the Psalm with the prophecy in 2 Sam. vii. We may observe, that the connexion here of the two, the triumphant expression of the Psalm, and the prophecy of Nathan, is a strong presumption in favour of Ebrard's view), **Thou** (the seed of David, anointed in God's counsels as king on His holy hill of Sion: see above) **art my Son** (according to the promise presently to be quoted, finding its partial fulfilment in Solomon, but its only entire one in the Son of David who is also the Son of God), **I** (emphatic: 'I and no other:' expressed also in the Hebrew) **this day have begotten thee** (First, what are we to understand by γεγέννηκα? Bleek says, "As Sonship, in the proper sense, is dependent on the act of begetting, so may, especially by the Hebrews, 'to beget' be figuratively used to express the idea of 'making any one a son,' in which derived and figurative reference this also may be meant. And we get an additional confirmation of this meaning from Jer. ii. 27, where it is said of the foolish idolatrous Israelites, τῷ ξύλῳ εἶπαν ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου εἶ σύ, καὶ τῷ λίθῳ Σὺ ἐγέννησάς με. Accordingly, the meaning here is,—'I have made Thee my son' (so Ps. lxxxix. 20, 26, 27: 'I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him: . . . He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father . . . . Also will I make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth'):—namely, by setting Thee on the throne of my people: and the σήμερον will most naturally be referred to the time of the anointing of the King on Zion, as the act whereby he was manifested as Son of God in this sense." And so Calvin, whom Bl. cites, in his comm. on Ps. ii.:

p = Rom. x. 21. Luke xx. 19. q Psa. ciii. 4. r = Matt. xxi. 13. xxiii. 15. John ii. 16. vi. 15 al. Gen. xlv. 9.

ABDK LMPℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

[p] πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει [q] Ὁ [r] ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους

7. aft 1st αγγελους ins αυτου D[1] 71 [æth] Chr$_2$.

"David genitus a Deo fuit, dum clare apparuit ejus electio. Itaque adverbium *hodie* tempus illud demonstrationis notat, quia, postquam innotuit creatum divinitus regem, prodiit tanquam nuper ex Deo genitus." The above remarks seem pertinent and unobjectionable, as long as we regard them as explaining the supposed immediate reference to David and present circumstances: but it is plain that, according to the above view of Ps. ii., and indeed to the usage of the N. T., in applying this passage to our Lord, we want another and a higher sense in which both words, **γεγέννηκα** and **σήμερον**, may be applicable to Him: a sense in which I should be disposed to say that the words must in their fulness of meaning be taken, to the neglect and almost the obliteration of that their supposed lower reference. For, granting the application of such sayings to our Lord, then must the terms of them, suggested by the Holy Spirit of prophecy, which is His testimony, bear adequate interpretations as regards His person and office. It has not therefore been without reason that the Fathers, and so many modern divines, have found in this word **γεγέννηκα** the doctrine of the generation of the Son of God, and have endeavoured, in accordance with such reference, to assign a fitting sense to **σήμερον**. As the subject is exceedingly important, and has been generally passed over slightly by our English expositors, I shall need no apology for gathering from Bleek and Suicer the opinions and testimonies concerning it. 1. One view refers **σήμερον** to the eternal generation of the Son, and regards it as an expression of the "*nunc stans*, as they call it" (Owen) of eternity. Thus Origen very grandly says, in Joann. tom. i. 32, vol. iv. p. 33: *λέγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ᾧ ἀεί ἐστι τὸ σήμερον· οὐκ ἔνι γὰρ ἑσπέρα θεοῦ, ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι, ὅτι οὐδὲ πρωΐα, ἀλλ' ὁ συμπαρεκτείνων τῇ ἀγενήτῳ καὶ ἀϊδίῳ αὐτοῦ ζωῇ, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, χρόνος ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται ὁ υἱός· ἀρχῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ οὕτως οὐχ εὑρισκομένης, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς ἡμέρας.* And so Athanasius (de Decret. Nicæn. Syn. § 13, vol. i. p. 172, adv. Arian. iv. § 24, vol. ii. (Migne) p. 503), Basil (contra Eunom. ii. 24, vol. i. p. 260), Aug. (on the Psalm: "Quanquam etiam possit ille dies in prophetia dictus videri, quo Jesus Christus secundum hominem natus est: tamen *hodie* quia præsentiam significat, atque in æternitate nec præteritum quidquam est, quasi esse desierit, nec futurum, quasi nondum sit, sed præsens tantum: quia quidquid æternum est, semper est: divinitus accipitur secundum id dictum *Ego hodie* genui te, quo sempiternam generationem virtutis et sapientiæ Dei, qui est unigenitus Filius, fides sincerissima et catholica prædicat"), Primasius, Thom. Aq.; of the Commentators on this place, Thl. (*οὐδὲν ἕτερον δηλοῖ ἢ ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐξ οὗ ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὢν λέγεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος καιροῦ, οὗτος γὰρ μάλιστα ἁρμόζει αὐτῷ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ σήμερον*): and so Corn.-a-lap., Est., Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, Schöttg., al. 2. A second, to the generation, *in time*, of the Incarnate Son of Man, when Jesus assumed the divine nature on the side of his *Manhood also*: so Chrys. (curiously enough using the illustration from **ὤν**, which Thl. afterwards, copying verbatim from him, turns to the opposite purpose: *ὥσπερ δὲ ὢν λέγεται κ.τ.λ.* as above under Thl. to *ἁρμόζει αὐτῷ· οὕτω καὶ τὸ σήμερον ἐνταῦθά μοι δοκεῖ εἰς τὴν σάρκα εἰρῆσθαι*), Thdrt. (*οὐ τὴν αἰώνιον δηλοῖ γέννησιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῷ χρόνῳ συνεζευγμένην.* And even more expressly on the Psalm: *ταύτην δὲ τὴν φωνὴν οὐκ ἄν τις τῇ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος διδασκαλίᾳ πειθόμενος, τῇ θεότητι προσάψοι τοῦ δεσπότου χριστοῦ*), Euseb., Cyr.-alex., Greg.-nyss. (see these in Suicer), Œc., Kuinoel, Stuart, &c. 3. A third, to the period when Jesus was manifested to men as the Son of God, i. e. by most, to the time of the Resurrection, with reference to Acts xiii. 33, where St. Paul alleges this citation as thus applying (so, recently, Delitzsch): by some, to that of the Ascension, when He was set at the right hand of God and entered on His heavenly High-priesthood (ch. v. 5): so Hilary (on the Psalm, § 30, vol. i. p. 48, "Id quod nunc in psalmo est, Filius meus es tu, hodie genui te, non ad virginis partum, neque ad lavacri generationem, sed ad primogenitum ex mortuis pertinere apostolica autoritas est:" and again, "Vox ergo hæc Dei patris secundum Apostolum (Acts l. c.) in die resurrectionis exstitit"), Ambrose (de Sacr. iii. 3, vol. iii. p. 362: "Pulchre autem Pater dixit ad Filium: 'Ego hodie genui te,' hoc est, quando redemisti populum, quando ad cœli regnum vocasti, quando implesti voluntatem meam: probasti meum esse te Filium"), Calv. ("Frivola Augustini argutia est, qui *hodie* æternum et continuum fingit. Christus

αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς [s] λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ [t] πυρὸς

s Rom. xiii. 6. xv. 16. Phil. ii. 25. ch. viii. 2 only. Ps. cii. 21. t Acts vii. 30. Rev. i. 14. ii. 18. xix. 12. Isa. xxix. 6. see 2 Thess. i. 8.

πνευμα D 1. 39. 67[2]. 71 [æth].

certe æternus est Dei filius, quia sapientia ejus est ante tempus genita. Sed hoc nihil ad præsentem locum, ubi respectus habetur ad homines, a quibus agnitus fuit Christus pro filio Dei postquam eum Pater manifestavit. Hæc igitur declaratio, cujus etiam Paulus meminit ad Rom. i. 4, species fuit æternæ (ut ita loquar) generationis. Nam arcana illa et interior quæ præcesserat, hominibus fuit incognita, nec in rationem venire poterat, nisi eam Pater visibili revelatione approbasset"), Grot. (the Resurrection is "initium gloriæ Christi"), al.: Schlichting and the Socinians generally, Storr, Sack, Hengstenberg, &c. Owen also takes the same view ("The eternal generation of Christ, on which His filiation or sonship, both name and thing, doth depend, is to be taken only declaratively, and that declaration to be made in His resurrection, and exaltation over all, that ensued thereon"). Of these interpretations, I agree with Bleek that the *first* is that which best agrees with the context. The former verses represent to us the Son of God as standing in this relation to the Father before the worlds: and ver. 6, which plainly forms a contrast to this ver. 5 as to time, treats distinctly of the period of the Incarnation. It is natural then to suppose that this verse is to be referred to a time prior to that event. And he also remarks, that the sense of *σήμερον* thus adopted is by no means foreign to the Alexandrine theology: Philo, de Profugis, § 11, vol. i. p. 554, says, *σήμερον δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἀπέραντος καὶ ἀδιεξίτητος αἰών. μηνῶν γὰρ καὶ ἐνιαυτῶν κ. συνόλως χρόνων περίοδοι δόγματα ἀνθρώπων εἰσὶν ἀριθμὸν ἐκτετιμηκότων, τὸ δὲ ἀψευδὲς ὄνομα αἰῶνος ἡ σήμερον.* And in Leg. Allegor. iii. § 8, vol. i. p. 92, *ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας, τουτέστιν ἀεί. ὁ γὰρ αἰὼν ἅπας τῷ σήμερον παραμετρεῖται· μέτρον γὰρ τοῦ παντὸς χρόνου ὁ ἡμέριος κύκλος*)? **and again** (how is the ellipsis here to be supplied? Probably, *καὶ* (*τίνι εἶπεν ποτὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων*) *πάλιν*: or perhaps *πάλιν* (see below on ver. 6) merely serves to introduce a fresh citation), **I will be to him as** ('for:' so the LXX often for the Heb. הָיָה לְ: e. g. in the citation, ch. viii. 10. The more ordinary Greek construction would be as in Levit. xxvi. 12, *κ. ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαός*) **a father, and he shall be to me as (for) a son** (the citation is from the LXX, as usual. It occurs in the prophecy of Nathan to David, respecting David's offspring who should come after him. The import of it has been above considered, and its connexion with Ps. ii. shewn to be probable. The direct primary reference of the words to Solomon, 1 Chron. xxii. 7—10, does not in any way preclude the view which I have there taken of their finding their higher and only worthy fulfilment in the greater Son of David, who should build the only temple in which God would really dwell. See Bleek in loc., who fully recognizes this further and Messianic reference)?

6.] **But** (*δέ*, because a further proof, and a more decisive one as regards the angels, is about to be adduced) **when He again** (or, '*when again He*'? Does *πάλιν* introduce a new citation, or does it belong to *εἰσαγάγῃ*, and denote a new and second introduction? This latter view is taken by many, principally the ancient expositors, Chrys., Thl., (not Thdrt. appy.,) Ambr., Œc., Anselm, Thos. Aquin., &c., and lately by Tholuck, De Wette, Lünemann, and Delitzsch,—interpreting the 'second introduction' diversely: some, as His incarnation, contrasted with His everlasting generation, or His creating of the world, which they treat as His first introduction: so Primasius, al.: others (Wittich, Surenhus., Peirce, al.), as His resurrection, contrasted with His incarnation: others (Greg.-nyss. contra Eunom. ii. vol. ii. p. 504 ed. Migne, Corn.-a-lap., Camerar., Gerhard, Calmet, Estius, Mede, Tholuck, De Wette, Lünemann, Delitzsch, Hofmann, in his Schriftbeweis, i. p. 151, al.), to His second coming, as contrasted with His first. The other view supposes a transposition of the adverb *πάλιν*, = *πάλιν δέ, ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ*. And this is taken by the Syr., Erasm., Luth., Calv., Beza, Cappellus, Schlichting, Grot., Hammond, Owen, Bengel, Wolf, Kuin., al. Bleek discusses the question, and adopts this meaning: Ebrard sets it down as certain, and congratulates himself on being "spared the fruitless trouble of deciding which are the two introductions." But I think we shall find the matter not quite so clear, nor so easily to be dismissed. The two passages of Philo adduced by Bleek (after Carpzov) for the transposition of *πάλιν*, do not touch the present construction. They are, *ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδιδράσκων θεόν. . . . φησιν*, Leg. Alleg. iii. 9, vol. i. p. 93: and *ἡ δὲ πάλιν θεὸν ἀποδοκιμάζουσα κ.τ.λ.* ib. Now in both of these, as Lünemann has pointed out, the con-

u as above (t). Luke xvi. 24 only. Isa. xxx. 30.

[tu] *φλόγα.* [8] *πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν* [v] *Ὁ θρόνος σου* [w] *ὁ θεὸς εἰς*

ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

v Psa. xliv. 6 (B εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος, but A ἀδικίαν). w = voc., Matt. xxvii. 29. Mark ix. 25. Luke viii. 54. xii. 32. xviii. 11, 13 al. Winer, § 29. 2.

trary suppositions have preceded: *ὁ δὲ νοῦν τὸν ἴδιον ἀπολείπων . . . ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδιδρ. κ.τ.λ.*: *ἡ μὲν γὰρ τὸν ἐπὶ μέρους, τὸν γεννητὸν κ. θνητὸν ἀπολιποῦσα . . . . ἡ δὲ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.*: and consequently in both, *πάλιν* has the meaning of *e contra*, and necessarily stands after the subject of the sentence, as *δέ* would: and as we find it repeatedly in Plato, e. g. Gorg. § 83, *νῦν δὲ πάλιν αὖθις* (or *αὐτὸς*) *ταὐτὸν τοῦτο ἔπαθε*: Laches, § 22, *νῦν δ' αὖ πάλιν φαμὲν κ.τ.λ.*: Rep. x. § 11, *ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν κεκριμέναι εἰσίν, ἐγὼ πάλιν ἀπαιτῶ κ.τ.λ.* Now manifestly no such meaning can here have place (notwithstanding that Storr and Wahl so give it): nor can I find any analogous instance in prose of a transposition of *πάλιν* in its ordinary sense. In this Epistle, when it is joined to a verb, it always has the sense of '*a second time*:' e. g. ch. iv. 7; v. 12; vi. 1, 6. This being the case, I must agree with those who join *πάλιν* with *εἰσαγάγῃ*. And of the meanings which they assign to the phrase *πάλιν εἰσαγ.*, I conceive the only allowable one to be, the second coming of our Lord to judgment. See more below) **hath** ('shall have:' this rendering, the 'futurus exactus,' is required by grammar: cf. the same verb in Exod. xiii. 5, 11, *καὶ ἔσται ἡνίκα ἐὰν* (*ὡς ἂν*) *εἰσαγάγῃ σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν Χαναναίων κ.τ.λ.*: Luke xvii. 10, *ὅταν ποιήσητε πάντα . . λέγετε*, "when ye shall have done," &c.: Matt. xxi. 40, *ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος . . , τί ποιήσει;* See numerous other instances cited in Winer, § 42. 5. It would certainly appear from all usage that the *present* rendering is quite inadmissible) **introduced** (in what sense? See some of the interpretations above. But even those who hold the trajection of *πάλιν* are not agreed as to the introduction here referred to. Some hold one of the above-mentioned meanings, some another. I have discussed the meaning fully below, and gathered that the word can only refer to the great entering of the Messiah on His kingdom. At present, the usage of *εἰσάγειν* must be considered. It is the 'verbum solenne' for the 'introducing' the children of Israel into the land of promise, the putting them into possession of their promised inheritance: see Exod. above, and indeed Exod., Levit., Num., Deut., passim: also Ps. lxxvii. 54. It is sometimes used *absolutely* in this sense: e. g. Exod. xxiii. 23, *εἰσάξει σε πρὸς τὸν Ἀμοῤῥαῖον κ. Χετταῖον κ.τ.λ.* We have it again in Neh. i. 9, of the second introduction, or restoration of Israel to the promised land. The Prophets again use it of the ultimate restoration of Israel: cf. Isa. xiv. 2; lvi. 7: Jer. iii. 14: Ezek. xxxiv. 13; xxxvi. 24; xxxvii. 21: Zech. viii. 8. This fact, connected with the circumstances to be noted below, makes it probable that the word here also has this solemn sense of 'putting in possession of,' as of an inheritance. The sense ordinarily given, of 'bringing into the world,' the act of the Father corresponding to the *εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον* (ch. x. 5) of the Son, appears to be unexampled. Estius remarks, "Juxta hunc sensum (that given above) magis apparet *ἐνέργεια* vocis '*introducere*:' quatenus ea significatur id quod jurisperiti vocant *inducere* seu *mittere in possessionem*") **the firstborn** (only here is the Son of God so called absolutely. It is His title by præ-existence, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15 (where see the word itself discussed): — by prophecy, Ps. lxxxviii. 27, *πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν, ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τῆς γῆς*:—by birth, Luke ii. 7, see also Matt. i. 18—25:—by victory over death, Col. i. 18, *πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*: Rev. i. 5: —and here, where he is absolutely *ὁ πρωτότοκος*, it will be reasonable to regard all these references as being accumulated—Him, who is *the Firstborn*,—of the universe, of the new manhood, of the risen dead. And thus the inducting Him in glory into His inheritance is clothed with even more solemnity. All angels, all men, are but the younger sons of God, compared to HIM, THE FIRSTBORN) **into the earth** (not = *κόσμον*, ch. x. 5: the 'inhabited earth:' and very frequently used by the LXX in prophetic passages, where the future judgments of God on mankind are spoken of. Cf. Ps. ix. 8; xcv. 13: Isa. x. 23; xiii. 5, 9; xiv. 26; xxiv. 1 al. fr., and see below on the citation. The usage would not indeed be decisive against referring the words to Christ's entrance into the human nature, but is much more naturally satisfied by the other interpretation), **He** (i. e. God, the subject of ver. 5) **saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him**— (there are two places from which these words might come; and the comparison of the two will be very instructive as to the connexion and citation of prophecy. 1. The words themselves, including the *καί*, which has no independent meaning here, come from Deut. xxxii. 43, where they conclude the dying song of Moses with a triumphant description of the victory of

τὸν [x] αἰῶνα τοῦ [x] αἰῶνος, καὶ ἡ [y] ῥάβδος [z] εὐθύτητος ἡ

x sing., here only. Ps. lxxxii. 17 al. see Eph. iii. 21. plur., ch. xiii. 21 al. fr. y 1 Cor. iv. 21. Rev. ii. 27 al. fr. Ps. ii. 9. z here only. — Josh. xxiv. 14. Ps. ix. 8. xxv. 12 al. fr.

8. om *του αιωνος* B 17. rec om *και* (*see note, so* LXX), with D^3KL[P] rel vulg-ed(with fuld demid) syrr [æth] Chr Cyr_2 Thdrt Damasc $Chron_1$ [Euthal-ms]: ins AB D^1Mℵ 17 am(with tol) [copt Cyr_1]. rec om *η* (bef 1st *ραβδος*) (*as* LXX), with DKL[P] rel gr-lat-ff: ins ABMℵ 17 Cyr_1. (om from *ραβδ.* to *ραβδ.* ℵ[1].) ins *της*

God over His enemies, and the avenging of His people. It will cause the intelligent student of Scripture no surprise to find such words cited directly of Christ, into whose hand all judgment is committed: however such Commentators as Stuart and De Wette may reject the idea of the citation being from thence, because no trace of a Messianic reference is there found. One would have imagined that the words *οὔτε ἔστιν ὃς ἐξελεῖται ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου*, occurring just before, ver. 39 (cf. John x. 28), would have prevented such an assertion. But those who see not Christ every where in the Old Testament, see Him no where. The fact of the usual literal citation of the LXX by our Writer, decides the point as far as the place is concerned from which the words are immediately taken. But here a difficulty arises. The words in the LXX, Deut. xxxii. 43, *εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*, do not exist in our present Hebrew text. It is hardly however probable, that they are an insertion of the LXX, found as they are (with one variation presently to be noticed) in nearly all the MSS. The translators probably found them in their Heb. text, which, especially in the Pentateuch, appears to have been an older and purer recension than that which we now possess. It is true that AB have here *υἱοὶ θεοῦ*, and in the third clause of the verse *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*: while the Ed-vat. reads as here. But our Writer cites from the Alexandrine text: and it has been noticed that the Alexandrine MS. itself in a second copy of this song, subjoined to the Psalter, reads *ἄγγελοι*, only prefixing to it *οἱ*. And Justin Martyr, Dial. 130, p. 222, quotes the words as here. 2. The other passage from which they might come is Ps. xcvi. 7, where however they do not occur verbatim, but we read *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*. This, especially the omission of the *καί*, which clearly belongs to the citation, is against the supposition of their being taken from thence: but it does not therefore follow that the Psalm was not in the sacred Writer's mind, or does not apply to the same glorious period of Messiah's triumph in its ultimate reference. Indeed the similarity of the two expressions of triumph is remarkable, and the words in the Psalm must be treated as a reference to those in Deut. at least in the LXX rendering, for the Heb. seems rather (as Delitzsch in loc.) to regard the gods of the heathen nations ("Worship Him, all ye gods"). As a corroboration of the view, that the Psalm was in the Writer's mind, it may be mentioned, that in introducing the description of the divine Majesty in ver. 4, we read *ἔφαναν αἱ ἀστραπαὶ αὐτοῦ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*. Ebrard denies the reference to the Psalm, but has some valuable remarks on the Messianic import of the passage in Deut. See also the whole subject and context of it set forth in Delitzsch.

προσκυνέω classically governs the accus. Some exceptions are found in which it has a dat., e. g. Hippocrates, Præcept. i. p. 29, *κακοτροπίῃ προσκυνεῦντες*: and more among the later authors, and in Philo and Josephus. See Bernhardy, Synt. p. 113 and 266, and Kypke on Matt. ii. 8).

7.] **And (with reference) indeed to** (*πρός* as in reff.: but not exactly correspondent in the two cases *πρὸς τ. ἀγγέλους* and *πρὸς τὸν υἱόν*: the fact being, as Bl., that *πρός* with a person, after *λέγειν* and similar verbs, implies direction of the saying towards the person, usually by direct address, but sometimes by indirect reference. So Bengel here: "Ad angelos indirecto sermone, ad filium directo sermone:" *μέν*, corresponding to *δέ* below) **the angels He** (God) **saith, Who maketh his angels winds** (see below) **and his ministers a flame of fire** (the citation is after the LXX according to the Alexandrine MS., which indeed commonly agrees with the citations in this Epistle. And as the words stand in the Greek, the arrangement and rendering of them is unquestionably as above (see this argued below). But here comes in no small difficulty as to the sense of the original Hebrew. It stands thus: after stating, vv. 2, 3, that God takes light for His raiment, and the heavens for a tent, and the clouds for a chariot, we read, עֹשֶׂה מַלְאָכָיו רוּחוֹת מְשָׁרְתָיו אֵשׁ לֹהֵט, ver. 4. And it is usually contended that these words can only mean, from the context, "who maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire his servants." But, granting that this is so, the argument from the context can only be brought in as sub-

[y] *ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλειας σου·* [9] *ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ* ABDK LMPℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

bef *ευθυτ.*, and om *η* (bef 2nd *ραβδος*) ABM ℵ-corr[1] 17[from the space] Cyr$_1$: txt DK L[l'] rel gr-lat-ff. for *σου, αυτου* Bℵ.

sidiary to that from the construction of the passage. And it will be observed that in this verse the order of the Hebrew words is not the same as that in the former verses, where we have הַשָּׂם עָבִים רְכוּבוֹ, "who maketh clouds his chariots." For this transposition those who insist as above have given no reason: and I cannot doubt that the LXX have taken the right view of the construction: that מַלְאָכָיו is the object, and רוּחוֹת the predicate, and so in the other clause: and that the sense is, "who maketh his messengers winds, his servants flames of fire," whatever these words may be intended to import. And this latter enquiry will I imagine be not very difficult to answer. He makes his messengers winds, i. e. He causes his messengers to act in or by means of the winds; his servants flames of fire, i. e. commissions them to assume the agency or form of flames for His purposes. It seems to me that this, the plain sense of the Hebrew as it stands, is quite as agreeable to the context as the other. And thus the Rabbis took it, as we see by the citations in Schöttgen and Wetstein. So Schemoth Rabba, § 25, fol. 123. 3: "Deus dicitur Deus Zebaoth, quia cum angelis suis facit quæcumque vult. Quando vult, facit ipsos sedentes, Jud. vi. 11. Aliquando facit ipsos stantes, Isa. vi. 2. Aliquando facit similes mulieribus, Zech. v. 9. Aliquando viris, Gen. xviii. 2. Aliquando facit ipsos spiritus, Ps. civ. 4. Aliquando ignem, ib.:" and many other Rabbinical testimonies. The construction maintained above is also defended by Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. p. 283, and proved to be the only admissible one by Delitzsch, whose commentary has been published since this note was written. The only accommodation of the original passage made by the Writer, is the very slight one of applying the general terms "His messengers" and "His servants" to the angels, which indeed can be their only meaning. And this I should be bold to maintain, even though it be against Calvin ("Locus quem citat, videtur in alienum sensum trahi . . . nihil certius est quam hic fieri mentionem ventorum quos dicit a Domino fieri nuntios . . . nihil hoc ad angelos pertinet"), Kuinoel ("Verum enimvero Psalmi l. l., de angelis, tanquam personis, sermo esse non potest"), De Wette (on the Psalm: Sinn: er bedient sich der Winde u. Feuerflammen als seine Werkzeuge: von Engeln als himmlischen Wesen ist hier gar nicht die Rede), Bleek, Ebrard, Lünemann, al. See the whole literature of the passage in the three last. Singularly enough, the ancient Commentators confine their attention to the part. *ποιῶν*, and seem simply to have taken the accusatives as epithets in apposition: e. g. Chrys.: *ἰδού, ἡ μεγίστη διαφορά· ὅτι οἱ μὲν κτιστοί, ὁ δὲ ἄκτιστος· κ. διὰ τί πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ φησιν· ὁ ποιῶν, πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν, διὰ τί οὐκ εἶπεν, ὁ ποιῶν;* Similarly Thl. and Thdrt. (on the Psalm also). The sense of the words I have endeavoured to give in some measure above. It is evident that *πνεύματα* must be rendered winds, not "*spirits*:" from both the context in the Psalm and the correspondence of the two clauses, and also from the nature of the subject. *πάντες εἰσὶν πνεύματα*, as asserted below, ver. 14: therefore it could not with any meaning be said, that He *maketh them* spirits): but to (that this *πρός* is used of direct address, and not, as Delitzsch, al., of indirect reference, is manifest by *ὁ θρόνος σου* following: see also above. The difficulty mentioned by Ebrard, that thus we shall have the Writer implying that Ps. xlv. is a direct address to the Son of God, is not obviated by the indirect understanding of *πρός*, but is inherent in the citation itself, however the preposition is rendered) **the Son,—Thy throne, O God** (**ὁ θεός** is probably vocative: both here and in the Hebrew: and is so taken even by modern Unitarians (see Yates, Vindication of Unitarianism, p. 183, and notes), who seek their refuge by explaining away *θεός*. To suppose the words a parenthetical exclamation to God, or the meaning "Thy God-like Throne," or "Thy throne of God" (see De W. in Psal.), i. e. 'the throne of Thy God,' seems forcing them from their ordinary construction. The rendering of Grot., adopted by some modern Socinians, "Thy throne is God for ever and ever," is not touched by any of the principal Commentators on the Psalm, and seems repugnant to the decorum (for Ps. lxxii. 26, *ἡ μερίς μου ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, is no case in point, the idea being wholly different) and spirit of the passage. I need hardly adduce instances of *ὁ* with a nom. as a form of the vocative: they will be found in the reff.) (**is**) **for ever and ever** (see Ps. ciii. 5; cx. 3, 8, 10; and fuller still ix. 5, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κ. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*); **and** (see var. readd.

Hofmann, Schriftbeweis i. 148, maintains that this **καί**, splitting as it does the

ἐμίσησας [a] ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο [b] ἔχρισέν σε ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός

a opposed to δικ., 2 Cor. vi. 14. b Luke iv. 18, from Isa. lxi. 1. Acts iv. 27. x. 38. 2 Cor. i. 21 only.

9. ανομιας D^1: αδικιαν Aℵ 17 Eus Chr_1-mss Cyr_1 $Chron_1$, so also A Eus_2 Ath_1(in

citation into two, is intended by the Writer to mark off the former portion as addressed to Jehovah, and the latter only to the King, as indicated by ὁ θεός σου. But, as Delitzsch well replies, he would thus be cutting asunder the thread of his own argument, which depends on the address to the Son as ὁ θεός, as exalting Him above the angels) **the rod** (i. e. sceptre: see especially Esth. iv. 11: Judg. v. 14 (see Bertheau in loc.): Amos i. 5 (this latter in Heb. and E. V., not in LXX), where the same Heb. word שֵׁבֶט occurs) **of thy kingdom is the rod of straightness** (i. e. righteousness, justice: see reff. to LXX. Notice that the position of ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς εὐθύτητος in all probability, according to usage, points it out as the *predicate;* and the other, ἡ ῥ. τ. β. σου, is the subject). **Thou lovedst** (the Writer refers the words to the whole life of our Lord on earth, as a past period) **righteousness, and hatedst lawlessness** (in Aℵ &c. (see var. readd.) and in LXX-A, **iniquity**: which is therefore very probably the right reading, but is hardly strongly enough attested): **for this cause** (as διό, Phil. ii. 9: because of His love of righteousness and hatred of lawlessness, shewn by his blameless life and perfect obedience on earth. Some take διὰ τοῦτο here, and עַל־כֵּן in the Psalm, as introducing not the consequence, but the *reason* of what has preceded: so Aug. Enarr. in Ps. xliv. § 19, vol. iv. pt. i., "Propterea unxit te, ut diligeres justitiam, et odires iniquitatem:" Thos. Aq., Schöttgen, al. In ver. 2 of the same Ps. the same ambiguity occurs: and there Bl. pronounces the sense to be decidedly "*because*" and not "*therefore,*" which latter however the E. V. has, and De W. without remark: and so also Aug. But the sense in both places seems decidedly '*therefore,*' and not '*because:*' the eternal blessing of ver. 2, and the anointing with the oil of gladness here, being much more naturally results of the inherent beauty and merit of the high Person addressed, than means whereby these are conferred) **God, thy God** (many Commentators of eminence, both ancient and modern, maintain that the first ὁ θεός here is as before, vocative. Some of them use the strongest language on the point: e. g. Aug. on the Psalm,—with regard to the *Greek:* "O tu Deus, unxit te Deus tuus. Deus unguitur a Deo. Etenim in Latino putatur idem casus nominis repetitus: in Græco autem evidentissima distinctio est, quia unum nomen est quod compellatur et alterum ab eo qui compellat, unxit te Deus. O tu Deus, unxit te Deus tuus: quomodo si diceret, Propterea unxit te o tu Deus, Deus tuus. Sic accipite, sic intelligite, sic in Græco evidentissimum est." And it is also assumed by Thl. (ὅτι δὲ τὸ Ὁ θεός, ἀντὶ τοῦ Ὦ θεέ ἐστι, μάρτυς ἀξιόπιστος ὁ ἐχθρὸς Σύμμαχος, ἐκδοὺς οὕτω· Διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε, θεέ, ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον χαρᾶς παρὰ ἑταίρους σου), Ps-Anselm ("Sicut et in Hebræo et Græco patet, primum nomen Dei vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo"), Wolf, Bengel, Kuinoel, De Wette, Bleek, Lünemann, Stier, Ebrard, &c. The last goes so far as to say that the Heb. will not bear the construction of the two nominatives in apposition: "It is impossible that אֱלֹהֶיךָ can be in apposition with אֱלֹהִים: even in a vocative address, such a juxtaposition would be foreign to the spirit of Hebrew idiom: certainly here in a nominative sentence, or connexion of *subjects*, such a redundance would be the more out of place, that an emphasis of this kind would be entirely aimless and uncalled for." But against such a dictum I may set the simple fact that, in a *vocative* sentence, the apposition does occur in Ps. xliii. 4 (xlii. LXX), both in the Heb. and in the Gr.—אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהָי, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου, "O God, my God:" and in a nominative sentence again, with the very same words as here, in Ps. l. (xlix.) 7, אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֶיךָ אָנֹכִי, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, "I am God, (even) thy God." See also Ps. lxvii. (lxvi.) 7, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, "God, (even) our God." So that I confess I am unable to see the necessity of interpreting either the Hebrew or the Greek in the way proposed. I take both as giving two nominatives in apposition, 'God, thy God.' And so Origen appears to have taken it, Contra Cels. vi. § 79, vol. i. 692, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισε καὶ αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως (Chrys. and Thdrt. do not touch it), Grot., Estius (Calvin does not touch it), Owen, al. Delitzsch leaves it undecided, conceding that the vocative acceptation is inconsistent with the usage of the "Elohimpsalmen," but balancing this by the consideration that the sense would be consistent with the usage of references to the Messiah, as Isa. ix. 5; xi. 2) **anointed thee** (*how*? and *when?* We must distinguish this anointing from the ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι

σου [c] ἔλαιον [d] ἀγαλλιάσεως [e] παρὰ τοὺς [f] μετόχους σου.

ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

c Mark vi. 13. James iv. 14 al. Deut. xxviii. 40. 4 Kings iv. 2. constr., Amos vi. 6 al. Winer, § 32. 4. d Luke i. 14, 44. Acts ii. 46. Jude 24 only. Ps. lxiv. 12. e = ver. 4. f Heb. (ch. iii. 1, 14. vi. 4. xii. 8) only, exc. Luke v. 7. Eccl. iv. 10. (-χή, 2 Cor. vi. 14.)

Ps xlv. 7). for ελαιον, ελεον (*itacism*) B[1]L, ελεος D[1].

ἁγίῳ κ. δυνάμει of Acts x. 38, and the ἔχρισέν με of Isa. lxi. 1. For it is a consequent upon the righteous course of the Son of God in his Humanity, and therefore belongs to his triumph, in which He is exalted above his μέτοχοι (see below). Again the '*oil of gladness*' below seems rather to point to a festive and triumphant, than to an inaugurative unction. We should therefore rather take the allusion to be, as in Ps. xxiii. 5; xcii. 10, to the custom of anointing guests at feasts: so that, as the King in the Psalm is anointed with the oil of rejoicing above his fellows, because of his having loved righteousness and hated iniquity, so Christ, in the jubilant celebration of His finished course at his exaltation in heaven, is anointed with the festive oil παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους αὐτοῦ (see below). There is of course an allusion also in **ἔχρισεν** to the honoured and triumphant Name χριστός) **with** (χρίω is found with a double accus. in the N. T. and LXX (reff.); usually elsewhere with a dative. But, as Bl. remarks, the construction is in accordance with Greek idiomatic usage. He compares Aristoph. Acharn. 114, ἵνα μή σε βάψω βάμμα Σαρδιανικόν: Pind. Isthm. vi. 18, πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἁγνὸν ὕδωρ) **oil of rejoicing** (see above: oil indicative of joy, as it is of superabundance: cf. Isa. lxi. 3) **beyond thy fellows** (i. e. in the Psalm, "other kings," as De W., Ebrard, al.: hardly "brothers by kin" (other sons of David), as Grot., al. But to whom does *the Writer* apply the words? Chrys. says, τίνες δέ εἰσιν οἱ μέτοχοι, ἀλλ' ἢ οἱ ἄνθρωποι; τουτέστι, τὸ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου ἔλαβεν ὁ χριστός: Thdrt., μέτοχοι δὲ ἡμεῖς καὶ κοινωνοὶ οὐ τῆς θεότητος, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος: and so Bengel, citing ὡραῖος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ver. 2 (3) of this Psalm. Thdrt. on the Psalm (Bl.), Calvin ("Nos sibi adoptavit consortes"), Beza, al., think of believers, the adopted into God's family: Wittich, Braun, Cramer (in Bl.), of the high-priests, prophets, and kings, in the O. T., anointed as types of Christ: Klee, of *all creatures:* Kuinoel and Ebrard, as in the Psalm, of *other kings*. Camero says, "μετόχους in officio nullos, in natura humana omnes homines, in gratia omnes fideles habet Christus." Still we may answer to all these, that they do not in any way satisfy the requirements of the context. Were it the intent of the Writer to shew Christ's superiority over his human brethren of *every kind*, we might accept one or other of these meanings: but as this is not his design, but to shew His superiority to the angels, we must I think take **μετόχους** as representing other heavenly beings, partakers in the same glorious and sinless state with Himself, though not in the strict sense, His 'fellows.' De Wette objects to this sense, that the Writer places the angels far beneath Christ: Delitzsch, that the angels are not *anointed*, whereas there is no necessity in the text for understanding that the μέτοχοι are also anointed: the **παρά** may consist in the very fact of the anointing itself:—and Ebrard, speaking as usual strongly, says that "neither the Psalmist, nor our author if in his senses, could have applied the word to the angels." But this need not frighten us: and we may well answer with Lünemann, "1. that the general comparison here being that of Christ with the angels, the fresh introduction of this point of comparison in ver. 9 cannot of itself appear inappropriate. 2. Granted, that just before, in ver. 7, the angels are placed far beneath Christ,—we have this very inferiority here marked distinctly by παρά. 3. The angels are *next* to Christ in rank, by the whole course of this argument: to whom then would the Writer more naturally apply the term μέτοχοι, than to them?" I may add, 4. that the comparison here is but analogous to that in ver. 4, of which indeed it is an expansion: and, 5. that thus only can the figure of anointing at a triumphant festival be carried out consistently: that triumph having taken place on the exaltation of the Redeemer to the Father's right hand and throne (ver. 8), when, the whole of the heavenly company, His μέτοχοι in glory and joy, being anointed with the oil of gladness, His share and dignity was so much greater than theirs. This meaning is held by Peirce, Olshausen, Bleek, Lünemann. Some, as Grot., Limborch, Böhme, Owen, join the interpretations—"angels and men." Certainly, if the former, then the latter; but these are not present in the figure here used). It remains that we should consider the general import, and application here, of Ps. xlv. From what is elsewhere found in this commentary, it will not be for a moment supposed that I can give in to the view of such writers as De Wette and Hupfeld, who maintain that it was simply an ode to some king, uncer-

[10] καὶ [g] Σὺ [h] κατ' [h] ἀρχάς, κύριε, τὴν γῆν [i] ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί· [11] αὐτοὶ [k] ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ [l] διαμένεις· καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον [m] πα-

g Psa. ci. 25—27. h here only. Ps. cxviii. 152. i Matt. vii. 25. (Luke vii. 48 v. r.). Eph. iii. 18. Col. i. 23. 1 Pet. v. 10 only. Ps. xxiii. 2. lxxvii. 69, &c. k 1 Pet. i. 7 reff. l Luke i. 22. xxii. 28. Gal. ii. 5. 2 Pet. iii. 4 only. Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 14. m Luke xii. 33. ch. viii. 13 bis only. Deut. xxix. 5. Josh. ix. 13. Neh. ix. 21. Job xiii. 28.

11. διαμενεῖς D[3]M 67[2] latt: txt (elder MSS uncert, having no accents) L.

tain whom, and has no further reference whatever. Granting that in its first meaning it was addressed to Solomon (for to him the circumstances introduced seem best to apply, e. g. the palace of ivory, ver. 9, cf. 1 Kings x. 18: the gold from Ophir, ver. 10, cf. 1 Kings ix. 28: the daughter of Tyre with her gift, ver. 13, cf. 2 Chron. ii. 3—16),—or even, with Delitzsch, to Joram, on his marriage with the Tyrian Athaliah,—we must yet apply to it that manifest principle, without which every Hebrew ode is both unintelligible and preposterous, that the theocratic idea filled the mind of the Writer and prompted his pen: and that the Spirit of God used him as the means of testifying to that King, who stood veritably at the head of the theocracy in the divine counsels. Thus considered, such applications as this lose all their difficulty; and we cease to feel ourselves obliged in every case to enquire to whom and on what occasion the Psalm was probably first addressed. And even descending to the low and mere rationalistic ground taken by De Wette and Hupfeld, we are at least safer than they are, holding as we do a meaning in which both Jews and Christians have so long concurred, as against the infinite diversity of occasion and reference which divides their opinions of the Psalm.

10.] **And** (πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν λέγει: see a similar καί introducing a new citation in Acts i. 20. The comma, or colon, or capital letter, as in text, should be retained after καί),—**Thou in the beginning** (Heb. לְפָנִים, *ad faciem, antea;* probably here rendered κατ' ἀρχάς by the LXX with reference to Gen. i. 1. The expression is found in Philo, and often in the classics: cf. Herod. iii. 153, 159, and instances in Wetst.; and see Kühner, Gr. Gr. § 607. 1), **Lord** (κύριε has no word to represent it in the Hebrew. But it is taken up from אֵלִי in ver. 25; and indeed from the whole strain of address, in which יְהוָה has been thrice expressed—in vv. 1, 12, 15. The order of the words in this clause is somewhat different in our text from that of the LXX in either of the great MSS.; B having κατ' ἀρχὰς τὴν γῆν, σύ, κύριε, A κατ' ἀρχὰς σύ, κύριε, τὴν γῆν, and ℵ omitting σὺ κύριε. The transposition has apparently been made from the alex. text, and for the sake of throwing the κύριε into emphasis. On the bearing and interpretation of the Psalm, see below), **foundedst** ("A primis fundamentis terram fecisti, et simul eam firmam et stabilem fundasti." Corn.-a-lap., in Bleek, who remarks that the verb יָסַד, θεμελιόω, is not so usual of the heavens, as of the earth. Still in Ps. viii. 3, we have the Greek verb ἐθεμελίωσας, applied to the heavens: but the Heb. is כּוֹנַנְתָּה) **the earth, and the heavens** ("Nil obstat," says Bengel, "quominus sub *cœlis* angeli innuantur, quemadmodum creatio hominis innuitur sub *terra* prætereunte." The same thought is implied in Theodoret's διὰ γὰρ οὐρανοῦ κ. γῆς πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς περιέλαβεν. Still, I would rather view the citation as made in proof of the eternal and unchangeable power and majesty of the Son, than as implicitly referred to the angels by the word οὐρανοί. And so most Commentators. The plur. οὐρανοί, representing the Heb. שָׁמַיִם, evidently includes in the Greek also the idea of plurality: see Eph. iv. 10: 2 Cor. xii. 2) **are works of thine hands** (see Ps. viii. 3. Bl. mentions an opinion of Heinrichs that the ἔργα τῶν χειρ. alludes to textile work, the heavens being considered as a *veil* spread out. But there does not seem sufficient warrant for this).

11.] **They** (seems most naturally to refer to οἱ οὐρανοί immediately preceding. There is no reason in the Psalm why the pronoun should not represent both antecedents, the heavens and the earth. Here, however, the subsequent context seems to determine the application to be only to the heavens: for to them only can be referred the following image, ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἑλίξεις αὐτούς) **shall perish** (as far as concerns their present state, cf. ἀλλαγήσονται below. ἐδήλωσε καὶ τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον μεταβολὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γεννησομένην, αὐτοῦ δὲ τὸ ἄναρχον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον. Thdrt. On this change, see the opinions of the Fathers in Suicer, vol. ii. pp. 151-2, 365, and 520 B), **but thou remainest** (Bleek prefers the fut. διαμενεῖς, see var. readd., on the ground of the verbs being all future in the Heb. text. But perhaps the consideration alleged by Lünemann, that the Writer, using only the LXX, seems to place σὺ δὲ διαμένεις and σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ as parallel clauses, is of more weight than the other. De Wette, on the Ps., renders the Hebrew

λαιωθήσονται, [12] καὶ ὡσεὶ [n] περιβόλαιον [o] ἑλίξεις αὐτοὺς καὶ [p] ἀλλαγήσονται, σὺ δὲ [q] ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ [r] ἐκλείψουσιν. [13] πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων [s] εἴρηκέν [t] ποτε [u] Κάθου [v] ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς

ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

n 1 Cor. xi. 15 only. Job xxvi. 6. Ps. ciii. 6.
o Rev. vi. 14 only. l. c. (see note.) Job xviii. 8. Isa. xxxiv. 4 only.
p Acts vi. 14. Rom. i. 23. 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52. Gal. iv. 20 only. Lev. xxvii. 23.
q = ch. xiii. 8.
r Luke xvi. 9. xxii. 32 only. Jer. vii. 28.
s Acts xiii. 34. 2 Cor. xii. 9. ch. iv. 3, 4, 7. x. 9, 15.
t ver. 5.
u Psa. cix. 1. Matt. xxii. 44 ||. Acts ii. 34. see 1 Cor. xv. 25.
v Matt. xx. 21, 23. xxv. 33, 34. Mark xvi. 19 al. 3 Kings ii. 19. Ps. xv. 8 al.

12. for *ωσει*, *ως* D[1] Damasc. for *ελιξεις*, *αλλαξεις* D[1]ℵ[1] 43 latt(not fuld harl[1]) Tert[from Ps, so also Bas$_1$ Iren-int$_1$ Orig-int$_1$]. aft *αυτους* ins *ως ιματιον* (*gloss? explaining ωσει περιβ.*) ABD[1]ℵ fuld æth arm: om D[3]KLM[P] rel [vulg(with am demid al) syrr copt] ff. aft *δε* ins *και* ℵ[1](marked with dots *eadem manu*).

verbs *present*: Dieselben vergehen, doch du bestehest. διαμένω, as in reff. and Ps. cxviii. 90, ἐθεμελίωσας τὴν γῆν καὶ διαμένει. The preposition gives the sense of endurance through all changes): **and they all shall wax old as a garment** (see besides reff. Isa. li. 6, ἡ δὲ γῆ ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεται: ib. l. 9; and Sir. xiv. 17, πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιοῦται), **and as a mantle** (περιβόλαιον (reff.) is a word of unusual occurrence, found principally in the later classics; but also in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 549, θανάτου περιβόλαι' ἀνήμμεθα, and 1269, σαρκὸς περιβόλαια ἡβῶντα. It, as περιβολή, Gen. xlix. 11, signifies any enveloping, enwrapping garment) **shalt thou fold them up** (the Heb. here and apparently some copies of the LXX have the same verb as below: תַּחֲלִיפֵם וְיַחֲלֹפוּ,—ἀλλάξεις αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται,—"thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed." See also var. readd. here. LXX-A (not F.), with which Bℵ agree, reads as our text: and there can be little doubt that the Writer of this Epistle followed that text as usual. Grot. thinks ἑλίξεις has come into the Greek text from ref. Isa., ἑλιγήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον. See also ref. Rev.), **and they shall be changed** (viz. as a mantle is folded up to be put away when a fresh one is about to be put on. Bleek quotes, as illustrating the idea, Philo de Profug. § 20, vol. i. p. 562, ἐνδύεται δὲ ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτατος τοῦ ὄντος λόγος ὡς ἐσθῆτα τὸν κόσμον· γῆν γὰρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ κ. τὰ ἐκ τούτων ἐπαμπίσχεται): **but Thou art the same** (Heb. וְאַתָּה הוּא, "and Thou art He:" viz. He, which Thou hast ever been; cf. Isa. xlvi. 4 Heb. and E. V. Bleek compares Philo, de Profug. § 11, p. 554: ἥλιος γὰρ οὐκ ἀλλαττόμενος ὁ αὐτός ἐστιν ἀεὶ κ.τ.λ.), **and thy years shall not fail** (Heb., "Thy years end not," are never completed: so LXX render the same verb תָּמַם by ἐκλείπειν, Ps. ciii. 35: 1 Kings xvi. 11: 4 Kings vii. 13, &c.). The account to be given of Ps. cii. seems to be as follows: according to its title it is "a prayer of the afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord." It was probably written during the Babylonian exile (cf. vv. 14, 15) by one who "waited for the consolation of Israel." That consolation was to be found only in Israel's covenant God, and the Messiah Israel's deliverer. And the trust of Israel in this her Deliverer was ever directed to the comfort of her sons under the immediate trouble of the time, be that what it might. As generations went on, more and more was revealed of the Messiah's office and work, and the hearts of God's people entered deeper and deeper into the consolation to be derived from the hope of His coming. Here then we have this sorrowing one casting himself on the mercy of the great Deliverer, and extolling His faithfulness and firmness over, and as distinguished from, all the works of His hands. To apply then these words to the Redeemer, is to use them in their sense of strictest propriety. See Delitzsch's note, where the whole matter is discussed.

13.] **But** (the contrast is again taken up from ver. 8. δέ is often found after the second word of a sentence and even later, when a preposition begins it: so κατὰ πόλεις δέ, Herod. viii. 68. 2: ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοι δὲ 'Αθηναῖοι, Thuc. i. 6: .... οὐχ ὑπὸ ἐραστοῦ δὲ κ.τ.λ., Plato, Phædr. 227 D: ξὺν τύχῃ δὲ πρόσφερε, Soph. Philoct. 764: πρὸς κακῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν μαθών, ib. 959: ἐν νυκτὶ δυσκύμαντα δ' ὠρώρει κακά, Æsch Agam. 653. See also other cases without the prepositional construction, in Klotz ad Devar. p. 379: Hartung, Partikellehre, i. p. 190: the account to be given being, that the particle may be thus postponed, whenever for any reason the previous words can be considered as one) **to whom of the angels hath He** (God, as before) **ever said, Sit thou on my right hand** (see above on ver. 3. The phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν is not found in classical writers: but we have in Diod. Sic. iv. 56, τὴν γῆν ἔχοντας ἐξ εὐωνύμων. It is very common of standing or sitting or being on the right hand of another, in Hellenistic Greek: see

σου [w] ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου; [14] οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν [x] λειτουργικὰ [y] πνεύματα, εἰς [z] διακονίαν [a] ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας [b] κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν; II. [1] διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ [c] περισσοτέρως [d] προσέχειν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀκουσ-

w Matt. v. 35. Acts ii. 35. vii. 49. ch. x. 13. James ii. 3 only. Ps. xcviii. 5. x here only. Exod. xxxi. 10. Num. v. 12, 26. vii. 5. 2 Chron. xxiv. 14. (-γός, ver. 7.) y = Luke xxiv. 37, 39. Acts xxiii. 8. 3 Kings xxii. 21. z = 2 Cor. xi. 8 al. (Esth. vi. 3 A. 1 Macc. xi. 58 only.) a Luke i. 19, 26. Rev. v. 6. Isa. vi. 6. b ver. 4 reff. Matt. xix. 29. c Paul, 2 Cor. i. 12. ii. 4 al[8]. ch. xiii. 19 (Mark xv. 14 v. r.) only †. d = and constr., Acts viii. 6, 10, 11. xvi. 14. 1 Tim. i. 4. iii. 8. iv. 1, 13. Tit. i. 14. ch. vii. 13. 2 Pet. i. 19. Prov. i. 30. Sir. xxiii. 27.

14. διακονιας B $Orig_2$(txt_5).

Chap. II. 1. περισσοτερως bef δει ℵ [aft προς. ημ. 17]. rec ημας bef προσεχειν, with KL[P] rel D-lat Thdrt [Damasc]: txt ABDℵ 17 vulg Ath_1 [Euthal-ms] Aug_1.

reff.) **until I place thine enemies (as) a footstool** (ὑποπόδιον, a word of later Greek, found in Athenæus, v. p. 192 E, ὁ γὰρ θρόνος . . . . ἐλευθέριός ἐστι καθέδρα σὺν ὑποποδίῳ: and xii. p. 514 f., Sextus Empir., al. The allusion is to the custom of putting the feet on the necks of conquered enemies, see Josh. x. 24 f.) **of thy feet?** Hardly any Psalm is so often quoted in the N. T. with reference to Christ, as Ps. cx. And no Psalm more clearly finds its ultimate reference and completion only in Christ, as even those confess, e. g. Bleek and De Wette, who question its being immediately addressed to Him at first: and regard the argument of our Lord to the Pharisees, founded on this place, as merely one 'ex concesso.' On the theocratic principle of interpretation, there is not the slightest difficulty in the application of the words directly to Him who is (and was ever regarded, even in David's time, as Ebrard well shews against Bleek) Israel's King, the Head and Chief of the theocracy. And see this further carried out in the note on ch. v. 6. Delitzsch, in loc., has devoted several pages to the discussion of the subject and arrangement of the Psalm.

14.] **Are they not all** (all the angels) **ministering** (in reference probably to λειτουργοὺς in ver. 7. The word λειτουργικός, not found in the classics, is used in the LXX (reff.) of any thing pertaining to the λειτουργοί or their service; the instruments, vessels, garments, or offerings for the ministry: here, of those devoted to or belonging to the ministry of God) **spirits** (unembodied beings, even as God Himself, but distinguished by the epithet λειτουργικά. The idea of "angels of service" or "of the ministry," is familiar to the Rabbis: see quotations in Wetstein) **sent forth** (mark the present participle, so also in ref. Rev.: he does not mean that angels have before now, in insulated cases, been sent forth, but that they are ever thus being sent forth,—it is their normal work and regular duty through all the ages of time) **for ministry** (in order to the ministration which is their work. The E. V. "sent forth to minister for them," gives a wrong idea of the meaning. The διακονία is not *a waiting upon men*, but a fulfilment of their office as διάκονοι of *God*. See Rom. xiii. 4. Schlichting observes, "Noluit dicere, ut ministrent iis qui &c. Non enim proprie ministratur et servitur illis, qui imperandi aut jubendi jus nullum habent, licet ministerium alteri præstitum in alterius commodum sæpe suscipiatur atque vertatur. Angeli proprie ministrant Deo et Christo, sed tamen in piorum usum et commodum. Idcirco maluit dicere, propter eos" &c. It may fairly be questioned whether the same idea, that of 'ministering to God in behalf of,' is not to be traced in such expressions as εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς, 1 Cor. xvi. 15: εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Acts xi. 29. Compare with this expression Col. i. 7, πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος τοῦ χριστοῦ) **on behalf of those who are about to inherit salvation** (σωτηρία, in the highest sense—eternal salvation: not, as Kuin., al. "deliverance from dangers:" in so solemn a reference, that meaning would be quite beside the purpose. Those spoken of are the elect of God, they who love Him, and for whom all things work together for good, even the principalities and powers in heavenly places. And if it be said, that the ministration of angels has often been used for other immediate purposes than the behoof of the elect, we may answer, that all those things may well come under the διακονία διὰ τοὺς μέλλ. κληρον. σωτηρίαν: for all things are theirs; and for them, in and as united to Christ, all events are ordered)? Thus the Son of God is proved superior to the angels —i. e. to the highest of created beings: who, so far from being equal with Him, worship Him, and serve His purposes.

Chap. II. 1—4.] *Practical inference from the proved superiority of the Son of God to the angels.* 1.] **On this account** (viz. because Christ, the mediator of the New Covenant, is far above all the angels, who were the mediators of the former Covenant) **it behoves us** (ταύτην τὴν διαφορὰν ἐπι-

e here only. Prov. iii. 21. Isa. xliv. 4 only.

θεῖσιν, μή ποτε [e] παραρυῶμεν. [2] εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων

ABDK LMPℵ abcde fghk mno 17. 47

(παραρυωμεν, so AB¹D¹L[P]ℵ n 17 [47] syr-marg-gr.)

σταμένους, Thdrt.: **δεῖ**, of moral necessity arising from the previous premises: so Matt. xviii. 33; xxv. 27: 2 Tim. ii. 6 al. There is no stress on **ἡμᾶς** according to the reading of the text) **to give heed** (**προσέχειν** usually in the classics is transitive, with τὸν νοῦν following: so e. g. Aristoph. Nub. 566, ὦ σοφώτατοι θεαταί, δεῦρο τὸν νοῦν προσέχετε, and Plut. 113, 151, al. In Demosth. both usages are found: e. g. p. 21. 26, εἴ τις ὑμῖν προσέξει τὸν νοῦν:—p. 132. 9, προσέχουσιν ἅπαντες, οὐχ οἷς εἴπομέν ποτε ἢ νῦν ἂν εἴποιμεν, ἀλλ' οἷς ποιοῦμεν. And later, intrans. usage prevailed: see reff.) **more abundantly** (some as Grot. ("*eo magis par est*"), Kuin., al. would join περισσοτέρως with δεῖ: but if so intended, it would certainly have been before that verb. We must not understand after the comparative, **τοῦ νόμου**, "than we did to the law," as Chrys., al.; or the aim of the Writer to be, to shew the superiority of the gospel over the law, as Thdrt.: but the adverb intimates how much our attention ought to be increased and intensified by our apprehension of the dignity of Him whose record the gospel is, and who is its Mediator) **to the things heard** (**by us**) (**ἀκουσθεῖσιν** is better taken neuter than masc., "the persons whom we have heard." Bleek remarks, after Böhme, the difference between the tone of exhortation here and in St. Paul, e.g. Gal. i. 6 ff.: but perhaps the remark is hardly just to the Pauline hypothesis: for difference of circumstances should be taken into consideration. Even the same person would not exhort in the same tone, converts to whom he stood in such different relations as St. Paul did to the Galatians and the Jewish converts. A similar criticism will apply to Bleek's second remark, that the Writer here classes himself absolutely with his readers who had heard the gospel from others. There may have been reasons for his descending to the level of those whom he was addressing. But see below on ver. 3, and on the authorship, the Prolegomena), **lest haply** (the **ποτε** is not to be pressed as meaning 'at any time:' it simply generalizes and renders indefinite the μή,—'ne forte,' daß nicht etwa) **we be diverted** (**παραρυῶμεν** is the 2nd aor. subj. passive (ἐρύην) from παραρέω, not the pres. subj. active from παραρυέω, which latter verb is not in use. The orthography with one ρ only is characteristic of the Alexandrine Greek: which usually wrote double consonants single. (See Sturz. de Dial. Maced.) The verb signifies to *flow by:* so Xen. Cyr. iv. 5. 2, πιεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραῤῥέοντος ποταμοῦ: ref. Isa. ὡς ἰτέα ἐπὶ παραῤῥέον ὕδωρ. Bleek gives an example from Artemidorus viii. 27, where dreams of running water are interpreted to signify change and instability, διὰ τὸ μὴ μένειν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀλλὰ παραῤῥεῖν. Aristotle, de Part. Animal. iii. 3, uses this same passive form to indicate that which we familiarly call food *going the wrong way* in course of swallowing: ἐὰν γάρ τι παρεισρυῇ ξηρὸν ἢ ὑγρὸν εἰς τὴν ἀρτηρίαν, πνιγμοὺς καὶ πόνους κ. βῆχας ἰσχυροὺς ἐμποιεῖ·—συμβαίνει γὰρ φανερῶς τὰ λεχθέντα πᾶσιν οἷς ἂν παραῤῥυῇ τι τῆς τροφῆς: see also numerous instances of the same or a similar meaning, from Galen, in Wetst. Plut. Amator, p. 754 A, says of fear lest a ring should fall off, ὡς μὴ παραῤῥυῇ δεδιώς. Elsner quotes similar Latin usages, among which notice Cicero pro Balbo, c. i., "Oratio quæ non *prætervecta* aures vestras, sed in animis omnium penitus insederit." The meaning of the *verb* παραῤῥεῖν seems then to be clear—to flow past, or away, or aside, to fall off, deflect from a course. But it is to one *part* of that verb that our attention is here directed,—the 2 aor. passive: and it may be noticed that whereas in the above examples that which flows away or flows aside is said παραῤῥεῖν, that which is carried away or aside by floating on it, or which is caused to fall off or away, is said παραῤῥυῆναι: cf. also υἱέ, μὴ παραρυῇς in ref. Prov. And so must the word be taken here. We, going onward in time, living our lives in one or another direction, are exhorted προσέχειν τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, 'to adhere to the things we have heard' (see above), and that, μή ποτε παραρυῶμεν, '*that we do not at any time float past them,*' be not carried away beside them, led astray from the course on which they would take us. Two mistakes respecting the word are to be avoided: 1. that of Bos, Valcknaer, al., and the E. V., "ne quando præterfluere ea sinamus:" "*lest at any time we should let them slip.*" From what has been above said of the tense and voice, it will be clear that such cannot be the meaning. 2. Still worse is that of those who, misled by the vulgate "*pereffluamus,*" have thought of a comparison with a sieve, or leaking vessel. So Est. (preferring however the other, the "*ne defluamus*" of Aug.), Calv. ("Attenta

λαληθεὶς [f] λόγος ἐγένετο [g] βέβαιος, καὶ πᾶσα [h] παραβασις

f = Acts xviii. 15. 2 Tim. i. 13. Tit. i. 9. ii. 8. 1 John ii. 7. g Rom. iv. 16. 2 Cor. i. 7. ch. iii. 14. vi. 19. ix. 17. 2 Pet. i. 10, 19 only †. Wisd. vii. 23 only. h Rom. ii. 23. iv. 15. v. 14. Gal. iii. 19. 1 Tim. ii. 14. ch. ix. 15 only. Ps. c. 3. Wisd. xiv. 31. 2 Macc. xv. 31 only. (-βαίνειν, Matt. xv. 2, 3. -βάτης, James ii. 9.)

mens similis est vasi bene obstructo: vaga autem et ignava, perforato"), Owen, al.: and I find it reproduced in Tait's commentary on the Hebrews: "*lest .... we should run out as leaking vessels.*" The meaning is as untenable, as the simile (after προσέχειν) is irrelevant. And, as Kuin. and Bleek remark, the passage of Terence cited in justification, Eun. i. 2. 25, "Plenus rimarum sum, hac atque illac perfluo," has reference not to forgetfulness, but to indiscreet loquacity. The Greek expositors, whose authority in matters of Greek verbal usage is considerable, all explain it as above:—so Chrys., τουτέστι, μὴ ἀπολώμεθα, μὴ ἐκπέσωμεν. καὶ δείκνυσιν ἐνταῦθα τὸ χαλεπὸν τῆς ἐκπτώσεως, ὅτι δύσκολον τὸ παραῤῥυὲν πάλιν ἐπανελθεῖν, καθότι ἐκ ῥαθυμίας τοῦτο συνέβη. ἔλαβε δὲ τὴν λέξιν ἀπὸ τῶν παροιμιῶν· "υἱὲ" γάρ, φησί, "μὴ παραῤῥυῇς:" Thdrt., μή τινα ὄλισθον ὑπομείνωμεν: Œc., τουτέστιν, ἐκπέσωμεν τοῦ καθήκοντος καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν ὁδοῦ: Hesych., ἐξολισθάμεν: Suidas, παραπέσωμεν. So also all the more accurate of the moderns) (**from them**) (such is the most natural object to supply after παρά: turned aside from and floated away from the course on which the προσέχειν to them would have carried us).

2.] **For** (introduces an argument (vv. 2—4) *a minori ad majus.* The law was introduced by the mere subordinate messengers of God, but was enforced with strict precision: how much more shall they be punished who reject that Gospel, which was brought in by the Son of God Himself, and continues to be confirmed to us by God's present power) **if the word which was spoken by means of angels** (i. e. the law of Moses: not as mentioned by way of alternative in Chrys., Œc., Thl., and adopted by Calv., al., *all commands in the O. T. delivered by angels* (excluding the law: or as Chrys., including it). For this would more naturally be οἱ .... λόγοι: and besides, in similar exhortations in our Epistle, the law and the gospel are so prominently set against one another, that there can be little doubt the same is the case here: see ch. iii. 1 ff., 7 ff.; iv. 2, 11; x. 28, 29; xii. 18—25. This will become even plainer still, when we enter on the consideration of **δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθείς.** These words seem to point especially at the law, which was διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων, Gal. iii. 19, where see note: cf. also Acts vii. 53, and Deut. xxxiii. 2, κύριος ἐκ Σινὰ ἥκει καὶ .... κατέσπευσεν ἐξ ὄρους Φαρὰν σὺν μυριάσι Καδῆς· ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ: on which see Ebrard's note: and Ps. lxviii. 17, E. V. The co-operation of angels in the giving of the law at Sinai was not merely a Rabbinical notion, but is implied in both the Old and New Testaments. There can consequently be little doubt that the Writer, in mentioning ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος, had reference to the law of Moses, and not to the scattered messages which were, at different times in O. T. history, delivered by angels. And so Origen, in Matt. tom. xvii. cap. 2, vol. iii. p. 767: Thdrt., δείκνυσιν ὅσον ὑπέρκειται τῶν νομικῶν διατάξεων ἡ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν διδασκαλία. τῇ γὰρ θέσει τοῦ νόμου ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν κ.τ.λ. It has been sometimes supposed that the ἄγγελοι spoken of here are not angels, but merely human messengers. Chrys. says, τινὲς μὲν οὖν τὸν Μωυσέα φασὶν αἰνίττεσθαι· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχει λόγον· ἀγγέλους γὰρ ἐνταῦθα πολλούς φησι. And Olearius, Analys. Ep. ad Hebr. § v., says, "Per ἀγγέλους hic maxime intelligi existimem προφήτας, doctores et Sacerdotes: qui sunt ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, et ita passim vocantur." But this latter point wants proof. The difficulty as to whether God Himself, or an angel, is to be understood as giving the law in Exodus, raised by Cameron (see also Schlichting in Bleek), hardly seems legitimately to arise here, where the words are **δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθείς**, and the angels may manifestly be considered as the inferior agents, acting and speaking in God's name. Bl. remarks that the Writer would hardly have used this argument of depreciating contrast, had he regarded the law as given either to Moses or to the people by the direct ministry of the Son of God Himself) **was made** ("*factus est*" vulg., "*constitutus est*" Grot., "*became,*" on being thus spoken by angels. The aorists point, hardly, as Lünemann, to the legal dispensation being past and gone by, but, since the same tenses are presently used of the gospel, to two historic periods compared with one another,—the giving of the law, and the promulgation of the gospel) **binding** (see reff.: *firm, ratified*: "*stedfast,*" as E. V.: as applied to commands, —*imperative,*—not to be violated with impunity. Bleek quotes from Philo, Vit. Mos. ii. § 3, vol. ii. p. 136, τὰ δὲ τούτου μόνου (Μωυσέως νόμιμα) **βέβαια**, ἀσάλευτα, ἀκράδαντα, καθάπερ σφραγῖσι φύσεως

καὶ [i] παρακοὴ ἔλαβεν [k] ἔνδικον [l] μισθαποδοσίαν, [3] πῶς ἡμεῖς [m] ἐκφευξόμεθα [n] τηλικαύτης [o] ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας,

ABDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

i Rom. v. 19. 2 Cor. x. 6 only †.
k Rom. iii. 8 only †.
l ch. x. 35. xi. 26 only †.
m Luke xxi. 36. Acts xvi. 27. xix. 16. Rom. ii. 3. 2 Cor. xi. 33. 1 Thess. v. 3. ch. xii. 25 only. L.P.H. Judg. vi. 11.
n 2 Cor. i. 10. James iii. 4. Rev. xvi. 18 only †. 2 Macc. xii. 3.
o Matt. xxii. 5. 1 Tim. iv. 14. ch. viii. 9 (from Jer. xxxviii. [xxxi.] 32) only. Jer. iv. 17. Wisd. iii. 10. 2 Macc. iv. 14 only.

αὐτῆς σεσημασμένα), **and every transgression** (overstepping of its ordinances, or more properly, walking alongside of, and therefore not in, the path which it marked out. See above on παραρυῶμεν, an allusion to which the prepositions in παραβ. and παρακ. seem to contain. Cf. Rom. iv. 15 and note there. The substantive does not occur in this sense in the classics, and only once in the Canonical LXX, ref. Ps.: but the verb is found in Plato, Crito, p. 52 D, 53 A, and Legg. 714 D, and Demosth. p. 624. 1, παραβὰς τοὺς ὅρκους κ. τὰς συνθήκας: and in the LXX passim) **and disobedience** ("παρακούειν imports etymologically, '*to hear beside*:' and hence the Greeks use it principally in two senses: 1. to hear any thing by stealth, to overhear, as Aristoph. Ran. 749, καὶ παρακούων δεσποτῶν ὅταν (ἅττ' ἂν, Bekker) λαλῶσι: and, 2. to hear any thing inaccurately, to mis-hear, as Plato, Theætet. p. 195 A, παρορῶσί τε κ. παρακούουσι κ. παρανοοῦσι πλεῖστα. From this last meaning of the word comes the Hellenistic usage, in which it betokens a more intentional mis-hearing, a reluctance to hear (ein Nicht-hören-wollen), and hence includes also the idea of non-compliance, of disobedience. So Isa. lxv. 12, ἐκάλεσα ὑμᾶς κ. οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε, ἐλάλησα κ. παρηκούσατε: Esth. iii. 8, τῶν δὲ νόμων τοῦ βασιλέως παρακούουσι. See also Matt. xviii. 17, ἐὰν δὲ παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ κ.τ.λ. So also in Josephus. Accordingly, παρακοή in the N. T., where it occurs thrice only (see reff.: never in the LXX), is used of practical mis-hearing, not listening to, a teaching, or law, or person. The relation of these two words to one another in point of sense seems accordingly to be, that παράβασις denotes the outward act of transgression of the law, the practical withstanding of its precepts,—while παρακοή occurs when we fulfil not, and have no mind to fulfil, the precepts of the law: the former expresses, viewed *ab externo*, more something positive, the latter something negative, while at the same time it regards more the disposition of the man. Still, the distinction, as regards the moral region here treated of, is not of such a kind that each παράβασις may not also be treated as a παρακοή, and each παρακοή include or induce a παράβασις." Bleek) **received just** (ἔνδικος, found twice only (reff.) in N. T. and not at all in LXX, is a good classic word: see lexx.) **recompense of reward** (used only in this Epistle, and every where else in a good sense: cf. also μισθαποδότης, ch. xi. 6. The classical writers use μισθοδοσία (Thuc. viii. 83: Xen. Anab. ii. 5. 22: Polyb. i. 69. 3: Diod. Sic. xvi. 73) and μισθοδότης (Xen. Anab. i. 3. 9: Plato, Rep. v. p. 463 B: Æschin. p. 85. 10: Theocr. xiv. 59). In the passage of Diod. Sic., μισθαποδοσία is a various reading. To what does the Writer refer? To the single instances of punishment which overtook the offenders against the law, or as Grot. suggests, to the general punishment of the whole people's unbelief, as in ch. iii. 8; iv. 11; xii. 21, and see 1 Cor. x. 6 ff.? I should be disposed to think, to the former: such penalties as are denounced in Deut. xxxii. 35, and indeed attached to very many of the Mosaic enactments: as Owen: "The law was so established, that the transgression of it, so as to disannul the terms and conditions of it, had by divine constitution the punishment of death temporal, or excision, appointed unto it"), 3.] **how shall we** (emphatic: including Christians in general, all who have received the message of salvation in the manner specified below) **escape** (φεύγω and its compounds belong to that class of verbs which take the future middle, not using the active form of that tense. See a list of such in Krüger, Gr. Sprachlehre, § 39. 12. We may here either supply an object after the verb, such as ἔνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν, as in ref. Rom., 2 Macc. vii. 35, οὔπω γὰρ τὴν τοῦ . . . . θεοῦ κρίσιν ἐκπέφευγας, and ib. vi. 26,—or take ἐκφ. absolutely, as in the two last reff. and Sir. vi. 13, οὐκ ἐκφεύξεται ἐν ἁρπάγμασιν ἁμαρτωλός. The latter seems best, inasmuch as τὴν ἔνδ. μισθ. does not fulfil the perfectly general motive of the hypothesis, and we are hardly justified in inserting any other object, such as τὸ κρῖμα τοῦ θεοῦ in ref. Rom. The *forensic* sense of ἐκφεύγειν, *to be acquitted*, founded on that of φεύγειν, *to be accused*, maintained here by Wolf, appears to be merely imaginary, the forensic word being ἀποφεύγειν, not ἐκφ. So Thom. Mag.: φεύγω, τὸ κατηγοροῦμαι. κ. φυγή, ἡ κατηγορία. ἀποφεύγω δέ, ὅταν νικήσας ἀπολυθῇ τις τῆς κατηγορίας. In the passage of Aristophanes which he quotes to support his view, Vesp. 993, ἐκπέφευγας, ὦ Λάβης,—

[p] ἥτις [q] ἀρχὴν [q] λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ [r] τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων [s] εἰς ἡμᾶς [t] ἐβεβαιώθη, 4 [u] συνεπιμαρτυ-

p = 1 Cor. v. 1 al. fr.
q here only. τ. ἀρχὴν τοῦ γενέσθαι λαβὸν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, Philo, Vit. Mos. ii. § 14, vol. i. p. 93.
r absol., = in this Ep., ch. xii. 14 only. Mark xvi. 20. Luke xxiv. 34 al. see ch. vii. 14. xiii. 20.
s so 2 Cor. x. 16. 1 Pet. i. 25.
t Mark xvi. 20. Rom. xv. 8. 1 Cor. i. 6, 8. 2 Cor. i. 21. Col. ii. 7. ch. xiii. 9 only. Ps. xl. 12. cxviii. 28 only.
u here only †. Clem. 1 Cor. § 23, 43.

4. for συνεπιμαρτ., συνμαρτ. B[1], συμμ. B[2].

the word, occurring as it does in the midst of the forensic use of ἀποφεύγειν (cf. vv. 985, 997), may very well be only in its ordinary meaning, '*thou hast escaped*') **if we have neglected** (the anarthrous participial construction implies a logical, i. e. here a hypothetical condition: the aor., that that condition will have been fulfilled at the date to which the fut. ἐκφ. refers) **so great** (καλῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ τηλικαύτης προσέθηκεν. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ πολεμίων, φησίν, ἡμᾶς διασώσει νῦν, οὐδὲ τὴν γῆν κ. τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ ἀγαθὰ παρέξει, ἀλλὰ θανάτου κατάλυσις ἔσται, ἀλλὰ διαβόλου ἀπώλεια, ἀλλ' οὐρανῶν βασιλεία, ἀλλὰ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Chrys.: and Theod.-mops. even more to the point,—ἐκεῖνο νομίμων δόσις ἦν μόνον, ἐνταῦθα δὲ κ. χάρις πνεύματος κ. λύσις ἁμαρτημάτων κ. βασιλείας οὐρανῶν ἐπαγγελία κ. ἀθανασίας ὑπόσχεσις· ὅθεν κ. δικαίως τηλικαύτης εἶπεν. τηλικαύτης might belong to ἥτις below, as Thol., assuming ἥτις = ὥστε, and referring to Matthiæ, Gr. Gr. § 479, obs. 1. The instances there given of relatives after οὕτως, ὧδε, τηλικοῦτος, τοιοῦτος, amply justify such a construction, e. g. Isocr. Epist. p. 408 D, χρὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν δόξης . . . . . τηλικαύτης τὸ μέγεθος, ἣν μόνος ἂν σὺ τῶν νῦν ὄντων κτήσασθαι δυνηθείης: Xen. An. ii. 5. 12, τίς οὕτω μαίνεται, ὅστις οὐ σοι βούλεται φίλος εἶναι; But it seems better here, and more befitting the majesty of the thing spoken of, to take τηλικαύτης absolutely, leaving the greatness and exalted nature of the salvation to be filled up, as Bleek says, in the consciousness of the readers. Still of course the ἥτις introduces, both by the sense and by its own proper meaning (*ut quæ*), an epexegesis of that which was enwrapped in τηλικαύτης) **salvation** (σωτηρία as in ch. i. 14; no need, as many Commentators, to supply λόγου before it), **the which** (= '*seeing that it,*' in a direct construction) **having begun** (ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα = ἀρξαμένη. The phrase is found in the classics: e.g. Eur. Iph. in Aul. 1111, τίν' ἂν λάβοιμι τῶν ἐμῶν ἀρχὴν κακῶν; Ælian, Var. H. ii. 28, πόθεν δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ὅδε ὁ νόμος, ἐρῶ: Polyb. iv. 28. 3, τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν . . . τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς τῶν πολέμων τούτων ἰδίας εἰλήφει: see more instances in Bleek, Raphel, and the same usage of λαβεῖν in Plato, Rep. p. 497 E, λαβέτω τέλος ἡ ἀπόδειξις τούτου φανεροῦ γενομένου: Thuc. i. 91, ὅτι τειχίζεταί τε κ. ἤδη ὕψος λαμβάνει. Cf. Palm and Rost's Lex. in λαμβάνω) **to be spoken** (the construction is a mixed one; the inf. after the substantive would naturally have the art., τοῦ λαλεῖσθαι, but it is put without it as if ἀρξαμένη had preceded) **by means of** (He was the instrument in this case, as the angels in the other; but both, law and gospel, came at first hand not from the mediators, but from God. See Ebrard's mistaken antithesis treated below) **the Lord** (διὰ τ. κυρίου is to be joined with the whole ἀρχ. λαβ. λαλ., not with λαλεῖσθαι alone. τοῦ κυρίου, as Bl. remarks, has here an especial emphasis setting forth the majesty and sovereignty of Christ: αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης πρῶτος τὴν σωτήριον διδασκαλίαν προσήνεγκε, Thdrt. See reff.), **was confirmed** (see ref. Mark, where the word is used exactly in the same sense and reference. It seems to be used to correspond to ἐγένετο βέβαιος above, signifying a ratification of the gospel somewhat correspondent to that there predicated of the law: as also **λαλεῖσθαι** here answers to λαληθεὶς there. Thl. explains it, διετορθμεύθη εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως κ. πιστῶς) **unto us** (not = the simple dative, which would be a dat. commodi, but implying the transmission and its direction; see reff.: nor, as Wolf, Wahl, al., to be rendered "*usque ad,*" a meaning of εἰς only to be assumed when defined by some indication of time or space in the context. Nor again must it be confounded with the idiom ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν, "*among you,*" 1 Cor. i. 6. The construction is a pregnant one) **by those who heard** (*it?* or *Him?* In the sense, the difference will be but little: in either case, those pointed at will be as Thdrt. οἱ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀπολαύσαντες χάριτος: the αὐτόπται κ. ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου of Luke i. 2. From the usage, however, of the Writer himself, I prefer understanding 'it:' cf. ch. iii. 16; iv. 2; xii. 19) **it** (Ebrard (with whom Delitzsch partly agrees) arranges this whole sentence strangely, and I cannot doubt, wrongly, thus: "was confirmed to us by those who heard it, as having been from the beginning spoken by the Lord:" and brings out a contrast between the law, which was given through a mediator, and the gospel, which came direct from the Lord Himself. But thus all the parallel,

ροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ [v] σημείοις τε καὶ [w] τέρασιν, καὶ [x] ποικίλαις [y] δυνάμεσιν, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου [z] μερισμοῖς κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ [a] θέλησιν;

C μερισμοις... ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

v Mark xvi. 20. w in N. T. alw. w. σημ., Matt. xxiv. 24 ‖ Mk. John iv. 48. Acts ii. 19 (from Joel ii. 30), 22 al. x Matt. iv. 24. 2 Tim. iii. 6. ch. xiii. 9. James i. 2. 1 Pet. i. 6. iv. 10. 1 Chron. xxix. 2. y = Matt. vii. 22. xiii. 54. Mark vi. 14 al. fr. z ch. iv. 12 only. Josh. xi. 23. xviii. 10 F.(not A) compl. Ezra vi. 18. Eccl. ii. 10 Ald. only. a here only. Prov. viii. 35. Ezek. xviii. 23. (-μα, ch. x. 7, 9, 10.).

[om τε MP 17 vulg arm Chr_1.] θερισμοις ℵ[1](txt ℵ-corr[1]). for αυτου, του θεου D[1].

and with it the true contrast, is destroyed. Both law and gospel, proceeding from God, were λαληθέντα to men: the former by angels, the latter by the Lord. Both were βεβαιωθέντα—the former absolutely, as exemplified by the penalties which followed its neglect, the latter relatively to us, as matter of evidence requiring our hearty reception; delivered by eye and ear witnesses, and further witnessed to by God Himself. And in proportion as the Mediator of the new covenant is more worthy than were the mediators of the old covenant, will our punishment be greater if we neglect it. So there can be no doubt that the Writer meant to convey the sense against which Ebrard protests, and that the beginning of the promulgation of the gospel by the Lord, and the handing down of it by those who were its first hearers, are alleged by him as two separate and coordinate circumstances. On the evidence furnished by this verse as to the Writer of the Epistle, see Prolegg. § i. parr. 130 ff.), **God also bearing witness to it** (nothing can be further from the truth than what Kuinoel, al., maintain, "συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν pro simplici μαρτυρεῖν positum esse." In his own rendering of the word, the force of both prepositions is to be traced: "Deo simul confirmante." μαρτυρεῖν is simply to *bear witness*: ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν to *attest*, to bear witness to: συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν to *join in, attesting*, or bearing witness to. The double compound is not uncommon in the later Greek writers: e.g. Aristot. de Mundo, v. 22, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ ὁ βίος ἅπας: Polyb. xxvi. 9. 4, παρόντων δὲ τῶν Θετταλῶν, κ. συνεπιμαρτυρούντων τοῖς Δαρδανίοις. See examples from Sextus Empir., Galen, Philo, &c., in Bleek. On the sense, Chrys. remarks: πῶς οὖν ἐβεβαιώθη; τί οὖν εἰ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἔπλασάν φησιν; τοῦτο τοίνυν ἀναίρων καὶ δεικνὺς οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνην τὴν χάριν, ἐπήγαγε "συνεπιμ. τ. θεοῦ·" οὐκ ἂν γάρ, εἰ ἔπλασαν, ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐμαρτύρησε· μαρτυροῦσι μὲν κἀκεῖνοι, μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ θεός. οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἐπιστεύσαμεν ἐκείνοις, ἀλλὰ διὰ σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ὥστε οὐκ ἐκείνοις πιστεύομεν, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ) **with signs and wonders** (Bleek remarks that these words are very commonly joined together, and cites numerous instances from the later classics, the LXX, and the N. T. His remarks are: "As regards the relation of the two expressions to each other in their combination here, as divine confirmations of human testimony, it is this: σημεῖον is a more general and wider idea than τέρας. Every τέρας, religiously considered, is also a σημεῖον, but not always *vice versa*. τέρας always includes the idea of something marvellous, something extraordinary in itself, betokens something which by its very occurrence raises astonishment, and cannot be explained from the known laws of nature. On the other hand a σημεῖον is each and every thing whereby a person, or a saying and assertion, is witnessed to as true, and made manifest: and thus it *may* be something, which, considered in and of itself, would appear an ordinary matter, causing no astonishment, but which gets its character of striking and supernatural from the connexion into which it is brought with something else, e.g. from a heavenly messenger having previously referred to some event which he could not have foreseen by mere natural knowledge. But it may also be a τέρας, properly so called. Still, it is natural to suppose that the biblical writers, using so often as they do the words together, did not on every occasion bear in mind the distinction, but under the former word thought also of events which of themselves would be extraordinary and marvellous appearances") **and various** (this adj. belongs only to δυνάμεσιν, not also, as Bleek, to the following clause, in which the μερισμοῖς of itself includes the idea of variety) **miraculous powers** (so δυνάμεις are used in reff.; and in Acts ii. 22: 2 Cor. xii. 22: 2 Thess. ii. 9, we find them joined with σημεῖα κ. τέρατα as here; and with σημεῖα only, in Acts viii. 13. See also 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28 f. In some of these places it is taken for the miraculous acts themselves which followed on the exercise of the powers: and so perhaps it may be here: but I prefer the other rendering on account of the near connexion with the following clause, which if we break by joining it to the foregoing, we destroy the grouping in couples, and also violate the proper construction of the σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν) **and distributions** (the rare word

[5] Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις [b] ὑπέταξεν τὴν [c] οἰκουμένην τὴν [b ver. 8 reff. c = and w. μέλ. here only. see ch. i. 6.]

5. aft υπεταξεν ins ο θεος C vulg(with am demid hal agst fuld harl[1] tol) Chron[1].

μερισμός (see reff.) is in strict analogy with the usage of the verb: e. g. Rom. xii. 3, ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως: 1 Cor. vii. 17, ἑκάστῳ ὡς ἐμέρισεν ὁ κύριος . . . περιπατείτω: 2 Cor. x. 13, κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρου. But both, in their simple classical meaning, merely signify *division*, as in ch. iv. 12, and not distribution, which is a later sense, found in Polyb. xi. 28. 9, Diog. Laert., Herodian, &c. See Palm and Rost's Lexicon) **of the Holy Spirit** (is this a genitive of the object distributed, or of the subject distributing? The latter is held by Camerar., al., and κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν also referred to the will of the Holy Spirit. And so St. Paul certainly speaks, 1 Cor. xii. 11, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται. But it does not thence follow that such is the sense here: and it seems much more natural to refer the pron. **αὐτοῦ** to God, the primary subject of the sentence. Otherwise we should have expected ἐκείνου. Still, it may be said that the reference of this genitive is independent of that of the pronoun αὐτοῦ, and that the clause πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς should be considered on its own ground. But thus considered, if it be once granted that αὐτοῦ refers to God, we should have, on the supposition of the subjective genitive, an awkwardly complicated sense, hardly consistent with the assertion of absolute sovereignty so prominently made in the following clause. I take then the genitive with most Commentators, as objective, and the Holy Spirit as that which is distributed according to God's will, to each man according to his measure and kind. The declaration in John iii. 34, of Him whom God sent, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα, speaks of the same *giving*, but of its unmeasured fulness, as imparted to our glorious Head, not of its fragmentary distribution to us the imperfect and limited members), **according to His** (God's: see above) **will** (**θέλησις** is a rarer word (reff.) than θέλημα, both being Alexandrine forms. Pollux says of it, v. 165, βούλησις, ἐπιθυμία, ὄρεξις, ἔρως· ἡ δὲ θέλησις ἰδιωτικόν. It is best to refer this clause, not to the whole sentence preceding, with Böhme, nor to the two clauses, ποικ. δυν., κ. πν. ἁγ. μερ., as Bleek, Lünem., but to the last of these only, agreeably to 1 Cor. xii. 11, and to the free and sovereign agency implied in μερισμοῖς. See on the whole sense, Acts v. 32)?

5—18.] *The dogmatic argument now proceeds. The new world is subjected, by the testimony of the Scriptures, not to angels, but to Christ: who however, though Lord of all, was made inferior to the angels, that He might die for, and suffer with, being made like, the children of men.*

5.] The proposition stated. **For** (the connexion is with the sentence immediately preceding, i. e. with vv. 2—4. That former λόγος was spoken by angels: it carried its punishment for neglect of it: much more shall this σωτηρία, spoken by . . . &c., confirmed by . . . &c. FOR this whole state of things, induced by the proclamation of that salvation, is not subjected to angels, but to Christ, the Son of God. Then the fact that it is to MAN, and to Him AS MAN, that it is subjected, is brought in, and a new subject thus grafted on the old one of His superiority to the angels. See Bleek and Ebrard) **not to angels** (ἀγγέλοις stands in the place of emphasis, as contrasted with ἄνθρωπος below) **did He subject** (aor.: at the date of His arrangement and laying out of the same. The subjection of this present natural world to the holy angels, as its administrators, is in several places attested in Scripture, and was a very general matter of belief among the Jews. In Deut. xxxii. 8, we read in the LXX, ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. There, it is true, the Heb. text has, as E. V., "according to the number of the children (more properly, *the sons*, in the stricter sense) of Israel." Origen, on Numbers, Hom. xxviii. 4, vol. ii. p. 385, says, "Secundum numerum angelorum ejus, vel ut in aliis exemplaribus legimus, secundum numerum filiorum Israel:" but perhaps, as Bleek suggests, it was not Origen that was pointing to a various reading in the Heb. text, but only his translator that was noticing that the Latin versions differed from the LXX. But the doctrine rests on passages about which there can be no such doubt. See Dan. x. 13, 20, 21; xii. 1, for this committal of kingdoms to the superintendence of angels: Rev. ix. 11; xvi. 5 al., for the same as regards the natural elements: Matt. xviii. 10, as regards the guardianship of individuals: Rev. i. 20 &c., for that of churches (for so, and not of chief bishops, is the name to be understood: see note there). See also Dan. iv. 13. In the apocryphal and Rab-

[d] μέλλουσαν περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν· 6 [e] διεμαρτύρατο δέ που

ABCDK LMℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

d = Matt. xii. 32. Acts xxiv. 25. Rom. v. 14. viii. 38. ch. vi. 5 al. Isa. ix. 6 A al.

e elsw. L.P. (Luke xvi. 28. Acts viii. 25 al7. 1 Thess. iv. 6. 1 Tim. v. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 14. iv. 1) only. Jer. vi. 10.

binical writings we find the same idea asserted, and indeed carried out into minute details. So in Sir. xvii. 17, ἑκάστῳ ἔθνει κατέστησεν ἡγούμενον, κ. μερὶς κυρίου Ἰσραήλ ἐστιν. The Rabbinical authorities may be found in Bleek and Eisenmenger. See also a very elaborate article—"Engel"—by Böhme in Herzog's Encyclopädie: and testimonies to the view of the early church from Eusebius (Demonstr. Evang. iv. 2, vol. iv. p. 146), Justin Martyr (Apol. ii. 5, p. 92), Irenæus (iii. 12. 11, p. 197), Athenagoras (Legat. 24, p. 302), and Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vii. 2, p. 831 P) in Whitby's note. The idea then of subjection of the world to angels was one with which the readers of this Epistle were familiar) **the world to come** (the reference of this expression has been variously given by expositors. 1. Many imagine it to refer to the world which is, strictly speaking, *to come*, as distinguished from this present world. So Thdrt. (οἰκουμ. μέλλ. τὸν μέλλοντα βίον ἐκάλεσεν), Œc. (μέλλ. οἰκ. φησὶ τὸν ἐσόμενον κόσμον, περὶ οὗ φησὶν ὁ ἅπας λόγος ἡμῖν· αὐτὸς γὰρ κριτὴς ὁ χριστὸς ἐκείνης καθεδεῖται οἰκουμένης, οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι ὡς λειτουργοὶ κ. δοῦλοι παρίστανται), Cajetan, Estius, a-Lapide, al. This meaning, as Bl. remarks, will hardly tally with the γάρ, nor with περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν: though it might be said that the future life, being the *completion* of the state of salvation by Christ, might very well here be spoken of as the subject of the present discourse. 2. Some have supposed a direct allusion to ch. i. 6. So Thl. (περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν, τουτέστι περὶ ἧς ἀνωτέρω εἴπομεν ὅτι ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην), Schlichting, Grot. ("λαλοῦμεν, id est ἐλαλήσαμεν . . . Respicitur enim id quod præcessit i. 6"), Böhme, al. But certainly in this case the verb would have been past; and besides, the addition of the epithet μέλλουσαν sufficiently distinguishes it from the mere οἰκουμένη, the inhabited world, in the other place. 3. Others again have thought of the heaven, which is to us future, because we are not yet admitted to its joys. So Cameron ("Mundus ecclesiæ desertum est, οἰκουμένη ecclesiæ est in cœlo, sicut Israelitarum in terra Canaan"), Calov., Limborch, Grot. ("In regione illa superætherea sunt quidem angeli, sed non illi imperant ut Christus. Vocat hanc οἰκ. μέλλ., non quia jam non exstat; sed quia nobis ea non plene nota est, nec adhuc contigit"), al. But this again would not agree with the γάρ and λαλοῦμεν. 4. The most probable account to be given is that the phrase represents the Heb. הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא (see note on ch. i. 1), and imports the whole new order of things brought in by Christ,—taking its rise in His life on earth, and having its completion in his reign in glory. So Calvin ("Nunc apparet non vocari orbem futurum duntaxat qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui cœpit ab exordio regni Christi: complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione"), Beza, Cappellus (adding a remark, "Sed nec contemnendum discrimen illud quod videmus inter veteris et novi testamenti sæcula, sub vetere Abraham, Josue, Daniel coram angelis procumbentes non reprehenduntur: sub novo Johannes idem bis faciens bis reprehenditur, Apoc. xix. et xxii."). Chrys. and Thl. are commonly quoted for this view even by Bleek: but if I understand Chrys., he means, as Thl. certainly does, that the οἰκουμένη here is identical with that in ch. i. 6, and that the Writer calls it μέλλουσαν, because at the time of the divine decree here spoken of, it was not yet created: μέλλουσαν δὲ αὐτὴν φησί, διότι ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἦν ἀεί, αὕτη δὲ ἔμελλε γίνεσθαι, μὴ οὖσα πρότερον δηλαδή. ὅσον οὖν πρὸς τὴν ἀΐδιον ὕπαρξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ, μέλλουσα ἦν ἡ οἰκουμένη. And nearly so Chrys., but not so plainly. This last-mentioned view is by far the best, agreeing as it does with the connexion, for he has been speaking of the gospel above,—with the usus loquendi,—with the whole subject of the Epistle.

The word μέλλουσαν has by some been supposed to be used "ex prospectu veteris Test. prophetico in Novum Test.," as Bengel, who again says, "*Futurus* dicitur, non quin jam sit, sed quia olim prædictus." And so Bleek (as an additional reason why the word was used, besides that the completion of the state is yet to come), al. I should be disposed, standing as the expression does here without emphasis, to regard μέλλουσαν rather as a well-known and well-understood designation of the latter dispensation, here technically adjoined, than as requiring minute explanation in this place. *All* reference to the future need not be excluded: we Christians are so eminently "prisoners of hope," that the very mention of such a designation would naturally awaken a thought of the glories to come: but this reference must not be pressed as having any prominence. With this latter view agrees in the main that of Delitzsch, which I have seen since this note

τὶς λέγων [f]Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι [g]μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ, ἢ

f Psa. viii. 4—6.
g μιμν., ch. xiii. 3 only. Isa. lxii. 6.

6. for τι, τις (*as* LXX-A) C[1][P] lect-2 tol D-lat copt [Euthal-ms] Damasc.

was first written. He concurs with Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erf. ii. 23, in requiring a more concrete sense for the words, and understands them to point to the new world of Redemption, as distinguished from the old world of Creation, which by reason of sin is subject to death and decay. So that *μέλλουσα* is not used from the O. T. standing-point, but from the N. T. also, and points to the times of the Messiah in their ideal perfection which shall one day be realized), **of which we are speaking** (which forms the subject of our present argument: viz. that urged in vv. 1—4. The sense is strictly *present*; not past (see Grot. above), nor future ("enallage temporis; de quo in sequenti testimonio loquemur," as Vatablus). Bleek has here some excellent remarks: "As regards the whole thought, the non-subjection of the new order of the world to angels, it respects partly what is already present, partly what we have yet to wait for. Certainly, here and there in the N. T. history angels are mentioned: but they come in only as transitory appearances, to announce or to execute some matter which is specially entrusted to them: they never appear as essential agents in the introduction of the kingdom of God, either in general, or in particular: they do not descend on earth as preaching repentance, or preparing men to be received into God's kingdom. This is done by *men*, first and chiefly by Him who is Son of Man *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and after Him by the disciples whom He prepared for the work. Even the miraculous conversion of Paul is brought about not by angels, but by the appearing of the Lord Himself. Our author has indeed in ch. i. 14, designated the angels as fellow-workers in the salvation of men: but only in a serving capacity, never as working or imparting salvation by independent agency, as does the Son of Man in the first place, and then in a certain degree his disciples also. So that we cannot speak with any truth of a subjection of this new order of things to the angels. Rather, even by what we see at present, does it appear to be subjected to the Redeemer Himself. And this will ever more and more be the case; for,—according to the prophetic declaration of the Psalm,—the whole world shall be put under His feet (ver. 8). Thus, by reminding them of the will of God declared in the holy Scriptures, does the Writer meet at the same time the objections of those of his readers and countrymen, to whom perhaps this withdrawal of the agency of the angels with the introduction and growing realization of the new order of things might appear an important defect"). 6.] **But** ("δέ introduces a contrast to a preceding negative sentence frequently in our Epistle: cf. ch. iv. 13, 15; ix. 12; x. 27; xii. 13. It makes a more sharply marked contrast than ἀλλά, as our aber or vielmehr as compared with sondern." Bleek. Cf. Thuc. i. 125, *ἐνιαυτὸς μὲν οὐ διετρίβη, ἔλασσον δέ*: ib. 5, *οὐκ ἔχοντός πω αἰσχύνην τούτου τοῦ ἔργου, φέροντος δέ τι καὶ δόξης μᾶλλον*: id. iv. 86, *οὐκ ἐπὶ κακῷ, ἐπ' ἐλευθερώσει δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων παρελήλυθα*: Herod. ix. 8, *οὔκω ἀποτετείχιστο, ἐργάζοντο δέ*: and see many other examples in Hartung, Partikellehre, i. 171. δέ then here introduces the positive in contradistinction to the negative sentence preceding. An ellipsis follows it, to be supplied in the thought, 'it is far otherwise, for' . . . .) **one somewhere** (no inference can be drawn from this indefinite manner of citation, either that the Writer was quoting from memory, as Koppe, Schulz, al., or that he did not know who was the author of the Psalm, as Grot. Rather may we say, that it shews he was writing for readers familiar with the Scriptures, and from whom it might well be expected that they would recognize the citation without further specification. He certainly is not quoting from memory, seeing that the words agree exactly with the LXX: and Ps. viii. both in the Heb. and LXX has a superscription indicating that it was written by David. Chrys. says, *τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὸ οἶμαι τὸ κρύπτειν κ. μὴ τιθέναι τὸν εἰρηκότα τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἀλλ' ὡς περιφερομένην κ. κατάδηλον οὖσαν εἰσάγειν, δεικνύοντός ἐστιν αὐτοὺς σφόδρα ἐμπείρους εἶναι τῶν γραφῶν.* And Thl.. *οὐ λέγει τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ εἰπόντος ἅτε πρὸς ἐπιστήμονας τῶν γραφῶν διαλεγόμενος.* Bleek quotes numerous instances of the same formula citandi from Philo, as applied both to Scripture writers and profane authors. Thus De Ebrietate, § 14, vol. i. p. 365 end, *εἶπε γάρ πού τις*, viz. Abraham, in Gen. xx. 12: De Opif. Mund. § 5, p. 5, *ὅπερ καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων εἶπέ τις*, viz. Plato: al. And our Writer has again, ch. iv. 4, *εἴρηκε γάρ που περὶ τῆς ἑβδόμης οὕτως*, viz. Gen. ii. 2. In all such cases the indefiniteness is designed and rhetorical. We can hardly infer, with Bleek and De Wette, that the Writer meant to express his feeling that

υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι [h] ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτόν; 7 [i] ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν

h = Matt. xxv. 36, 43. Luke i. 68. vii. 16. James i. 27. Sir. vii. 35. i ver. 9. John iii. 30 only. 1 Kings xxi. 15. Philo de Opif. § 29, vol. i. p. 21, ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὴν τάξιν ἠλάττωται.

the O. T. books had no human authors, but God Himself: for in this case, as Lünemann remarks, the personal *τις* would hardly have been used, but a passive construction adopted instead) **testified** (the word **διαμαρτυρέω** has in Attic law the technical sense of appearing as a witness previously to the admission of a cause into court, for the plaintiff or defendant, to substantiate or oppugn its admissibility: so Harpocration, *πρὸ τοῦ εἰσαχθῆναι τὴν δίκην εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, ἐξῆν τῷ βουλομένῳ διαμαρτυρῆσαι ὡς εἰσαγώγιμός ἐστιν ἡ δίκη, ἢ οὐκ εἰσαγώγιμος*. Hence the deponent middle, **διαμαρτύρομαι**, is *to call in*, or *invoke witnesses* to the justice of one's cause or truth of one's assertion. And thus it acquires its less proper senses of *conjuring*, *earnestly beseeching*, on the one hand: and *affirming*, *positively asserting*, either absolutely, as here, or with an accusative of reference, on the other. Both these two are found in the N. T. See reff.: the former occurs chiefly in the pastoral Epistles, the latter in reff. Acts, 1 Thess., Jer.), **saying** (this seems the proper place for a few remarks on the sense of the citation which follows, and on the connexion of thought in the rest of the chapter. The general import of the *eighth Psalm* may be described as being, to praise Jehovah for His glory and majesty, and His merciful dealing with and exaltation of mankind. All exegesis which loses sight of this general import, and attempts to force the Psalm into a direct and exclusive prophecy of the personal Messiah, goes to conceal its true prophetic sense, and to obscure the force and beauty of its reference to Him. This has been done by Bleek and others, who have made 'the Son of Man' a direct title here of Christ. It is MAN who in the Psalm is spoken of, in the common and most general sense: the care taken by God of *him*, the lordship given to *him*, the subjection of God's works to *him*. This high dignity he lost, but this high dignity he has regained, and possesses potentially in all its fulness and glory, restored and for ever secured to him. How? and by whom? By one of his own race, the MAN Christ Jesus. Whatever high and glorious things can be said of man, belong *de proprio jure* to Him only, *propriâ personâ* to Him only, but derivatively to us His brethren and members. And this is the great key to the interpretation of all such sayings as these: whatever belongs to man by the constitution of his nature, belongs *κατ' ἐξοχήν* to that MAN, who is the constituted HEAD of man's nature, the second Adam, who has more than recovered all that the first Adam lost. To those who clearly apprehend and firmly hold this fundamental doctrine of Christianity, the interpretation of ancient prophecy, and the N. T. application of O. T. sayings to Christ, become a far simpler matter than they ever can be to others. And so here, it is to MAN, not to angels, that the 'world to come' is subjected. This is the argument: and, as far as the end of ver. 8, it is carried on with reference to *man*, properly so called. There is *here* as yet no personal reference to our Lord, who is first introduced, and that in his lower personal human Name, at ver. 9. This has been missed, and thus confusion introduced into the argument, by the majority of Commentators. To hold that our Lord is from the first intended by **ἄνθρωπος** and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* here, is to disturb altogether the logical sequence, which runs thus: 'It is *not to angels* that He has subjected the latter dispensation, but to *man*. Still, we do not see man in possession of this sovereignty. No; but we do see Jesus, whose humiliation fulfilled the conditions of manhood, crowned with glory and honour, and thus constituted the Head of our race, so that His death and sufferings were our deliverance and our perfecting. And for this to be so, the Sanctifier and the sanctified must be all of one race.' And the rest of the chapter is spent in laying forth with inimitable beauty and tenderness the necessity and effect of Jesus being thus made like us. The whole process of this second chapter stands without parallel for tender persuasiveness amidst the strictest logical coherence. And yet both of these are concealed and spoiled, unless we take these words of the Psalm, and the argument founded on them, of man generally, and then, and not till then, of Jesus, as man like ourselves. And so Clem.-alex. (Strom. iv. 3, pp. 566 f. P), Chrys., Thl., Thdrt. (*τὸ δὲ "τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος" εἴρηται μὲν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως, ἁρμόττει δὲ τῇ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀπαρχῇ, ὡς οἰκειουμένῃ τὰ πάσης τῆς φύσεως*. See also on the Psalm): so Pellicanus, Calvin, Piscator, Schlichting, Grot., Jansen., Bengel, and almost all the moderns, including Delitzsch. The principal upholders of the other view are Beza (in part), Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, and the Lutheran Commentators, and recently Bleek), **What is man** (some, e. g. Kuinoel, have understood this

[k] *βραχύ τι* [l] *παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ* [m] *ἐστεφάνωσας*

k = (see note) ver. 9. John vi. 7. 1 Kings xvi. 29. 2 Kings xix. 26. l = ch. i. 4 reff. m ver. 9. 2 Tim. ii. 5 only. Ps. v. 12.

to mean, "How great, how noble, is man; who even amongst the immensity of all these heavenly works of God, yet is remembered and visited of Him!" but against this are the words here used in the Heb.: אֱנוֹשׁ in the first member of the parallel, and בֶן־אָדָם in the second, both betokening man on his lower side, of weakness and inferiority. There can be little doubt that the ordinary view is right—not '*quantus est homo*,' but '*quantulus est homo*.' This agrees far better also with the wonder expressed at God's thinking of and visiting him, below), **that thou art mindful of him** (i. e. objectively,—as shewn by Thy care of him), **or** (in the Heb. ו; ἢ is here doubtless substituted for it by the LXX, to indicate that the second member of the parallelism does not point to another subject additional to the first. Bleek is hardly right, when he says, that the ἢ has *here* a meaning somewhat modified from *καί*, as bringing out more definitely 'the Son of Man,' the Messiah, who follows. For (see above), the thought of Him is as yet in the background,—nay, carefully *kept* back; and the reference as yet to man generally) **the son of man** (proceeding on the same view as that given above, it would be irrelevant here to enter on an enquiry as to the application of this title to our Lord, by others and by Himself,—inasmuch as it is not here appropriated to Him, but used of any and every son of Adam. It is true, our thoughts at once recur to Him on reading the words—but, if we are following the train of thought, only as their ulterior, not as their immediate reference), **that Thou visitest** (reff.: the common word by which the LXX express the Heb. פָּקַד, and almost always in a good sense (see exceptions, Jer. v. 9, 29 al., in Trommius). The good sense is never departed from in the N. T. It is often found in the classics: e. g. in Ajax's celebrated speech, Soph. Aj. 854, *ὦ θάνατε θάνατε, νῦν μ᾽ ἐπίσκεψαι μολών*: Eur. Heracl. 869, *ὦ Ζεῦ, χρόνῳ μὲν τἄμ᾽ ἐπεσκέψω κακά*. It is very commonly used of a physician or other visiting the sick; so Xen. Cyr. v. 4. 10, *ὡς ἐπισκέψαιτο τὸν Γαδάταν πῶς ἔχοι ἐκ τοῦ τραύματος*: Mem. iii. 11. 10. See Palm and Rost's Lex.) **him?**

7.] **Thou madest him a little lower than the angels** (Heb., וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ מְּעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים: which is literally, "Thou lettest him be little inferior to God." "חָסֵר in Kal betokens 'to be without,' 'to fall short of,' and has, like all other verbs of abounding and wanting, the thing wanted in the accusative: see Gesen. § 135. 3. b. The causative Pihel, 'to make or let want,' takes consequently a double accusative, of the person (here הוּ) and of the thing (here מְעַט): see Gesen. § 136. 1. מִן is usually taken comparative, '*in comparison of God*:' according to Hupfeld, it is properly partitive, '*of God*:' of the attributes which constitute the essence of God." De Wette: and thus also Calvin: "Tot decoribus ornatos esse dicit ut eorum conditio divina et cœlesti gloria non longe sit inferior." But when De W. goes on, in treating of מְעַט, to say that some understand it, *with the LXX*, of *time*, and refers to Heb. ii. 6, 7 to confirm this, I must venture to doubt, though I find the same very generally assumed (e. g. by Calvin,—"Videtur apostolus verba trahere in diversum sensum quam intellexerit David. Nam *βραχύ τι* videtur ad tempus referre ut sit *paulisper*, et imminutionem intelligit quum exinanitus fuit Christus, et gloriam ad resurrectionis diem restringit, quum David generaliter extendat ad totam hominis vitam." And then he defends this method of quotation on the ground of there being "nihil incommodi si allusiones in verbis quærat ad ornandam præsentem causam." Similarly Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, and most of the moderns: and, maintaining the sense of *time* in the *Psalm also*, Beza, Gerhard, Calov., Peirce, Michaelis, al.), whether this is so certain after all. The expression **βραχύ τι** is used both in the classics and in Hellenistic Greek, just as much of space and quantity, as of time; as the following examples (besides reff.) will shew, gathered from Wetst., Bleek, and from various indices: Hippocrat. de Natur. Hominum i., *τὸ μὲν ὅλον βιβλίον σχεδὸν εἰς χ᾽ στίχους ἢ βραχύ τι ἧττον ἐκτεταμένον*: Thucyd. i. 63, *βραχὺ μέν τι προῆλθον ὡς βοηθήσοντες*: 2 Kings xvi. 1, *καὶ Δαυεὶδ παρῆλθε βραχύ τι ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥῶς*: Galen, de Usu Part. xiv., *ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ διαπλάσει βραχύ τι πλημμεληθῇ*: id. de Facult. Med. Simpl. v., *ὑπερβάλλουσιν βραχύ τι ῥητίνῃ κ. πίττᾳ*: ib. vi., *φαίνεται μὲν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ βραχύ τι τὸ δριμύ, πλεῖστον δὲ τὸ πικρόν*. Also Plato, Legg. x. p. 906 B, *βραχὺ δέ τι καὶ τῆς ἂν τις τῶν τοιούτων ἐνοικοῦν ἡμῖν σαφὲς ἴδοι*. It is used of *time* in Luke xxii. 58: Acts v. 34; xxvii. 28: Isa. lvii. 17. This being the case, I do not see why it should be at once set down that the LXX or our Writer

n Luke x. 17, 20. Rom. viii. 20. 1 Cor. xv. 27 (from l. c.) 1 Pet. iii. 22. Ps. xvii. 47. Matt. xiii. 4 al. fr.

αὐτόν, 8 πάντα n ὑπέταξας o ὑποκάτω τῶν o ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. p ἐν τῷ γὰρ n ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ q τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν r ἀφῆκεν

ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

o Matt. xxii. 44. Mark vi. 11. Rev. xii. 1. p ch. iii. 15. viii. 13. see q ch. i. 3 reff. r = Acts xiv. 17. 1 Macc. i. 48. see ch. vi. 1.

7. rec at end ins και κατεστησας αυτον επι τα εργα των χειρων σου (*prob addn from LXX*), with ACD[1]M[P]ℵ b m 17 latt [Syr(ed-widm)] syr-w-ast [copt æth arm Euthal-ms] Thdrt Sedul: om BD[3]KL rel Syr-mss-edd Chr Damasc Œc Thl.

8. rec γαρ bef τω, with ACKL[P] rel [Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt]: txt BDMℵ. τα παντα bef υποτ. αυτω D syr [copt].—om αυτω B D-lat [arm-usc: ins syr-w-ob].

necessarily referred it to time, either here or in ver. 9: see below. So also Kuinoel, Heinrichs, Wahl, and Bretschneider. The only point remaining for discussion is **ἀγγέλους**, the LXX rendering of אֱלֹהִים, and the meaning understood also by the Chaldee paraphrast. The best Hebrew scholars seem to agree that it represents, not the personal God, but the abstract qualities of Godhead, in which all that is divine, or immediately connected with the Deity, is included. This, as Hupfeld himself confesses, the angels may well be, in so far as they may be called אֱלֹהִים, or בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים. If so, then the rendering of the LXX and our text is, though not exhaustive of the original, yet by no means an inaccurate one. The angelic nature, being the lowest of that which is divine and heavenly, marks well the terminus just beneath which man is set. And it must be remarked, that the stress of the argument here is not on this mention of the angels, but on the assertion of the sovereignty of man. The verb **ἐλαττοῦν** is in frequent classical use: see Palm and Rost's Lex.: and notice the parallel from Philo in reff.): **thou crownedst him with glory and honour** (I must remind the reader of what has been said before; that the quotation is adduced *here* not of the Messiah but of *man*, and that on this the whole subsequent argument depends. With this view vanish the difficulties which have been raised about the original and the here-intended meaning of this clause. It is, in fact, a further setting forth of the preceding one. Man, who was left not far behind the divine attributes themselves, was also invested with kingly majesty on earth, put into the place of God Himself in sovereignty over the world. That this has only been realized in the man Jesus Christ is not brought out till below, and forms the central point of the argument. Hupfeld remarks, that כָּבוֹד וְהָדָר, here rendered δόξῃ κ. τιμῇ, is a common expression for the divine majesty, and thence for the kingly, as a reflection of the divine: and the crowning represents the kingly majesty, with which man is adorned as with a kingly crown: Calv., "Decoratum esse honoris insignibus quæ non longe a divino fulgore absint"): 8.] **thou didst put** (the Heb. is *perfect:* on which Hupfeld remarks, "The imperf. is at first continued from the foregoing verses, but in the concluding sentence all is finished with the perfect שַׁתָּה, and treated as a standing arrangement and permanent ordering of things: 'all things hast thou put under his feet.'" So that our E. V., though imperfectly representing the Greek, is true to the original Heb.) **all things under his feet** (these words form in the Heb. and LXX the second member of a parallelism, the first of which, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου, is found indeed in our rec. text, but (see var. readd.) must be omitted on critical principles. The probable cause why the Writer omitted it, has been discussed by Bleek. He thinks that it was unnecessary to the argumentation, the latter clause expressing more definitely the same thing. This he gathers, believing the whole to apply to our Saviour: but the same will hold good on our understanding of the passage also.

The words themselves are plain. Universal dominion is bestowed on man by his constitution as he came from God. That that bestowal has never yet been realized, is the next step of the argument: the Redeemer being at present kept out of sight, but by and by to be introduced as the real fulfiller of this high destiny of man, and on that account, incarnate in man's nature. It is, as Ebrard remarks, astonishing that a thorough Commentator like Bleek should have so entirely misread and misunderstood the logical connexion of so clear a passage: while he himself confesses, that it looks as if the Person were first introduced in ver. 9, to whom vv. 6, 7, have been pointing: and yet denies that in ver. 6 f. ἄνθρωπος can mean 'mankind.' Besides all other objections, on Bleek's view, the question τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος κ.τ.λ. loses all appropriate meaning. The connexion was first laid out by Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erfüll. ii. 23 ff.: Schriftbeweis i. 185—188; ii. 1. 38 ff., and is adopted by Ebrard and Delitzsch).

For (Bleek thinks that the **γάρ** rather repeats the former γάρ, ver. 5, than has any

αὐτῷ [s] ἀνυπότακτον· νῦν δὲ οὔπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ [q] τὰ πάντα [n] ὑποτεταγμένα. [9] τὸν δὲ [t] βραχύ τι [t] παρ' ἀγγέλους

s 1 Tim. i. 9. Tit. i. 6, 10 only †.
t ver. 6 (reff.).

logical force of its own here. This peculiar use of γάρ, he says, is characteristic of our Epistle: see ch. iv. 2, 3; iv. 15; v. 1; vii. 12, 13: see his vol. i. p. 330. Hofmann however protests strongly against this view (Weissag. ii. 26, &c. as above), holding the **γάρ** to be ratiocinative, and justificative of the Psalm, as referring back to Gen. i. 28 to substantiate the ὑπέταξας. But, as Delitzsch remarks, this would be but to prove *idem per idem;* for the ὑπέταξας itself necessarily refers back to Gen. i. 28. He therefore prefers Bleek's view, which is also that of Tholuck, De Wette, and Winer,—that **γάρ** grounds, or rather begins to ground, that already asserted in ver. 5) **in that he** (viz. God: not the writer of the Psalm, as Heinrichs: unless indeed we are to understand ὑποτάξαι to mean εἰπεῖν ὅτι ὑποτέτακται, as St. Paul expresses it 1 Cor. xv. 27: but the other is much simpler, more analogous to usage, and more in the sense of the Psalm, which is a direct address to God) **put all things** (*the universe:* not πάντα, as before, merely, but **τὰ πάντα**) **under him** (Man, again: not, Christ: see above, and remarks at the end of the verse) **He left** (aor. as in E. V.; not perfect, which would be ἀφεῖκεν) **nothing** ("Nec cœlestia videtur excepisse nec terrestria," Primasius: and so Estius, al. Possibly: and in the application itself, certainly: but we can hardly say that such was his thought *here.* The idea that angels are especially here intended, has arisen from that misconception of the connexion, which I have been throughout endeavouring to meet) **unsubjected** (see reff. where, as in υἱοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι, Symm. 1 Kings ii. 12, it is in the sense of *rebellious.* The word belongs to later Greek: we have, Arrian, Epictet. ii. 10, ταύτῃ (to the will of man) τὰ ἄλλα ὑποτεταγμένα, αὐτὴ δ' ἀδούλωτον κ. **ἀνυπότακτον**: Porphyr. Oneirocrit. 196, **ἀνυπότακτος** ἔσται πᾶσιν: Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 1, vol. i. p. 473. **ἀνυποτάκτῳ** φορᾷ χρῆσθαι: and in Polyb. several times, **ἀνυπότακτος** διήγησις, "narratio quæ non habet notitiam antecedentem in animo discentis cui ceu fundamento et basi innitatur." Casaubon) **to him: but** (contrast bringing out the exception) **now** ('ut nunc est:' in the present condition of things: not strictly temporal, but as the νῦν, ch. xi. 16, and the νυνί, ch. ix. 26) **we see not yet** (cf. on the whole, 1 Cor. xv. 24—27) **all things** (**τὰ π.**, again) **put under him** (the αὐτῷ in all three places referring to MAN: man has not yet attained his sovereignty. That the summing up of manhood in Christ is in the Writer's mind, is evident throughout, and that he wishes it to be before his readers' minds also; but the gradual introduction of the humiliation and exaltation of Christ in His humanity is marred by making all this apply personally to Him. Manhood, as such, is exalted to glory and honour, and waiting for its primæval prerogative to be fully assured, but it is IN CHRIST, and in Him alone, that this is true: and in Him it is true, inasmuch as He, being of our flesh and blood, and having been Himself made perfect by sufferings, and calling us His brethren, can lead us up through sufferings into glory, freed from guilt by His sacrifice for our sins). **9**] We do not see man, &c.: **but** (**δέ**, strong contrast again: '*but rather*' —see on ver. 6) **him who is made** (better than '*was,*' or '*hath been, made;*' His humanity in its abstract position being in view) **a little** (not necessarily, here either, of time (as Delitzsch here, though not above): nor are we at liberty to assume such a rendering: though of course it is difficult to say, when the same phrase has two analogous meanings both applicable, as this, how far the one may have accompanied the other in the Writer's mind) **lower than (the) angels, we behold** (notice the difference between the half-involuntary ὁρῶμεν above, the impression which our eyes receive from things around us,—and the direction and intention of the contemplating eye (here, of faith: cf. ch. iii. 19; x. 25) in **βλέπομεν**), **(namely) Jesus** (Lünemann is quite right against Ebrard here. The latter would take the words thus: "*But we behold Jesus* (object) τὸν βρ. τι παρ' ἀγγ. ἠλαττ. (adjectival attribute to Ἰησοῦν), ἐστεφανωμένον (predicate)." But this would be to throw Ἰησοῦν into a position of emphasis: and would have been expressed Ἰησοῦν δὲ τὸν κ.τ.λ., or, τὸν δὲ βρ. τ. π. ἀγ. ἠλ. Ἰησοῦν βλέπομεν. As it is, Ἰησοῦν, standing as it does behind the verb, is, as Lünem. well remarks, altogether unemphasized, and is merely an explicative addition, to make it clear who is intended by τὸν βρ. τι παρ' ἀγγ. ἠλαττωμένον. So that this latter clause is the object, διά to ἐστεφ. (see below) the predicate, and Ἰησοῦν an appositional elucidation of the object. So Hofmann *now,* Schriftb. i. 187. Formerly he took it as Ebrard; Weissag. u. Erfüll. ii. 28. Delitzsch takes Ἰησοῦν as the object and τὸν ἠλαττωμ. κ.τ.λ. as the appositional clause. But I prefer as above: see more

[t] ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν [u] διὰ τὸ [v w] πάθημα τοῦ

ABCDK LMP℞ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

u see διά, Phil. ii. 9.
v ver. 10. ch. x. 32. elsw. Paul (Rom. vii. 5 al[8].) and 1 Pet. (i. 11 al[3].) only †.
w gen., John v. 29. 2 Cor. ix. 13 al. Winer, edn. 6, § 30. 2. β.

below), **on account of his suffering of death** (it has been much doubted whether these words belong, 1. to the foregoing clause, *βραχύ τι παρ. ἀγγ. ἠλαττ.*, or, 2. to the following, *δόξῃ κ. τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον*. The former connexion is assumed without remark by the ancient Commentators: so Origen in Joann. tom. ii. 6 (vol. iv. p. 62), *ἀγγέλων ἐλάττονα διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*: Augustine, contra Maximin. ii. 25, vol. viii. (misquoted in Bleek), „Eum autem modico minus quam angelos minoratum vidimus Jesum propter passionem mortis. Non ergo propter naturam hominis, sed propter passionem mortis:" Chrys., Thdrt. (see below), (not Thl. as Bleek: see below), Beza, Schlichting, Justiniani, a-Lapide, Cameron (but interpreting it "per illud tempus quo passus est mortem"), Calov., Limborch, Owen, Michaelis, Baumgarten, Semler, Dindorf, Wakefield. And these interpret the words two ways: *a.* on account of the suffering of death, i. e. because He has suffered death (*οὐ τῇ φύσει τῆς θεότητος τῶν ἀγγέλων ἠλάττωται, ἀλλὰ τῷ πάθει τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος*, Thdrt.),—thus making *βραχύ τι* refer to the time of His sufferings and death, or as Chrys. (*τὸ βραχὺ αὐτῷ ἂν ἁρμόσειε . . . τῷ τρεῖς ἡμέρας γενομένῳ ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ μόνας*), al., to the three days of His being in the grave: *β.* for the sake of the suffering of death, = *εἰς τὸ πάσχειν τ. θ.* So Aug. above, and most of the foregoing list. But, 2. the latter connexion, with the following clause, is adopted by Theophylact (as Thl. has been said by Bleek to maintain the other connexion, I give his note entire: *σπουδάζει δεῖξαι τὰ ῥηθέντα τῷ χριστῷ προσαρμόζοντα, καὶ φησὶν ὅτι εἰ καὶ τὰ πάντα ὑπέταξεν οὔπω δοκεῖ ἁρμόζειν αὐτῷ, καίτοι ἐδείξαμεν ὅτι πάντως καὶ τοῦτο ἐκβήσεται. ἀλλ' οὖν τὸ βραχύ τι ἠλαττῶσθαι παρ' ἀγγέλους, τούτῳ ἁρμόζει ἢ ἡμῖν. καὶ γὰρ ὁ μὲν τρεῖς ἡμέρας γεγονὼς ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ ὡς ἄνθρωπος, βραχὺ ἠλάττωται τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἅτε μηδ' ὅλως θανάτῳ ὑπαγομένων ἐκείνων· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ φθειρόμενοι, οὐ βραχὺ ἀλλὰ πάμπολυ αὐτῶν ἠλαττώμεθα. καὶ* **τὸ δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανῶσθαι διὰ τὸ πάθος**, *ἐκείνῳ μᾶλλον ἁρμόζει ἢ ἡμῖν. πάθημα δὲ θανάτου εἰπών, τὸν ἀληθῆ θάνατον ἐδήλωσεν. οὐ φαντασία γὰρ θανάτου, ἀλλὰ πάθημα ἦν ἔνεργον. ἀνέμνησε δὲ τοῦ σταυροῦ κ. τοῦ θανάτου, ἵνα πείσῃ αὐτοὺς γενναίως φέρειν τὰς θλίψεις, εἰς τὸν διδάσκαλον ἀφορῶντας. ἀλλὰ* **καὶ δόξα**, *φησί*, **καὶ τιμὴ ὁ σταυρὸς αὐτῷ γέγονεν**· *οὐκοῦν καὶ ὑμῖν αἱ θλίψεις κ. τὰ πάθη· τί οὖν ἀποπηδᾶτε τῶν στεφανούντων; ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ σοῦ τοῦ δούλου ἔπαθε· σὺ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέχῃ θλιβῆναι τοῦ δεσπότου;* Here, although he partially adopts the notion of *βραχύ τι* referring to the three days, it is evident both from the words which I have noted by different type, and by the application which he makes to ourselves, that he joins *διὰ τὸ πάθ. τ. θ.* with *δόξῃ κ. τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον*, not with the preceding clause), Luther, Calvin, Estius, Grot., Seb.-Schmidt, Bengel, Wetst., Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Bleek, Tholuck, Ebrard, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al. The question must be determined by the arrangement of the words, and by the requirements of the context. And both these seem to require the latter, not the former connexion. The words *διὰ τὸ πάθ. τ. θ.* are emphatic; they are taken up again in the next sentence by *διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι* (which words themselves are a witness that suffering and exaltation, not suffering and degradation, are here connected). But emphatic they could not be in the *former* connexion, coming as they would only as an explicatory clause, after *βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγ. ἠλαττωμένον*. Again, the former connexion hardly satisfies the *διά* with an accusative; certainly not if the sense *a.*, *because He has suffered death*, be taken; and if the other, *β.*, we should have expected rather *εἰς τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θ.*, or *εἰς τὸ παθεῖν τὸν θ.* Whereas the latter connexion entirely satisfies the context, the sufferings of Christ being treated of as necessary to His being our perfect Redeemer: entirely also fulfils the requirements of *διά* with an accusative; wherein, which is no small consideration in its favour, it is in strict analogy with the construction in ref. Phil., *γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν κ.τ.λ.* And this connexion will be made even clearer by what will be said on the next clause, *ὅπως κ.τ.λ.*), **crowned with glory and honour** (viz. at His exaltation, when God exalted Him to His right Hand: not, as some (e. g. Hofmann, ubi supra: see also Schriftbeweis i. 271, um des Todes willen ist Jesus mit der Berufsherrlichkeit und Berufsehre gekrönt), at His incarnation, or His establishment as Saviour of the world: see above, ver. 7): **in order that** (how is this **ὅπως** logically constructed? In answering the question, we may at once dismiss all impossible senses of *ὅπως*, invented to

[w] θανάτου δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ [x] ἐστεφανωμένον, ὅπως [y] χάριτι

x ver. 7. y dat. Rom. iii. 24. xi. 6. 1 Cor. xv. 10. Eph. ii. 5, 8. Tit. iii. 7. P. H.

9. for χαριτι, χωρις M 67² Syr-mss(*"The common text of the Syriac has χαριτι. This reading has been considered to be Monophysite; and another which is found in some mss and in the edn of Tremellius, is equally supposed to be preferred by the Nestorians,* 'for he apart from God (or except God) should taste death,' &c. *But this latter reading is much more ancient than all questions about the Eutychian and Nestorian controversy; it is simply the rendering of χωρις θεου found in some authorities. Nestorians might* prefer *this, but they did not* (as Œc Thl say) *invent it."* Treg. in Horne iv. 262) [syr-ms] Orig(χωρὶς θεοῦ . . ἤ ὅπερ ἔν τισι κεῖται . . ἀντιγρ. χάριτι θεοῦ, and elsw ὅπως χάριτι ἢ χωρὶς θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.) Thdor-mops(expr: γελοιότατον δή τι πάσχουσιν ἐνταῦθα τὸ χωρὶς θεοῦ ἐναλλάττοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες χάριτι θεοῦ οὐ προσέχοντες τῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ τῆς γραφῆς κ.τ.λ.) Thdrt₂ Ambr₁ Fulg₁ Vig-taps₁. (*Storr Griesb Kuin Scholz Mey Tischdf Delitzsch think that it may have been a marginal gloss on ver 8, arising from comparing ουδεν αφηκ. αυτω ανυπ. with* 1 *Cor* xv. 27; *and then erroneously taken into the text here: on the whole see note.*)

escape the difficulty: such as the supposed *ecbatic* sense, *"so that"* (Erasm. (paraphr.), Valck., Kuinoel, &c.), *"postquam* mortem gustavit," Schleusner; &c. &c. ὅπως has no such ecbatic sense any where: and its temporal sense is altogether unexampled with the subjunctive mood. It can have here none but its constant telic sense: *'in order that.'* And as to its dependence we must have recourse to no inversions of construction, but take it simply as we find it, however difficult. It depends then on the last clause, which clause it will be best to take in its entirety, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον. The full connexion we cannot enter into, till the three other questions arising out of our clause are disposed of: **χάριτι θεοῦ— ὑπὲρ παντός**—and **γεύσηται θανάτου**) **by the grace of God** (here comes into question the very important various reading **χωρὶς θεοῦ**, the authorities for which see in the digest. That it does not owe its origin to the Nestorians, whatever use they may have made of it, is evident from Origen reading and expounding it. In his time it was the prevalent reading, the present ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ being found only ἔν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις. Theodoret here, and on Eph. i. 10 (see below), knew of no other reading: nor did Ambrose, nor Fulgentius. Jerome on Gal. iii. 10 says, "Quia Christus *gratia Dei*, sive ut in quibusdam exemplaribus legitur, *absque Deo*, pro omnibus mortuus est." In the Greek Church, the Nestorians mostly held fast to the old reading, as favouring their views. It may be well to cite Theophylact on this point: οἱ δὲ Νεστοριανοὶ παραποιοῦντες τὴν γραφὴν φασι· "χωρὶς θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου," ἵνα συστήσωσιν ὅτι ἐσταυρωμένῳ τῷ χριστῷ οὐ συνῆν ἡ θεότης, ἅτε μὴ καθ' ὑπόστασιν αὐτῷ ἡνωμένη, ἀλλὰ κατὰ σχέσιν. πρὸς οὓς ὀρθόδοξός τις χλευάζων τὴν ἀνοησίαν αὐτῶν εἶπεν· ὅτι ἐχέτω, ὥς φατε, ἡ γραφή, καὶ οὕτως ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστι τὸ λεγόμενον· χωρὶς γὰρ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς ἄλλου ἀπέθανεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτῶν, ἵνα λύσῃ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐχθρὰν αὐτῶν καὶ χαρὰν αὐτοῖς περιποιήσηται. And similarly Œcumenius. In our copies of the Peschito this reading is not now found, but the passage runs "Nam ipse Deus per gratiam suam pro omni homine gustavit mortem" ("For He Aloha in his grace for every man hath tasted death," Etheridge's version): but (see digest) in certain mss., we have a combination of the readings, "Ipse enim excepto Deo per gratiam suam pro omni homine gustavit mortem," [but this combination appears to be due to Editors only, and not to mss.] Bleek adduces, from the 8th century, Anastatius Abbas, a writer of Palestine: "Absque Deo: sola enim divina natura non egebat." In modern times, the reading has been defended by Camerarius, Colomesius, Bengel, Ch. Fr. Schmid, Paulus, and more recently Ebrard and Baumgarten. Hofmann once defended it, Weissag. u. Erfüll. i. 92; but has now given it up;—Entstehungsgeschichte, u.s.w. p. 338. By those who have adopted it, it has been interpreted three different ways: 1. as Origen (ὑπὲρ πάντων χωρὶς θεοῦ), Thdrt. (πάντα γὰρ ὅσα κτιστὴν ἔχει τὴν φύσιν, ταύτης ἐδεῖτο τῆς θεραπείας· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν· ὅπως χωρὶς θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου. μόνη φησὶν ἡ θεία φύσις ἀνενδεής, τἄλλα δὲ πάντα τοῦ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως ἐδεῖτο φαρμάκου), Thl. and Œc. (hypothetically, see above), and Ebrard; and in a modification, Bengel and Schmid ("Omne, præter Deum, Christo subjectum est,' Beng.: in accordance with 1 Cor. xv. 27). 2. as Ambrose, Fulgentius, and the Nestorians, and Colomesius ("Ut divinitate tantisper deposita, ut homo mortem subiret pro omnibus"). 3. as Paulus and Baumgarten,— "forsaken of God," as witnessed by the cry on the cross. In considering the

θεοῦ [z] ὑπὲρ [a] παντὸς [bc] γεύσηται [b] θανάτου. 10 [d] Ἔπρεπεν

z = John x. 11, 15. 2 Cor. v. 15. 1 Tim. ii. 6. 1 John iii. 16. a so sing., ch. iii. 4. iv. 12. v. 1, 13. viii. 3. x. 11. xii. 11. b Matt. xvi. 28 ||. c ch. vi. 4, 5. 1 Pet. ii. 3 al. Job xx. 18. Ps. xxxiii. 8. d Matt. iii. 15. 1 Cor. xi. 13. Eph. v. 3. 1 Tim. ii. 4. Tit. ii. 1. ch. vii. 26 only. Ps. lxiv. 1.

probability of this reading, as to, α. external evidence, and, β. internal probability, it must, α. be confessed, that such instances as this, where an important reading, prevalent in the early ages, is found only in two or three of our present mss., tend considerably to shake the trustworthiness of mere manuscript evidence as to the original text of the N. T., and to enhance the testimony of those sources which are anterior to any of our present MSS., viz. the earlier Fathers. In treating of (β), we must deal with each of the assigned meanings separately. Of (1) it may be said, that however true in fact,—the thought that Jesus died for every rational being (παντὸς λογικοῦ as Origen), or for every thing (neut.), except God, is quite alien from the present context, where the sovereignty of MAN in the new world is the subject—of man, in and through the Son of man, Jesus Christ: cf. the πολλοὺς υἱούς ver. 10, τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου ver. 12: &c. &c. And as to (2), it is even more alien from the context, as it also is from the N. T. Christology. We have no analogical expression whereby to justify it, nor any safeguard against such a view being carried out at once into the bi-personality of the Nestorians. It is hardly to be imagined that the Writer here, with no end in view at all requiring such a severance of the two natures in Christ, should thus gratuitously have introduced a sentiment of the most novel and startling character. And with regard to (3) it may well be said, that we have no right to press the exclamation of our Redeemer in His agony to so bare and strong a dogmatic fact as that He really was χωρὶς θεοῦ on the cross. We no where find Himself so speaking, nor His Apostles: nay the Writer of our Epistle would be the first to testify against such an understanding of his words: cf. ch. v. 7, and indeed our next verse here. So that it does not seem possible to assign to the words χωρὶς θεοῦ a meaning in accordance with the demands of the context, and the analogy of Scripture. This indeed would be no argument against a reading universally and unobjectionably attested by external authorities; but where no such attestation exists, may well be brought in to guide us to a decision. If so then, and we reject χωρὶς θεοῦ, how are we to understand the rec. reading, **χάριτι θεοῦ**? At all events we have strong Scripture analogy for such an expression. In Gal. ii. 21, the Apostle's confession of faith in the Son of God, he says, οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἄρα χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν. And in Rom. v. 8, we read, συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς (ὁ θεός), ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν. And in Titus ii. 11, ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. So that, in point of meaning, no difficulty need be found in the words. It was by the love and grace, the χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία of the Father, that all Redemption was effected, and above all that one sacrifice which was the crowning act of Redemption. Bleek's account of the origin of the reading χωρὶς in a mistake of a scribe, copying an illegible χάριτι, and Origen's possessing this copy or one made from it, and the further progress of the reading being due to his mention of it,—is perhaps a shade more probable than that mentioned in the digest,—but at the same time far from satisfactory. I may mention, as a curious instance of the helplessness of those who read Scripture in a version only, that (see Bleek) Primasius and Thom. Aquinas, in the sentence "Ut gratia dei pro omnibus gustaret mortem," take "gratia dei" as nominative, and interpret it as a title of Christ) **He might for** (ὑπέρ, 'on behalf of,' 'for the benefit of:' where this ordinary meaning of ὑπέρ suffices, that of vicariousness must not be introduced. Sometimes, as e. g. 2 Cor. v. 15, it is necessary. But here clearly not, the whole argument proceeding not on the vicariousness of Christ's sacrifice, but on the benefits which we derive from His personal suffering for us in humanity; not on His substitution for us, but on His community with us) **every man** (is παντός neuter or masculine? and if the latter, to what to be referred? Origen (apparently, see above), Thdrt., Œc., Thl. (above), take it as neuter, and apply it either to all nature, or to all reasonable beings. The latter see discussed below. The former can hardly be here meant: for of such a doctrine, however true, there is no hint (see above on the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ, β. 1). Then taking παντός masculine, are we to understand it "*for every one, angels included?*" So Ebrard: but where do we find any such usage of πᾶς, absolutely put as here? And where in this chapter again is any room for the position, that Christ suffered death for angels? In the logical course of the argument, we have done with them, and are

γὰρ αὐτῷ [e] δι' ὃν [f] τὰ πάντα καὶ [e] δι' οὗ [f] τὰ πάντα,

e Rom. xi. 36. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Col. i. 16. f ch. i. 3 reff.

now treating of man, and of Him who was made man to be our High Priest and advocate. And therefore of none other than man can this word παντός be here meant, in accordance indeed with its universal usage elsewhere. If it be asked, why παντός rather than πάντων, we may safely say, that the singular brings out, far more strongly than the plural would, the applicability of Christ's death *to each individual man:* and we may say that this again testifies to the sense 'every man,' as there would be no such reason for individualizing other rational beings, as there is for shewing that the whole nature of man, to which this promise of sovereignty is given, is penetrated by the efficacy of Christ's death) **taste of death** (reff. and so γεύεσθαι frequently in the classics with other substantives, e.g. μόχθων Soph. Trach. 1103, πόνων Pind. Nem. v. 596, πένθους Eurip. Alcest. 1069, τῶν κακῶν Hecub. 379, ὀϊστοῦ, ἀκωκῆς δουρός Homer, τῆς ἀρχῆς, τῆς ἐλευθερίης Herod. iv. 147; vi. 5,—but never with θανάτου. So that Bleek infers it has come into the N. T. diction from the Heb. phrase, which is not uncommonly found in the Rabbinical writings. Some have seen in the phrase an allusion to the shortness and transitoriness of the Lord's death: so Chrys., καὶ κυρίως εἶπεν, ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου, καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀποθάνῃ. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὄντως γευσάμενος, οὕτω μικρὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιήσας διάστημα, εὐθέως ἀνέστη: then, comparing Christ to a physician who first tastes his medicines to encourage the sick man to take them, adds, οὕτω καὶ ὁ χριστός, ἐπειδὴ πάντες ἄνθρωποι τὸν θάνατον ἐδεδοίκεσαν, πείθων αὐτοὺς καταΤολμᾶν τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεγεύσατο αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἔχων ἀνάγκην. And so Thl. and Œc., καλῶς δὲ τὸ γεύσηται· οὐ γὰρ ἐνέμεινε τῷ θανάτῳ, ἀλλὰ μόνον αὐτὸν τρόπον τινὰ ἀπεγεύσατο. And so many other Commentators, among whom Beza and Bengel find also the *verity* of His Death indicated in the words. But it is well answered (not by Calvin, as Bleek; for he says, "Quod Chrysostomus *gustare mortem* exponit, quasi summis labris delibare, eo quod Christus victor e morte emerserit, non refello neque improbo, quanquam nescio an adeo subtiliter loqui voluerit apostolus"), that in none of the places where the phrase appears, either in the N. T. or in the Rabbinical writings, does any such meaning appear to be conveyed. Nor again can we, as Bleek himself, understand the implication to be that Christ underwent all the *bitterness* of death. But, as θανάτου has been just before mentioned, I cannot help regarding its position here behind the verb as throwing that verb into some little prominence, as θανάτου itself is this second time in a place of insignificance. Thus viewed, the phrase falls into exact accord with the general argument of the passage, that it became Christ, in order to be the great and merciful High Priest of humanity, to be perfected through human sufferings: and it forms in fact the first mention of this idea, and prepares the way for γάρ which follows. I would say then, that γεύσηται must be regarded as slightly emphatic, and as implying the personal undergoing of death and entering into its suffering. And I doubt much, whether it will not be found that in the other passages where the phrase occurs, this personal suffering of death, though not boldly prominent, is yet within view, and agreeable to the context. And now, having considered the three points, χάριτι θεοῦ—ὑπὲρ παντός—and γεύσηται θανάτου,—we return again to the question of the connexion of the ὅπως, with which this clause begins. We before stated that, avoiding all tortuous and artificial arrangements, we find it dependent on the former clause διὰ . . . . . ἐστεφανωμένον. This exaltation, being the τελείωσις (see ver. 10) of Christ, was arrived at διὰ παθημάτων, and διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου—both by means of and on account of, His suffering of death. And this exaltation has made Him the divine Head of our humanity—the channel of grace, and the ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν. Without His exaltation, his death would not have been effectual. Unless he had been crowned with glory and honour, received to the right hand of the Father, and set in expectation of all things being put under his feet, His death could not have been, for every man, the expiation to him of his own individual sin. On the *triumphant issue* of His sufferings, their efficacy depends. And this I believe is what the sacred Writer meant to express. His glory was the consequence of His suffering of death;—arrived at through His suffering: but the applicability of His death to every man is the consequence of His constitution in Heaven as the great High Priest, in virtue of his blood carried into the holy place,—and the triumphant Head of our common humanity: which common humanity of Him and ourselves now becomes the subject

[g] πολλοὺς [h] υἱοὺς εἰς [i] δόξαν [k] ἀγαγόντα, τὸν [l] ἀρχηγὸν

g Matt. xx. 28. Rom. viii. 29. ch. ix. 28.
h = Rom. viii. 14 al. absol., Gal. iv. 6, 7.
i = Rom. viii. 18. 1 Thess. ii. 12. 2 Thess. ii. 14.
k = Rom. viii. 14.
l Acts iii. 15. v. 31. ch. xii. 2 only. Isa. xxx. 4.

of further elucidation). **10.]** **For** (the connexion with the foregoing, see above. The γάρ renders a reason why the result just introduced by the ὅπως should have been one which the χάρις θεοῦ contemplated) **it became** (as matter not only of decorum, but of sequence from the data,—'*was suitable to*,' 'decebat:' not as matter of absolute necessity, which was not the question here. "The expression here glances at those who found in a suffering and crucified Messiah something unsuitable to the Godhead; and expresses not merely a negative, that it was not unsuitable, not unworthy of God,—but at the same time the positive, that it was altogether correspondent to and worthy of His Being and His Wisdom and His Love, to take this course: that it is so shaped, that he who knows the being and attributes of God, might have expected it. And thus it is indirectly implied, that it was also the most suitable, and that any other way would have been less correspondent to the being and purpose of God. In this sense we have πρέπει τῷ θεῷ and similar formulæ often in Philo: e. g. Leg. Allegor. i. 15, vol. i. p. 53, τί οὖν λεκτέον; ὅτι πρέπει τῷ θεῷ φυτεύειν κ. οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν ψυχῇ τὰς ἀρετάς: De Incorrupt. Mundi, § 13, vol. ii. p. 500, ἐμπρεπὲς δὲ θεῷ τὰ ἄμορφα μορφοῦν κ. τοῖς αἰσχίστοις περιτιθέναι θαυμαστὰ κάλλη. And so elsewhere also ἁρμόττει τ. θεῷ, πρεπῶδές ἐστιν, cf. Carpzov here." Bleek; who has some excellent remarks on the lingering of the offence of the cross among these Jewish Christians, who, although their ideas of the glory and kingly triumph of the Messiah had been in a measure satisfied by the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, and their hopes awakened by the promise of future glory at His second coming,—yet, in the procrastination of this great event, felt their souls languishing, and the old stumbling-block of Christ's sufferings recurring to their minds. To set forth then the way of suffering and the cross as one worthy of God's high purpose, would be a natural course for the argument of the Writer to take) **Him, for whom** (cf. εἰς αὐτόν in reff.) **are all things** (not only, "all those things which contribute to man's salvation," as Grot., al., but 'the sum total of things,' 'the universe,' as in the parallel passages. All created things are for God (see below), for His purpose and for His glory) **and by whom** (by whose will, and fiat, and agency, cf. ἐξ οὗ in ref. Rom., which perhaps would have been the expression here, had not the Writer preferred using the διά in its two senses: see below) **are all things** (WHO *is intended?* From the sequel of the sentence there can be no doubt that it is God the Father. For the subject of this clause is there said τελειῶσαι Christ: and this could be predicated of none but the Father Himself. That these expressions are found frequently used of the Son, need be no objection: whatever is thus said of Him as the End, and the Worker, in creation, may *à fortiori* be said of the Father who sent Him and of whose will He is the expression. As to the reason of this periphrasis here, Calvin well says: "Poterat uno verbo Deum appellare; sed admonere voluit pro optimo id habendum, quod statuit ipse cujus et voluntas et gloria rectus est omnium finis." And not only this: in introducing the πρέπον of Christ's sufferings by such a description of God, he reminds his readers that those sufferings also were δι' αὐτόν—contributing to His end and His glory—and δι' αὐτοῦ, brought about and carried through by His agency and superintendence. The words are referred to Christ by Theodoret (reading ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτόν), Primasius, al., taking τελειῶσαι neuter: Cramer refers this clause to Christ, and πολλ. υἱ. εἰς δόξ. ἀγ. to the Father: Chr. Fr. Schmid refers αὐτῷ to the Father, and δι' ὃν &c. to Christ: Paulus refers αὐτῷ δι' ὃν τὰ π. to the Father, and then begins the reference to Christ with δι' οὗ τ. π. None of these require a serious answer), **bringing** (a grave question arises: does this clause, πολ. υἱ. εἰς δ. ἀγ., belong to the subject of the preceding, αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τ. π. κ. δι' οὗ τ. π., or to the object of the following, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τ. σωτ. αὐτῶν? The latter is held by the Commentators mentioned above, who refer the former clause to Christ, and by Erasm. (paraphr.), Estius, Justiniani, Schöttg., Bengel, Pyle, and several others; recently also by Ebrard. It is argued that as τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον, above, ver. 9, was in apposition with Ἰησοῦν following, so is πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀγαγόντα with τὸν ἀρχηγὸν κ.τ.λ. here. At first sight, it forms an objection to this view, that the art. is expressed with ἠλαττωμένον, and not with ἀγαγόντα. And this objection is urged by Bleek. But as Lünemann has pointed out, it is not a valid one. Had the art. been expressed, then τὸν πολλ. υἱ. εἰς δ. ἀγαγόντα and τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτ.

τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ [m] παθημάτων [n] τελειῶσαι. 11 ὅ

m 2 Cor. i. 5, 7. Phil. iii. 10. 1 Pet. iv. 13. v. 1 †. n ch. v. 9. vii. 19, 28. ix. 9. x. 1, 14. xi. 40. xii. 23, 32. Luke xiii. 32. (see note.)

αὐτῶν would be co-ordinate clauses in apposition, the latter being slightly emphasized. Whereas with the art. omitted, the former clause is subordinate to the latter —'the Captain of their salvation, while bringing many sons to glory.' The arrangement would indeed be exceedingly harsh, but not grammatically inadmissible. There are, however, serious objections to it. It would be contrary to all Scripture analogy, to represent us as *sons*, in relation to Christ. Nay, in the very next verses, the argument goes on to substantiate the community of our nature with Him by the fact of our being His *brethren*. And besides, on this hypothesis the sentence would contain little more than a tautology: *πολλ. υἱ. εἰς δόξ. ἀγ.*, and *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τ. σωτηρίας αὐτῶν*, being in fact mere assertions of the same thing. So that there can hardly be a doubt that the true application of the clause is to God the Father, the subject of the preceding. And so Chrys., Thl., Œc., Erasm. (annot.), Luth., Calv., Schlichting, Grot., Limb., and many others, and recently Bleek, Lünemann, and Delitzsch. The accusative *ἀγαγόντα*, after *αὐτῷ*, will not surprise any Greek scholar: cf. Herod. i. 37, *τὰ κάλλιστα . . . ἡμῖν ἦν, ἔς τε πολέμους κ. ἐς ἄγρας φοιτέοντας εὐδοκιμέειν*: vi. 109, *ἐν σοὶ . . . ἔστι ἢ καταδουλῶσαι Ἀθήνας, ἢ ἐλευθέρας ποιήσαντα μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι* . . . Thuc. ii. 39, *περιγίγνεται ἡμῖν τοῖς τε μέλλουσιν ἀλγεινοῖς μὴ προκάμπτειν, καὶ ἐς αὐτὰ ἐλθοῦσαι μὴ ἀτολμοτέρους τῶν ἀεὶ μοχθούντων φαίνεσθαι*. See many other examples in Matthiæ, § 536, obs. The most frequent in the N. T. are found in St. Luke, whose style approximates the closest to that of this Epistle: e. g. Luke i. 74: Acts (xi. 12 v. r.) xv. 22; xxv. 27. The aor. part. *ἀγαγόντα* is by many taken as an absolute past: so D-lat., "*multis filiis in gloriam adductis*:" the vulg., "*qui multos filios in gloriam adduxerat*," and similarly Luther, Estius, al., and recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 39, referring the expression chiefly, or entirely, to the O. T. saints. These however can hardly be meant; for they cannot be said in any adequate sense to have been led to glory, or to have had Christ for the *ἀρχηγός* of their salvation. And surely it would be most unnatural to refer the part. to those saints only who had entered into glory since the completion of Christ's work, but before this Epistle was written. Bleek maintains that the aor. part., with an infinitive, may have sometimes a future sense, and would render, "intending to bring," &c., da er viele Söhne zur Herrlichkeit führen wollte: and he cites for this Bernhardy, p. 383 f.: who however only notices the use of the aor. with verbs of waiting, hoping, expecting, and says that in such cases it has eine entschiedene Richtung zum Futurum. The fact seems to be that it has in all such cases reference to the *completion* of the action (being a *futurus exactus*): *τὸ κατθανεῖν* is to *have died*,—Anglicè, idiomatically, *to die*, but the act of death is regarded in both phrases as completed. And similar is the use of the aor. here. In Christ's being *τετελειωμένος*, the bringing many sons to glory is *completed*. Had it been *ἄγοντα*, we must have rendered, as indeed the E. V. has erroneously rendered now, "*in bringing*:" so that the Father's *τελειῶσαι* of Christ was *only a step in the process* of leading many sons to glory. But now it is *the whole process*. We cannot give in idiomatic English this delicate shade of meaning correctly: the nearest representation of it would perhaps be,—'it became Him . . . ., bringing, as He did, many sons to glory, to' &c. Various other renderings are "adducere decreverat," so Grot., al., and Kuinoel: that it signifies only the manner, without any temporal reference; so, after a long discussion, Tholuck (last edn.): that it is simply present; so Beza, "Ipsa sententia ostendit actum præsentem, non præteritum." But we need not have recourse to any elaborate and refined interpretations, where the simple force of the tense will serve) **many** (see reff. Not identical with *πάντας*, but as there, an indefinite expression, indicating great number, but no more. "*πολλούς*," says Delitzsch, "not in contrast to *all*, but in contrast to *few*, and in relation to *One*") **sons** (probably in the closer sense; not merely sons by creation, but sons by adoption. This seems necessitated by the next verse) **to glory** (the expression is not common in this meaning in our Epistle: and is perhaps chosen on account of *δόξῃ* in ver. 9. It is, that supreme bliss and majesty which rightly belongs to God only—of which His divine Son is (ch. i. 3) the *ἀπαύγασμα*, and of which believers in Christ are here in their degree partakers, and shall be fully so hereafter. It is the crowning positive result of the negative *σωτηρία*), **to make perfect** (*τελειοῦσθαι* is used often in our Epistle (reff.), and in various references. It is said of the Redeemer Himself, here, and in ch. v. 9; vii. 28,—of His people,

τε γὰρ [o] ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ [o] ἁγιαζόμενοι [p] ἐξ [q] ἑνὸς πάντες·

o = John xvii. 19. ch. ix. 13. x. 10, 14, 29. xiii. 12. Exod. xxix. 37. p = Rom. xi. 36. 1 Cor. viii. 6 al. q Rom. iii. 12 (from Ps. xiii. 3). v. 15, 16. ix. 10. Gal. iii. 16, 20. ch. xi. 12. always masculine.

who τελειοῦνται through Him, ix. 9; xi. 14, 40; xii. 23; and indeed xii. 2;—with a general reference, vii. 11, 19: see also τέλειος, ch. v. 14; ix. 11,—and τελειότης, ch. vi. 1. From all this it is evident, that some meaning must be looked for wide enough to include all these senses of the word itself and its cognates. And such a sense is found in the ordinary rendering of the word,—to '*accomplish*,' or '*make complete*,' or '*perfect*.' This accomplishment, completion, or perfecting of Christ was, the bringing Him to that glory which was His proposed and destined end: so Thl., τελείωσιν ἐνταῦθα νοεῖ τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἐδοξάσθη. Estius, "Consummaret, i. e. ad consummatam gloriam perduceret:" and it answers to the δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον of ver. 9: and to the δοξασθῆναι of St. John: and fits exactly the requirements of the other passages in our Epistle where our Lord is spoken of. Nor is such meaning at all misplaced in those passages where *we* are spoken of: seeing that it is a relative term, and our τελειωθῆναι is the being brought, each one of us, to the full height of our measure of perfection, in union with and participation of Christ's glory. Some Commentators, from the LXX usage of τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας for מִלֵּא אֶת־יָד, in Exod. xxix. 9, 33: Levit. viii. 33; xvi. 32 (xxi. 10 Grabe on the authority of Codd. Ambros.-marg., Coisl.): Num. iii. 3, spoken of the consecration of a priest, and of τελείωσις for מִלֻּאִים in reference to the same, and especially for the offering offered on the occasion, in Exod. xxix. 22 ff.: Levit. vii. 27; viii. 21 ff., 33 (ἕως ἡμέρα πληρωθῇ, ἡμέρα τελειώσεως ὑμῶν· ἑπτὰ γὰρ ἡμέρας τελειώσει τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν),—have imagined that the meaning here and elsewhere in our Epistle is '*to consecrate*:' and understand the word of the setting apart or consecration of Christ to the high-priestly office. So Calvin (the first, as Bleek thinks, who propounded the view), Beza (in his earlier edd.), a-Lapide, Le Clerc, Schöttg., Peirce, Whitby, al. But Bleek replies well, that such a meaning will not suit the other passages in our Epistle, e. g. ch. vii. 11, 19; and that in the LXX itself τελειοῦν τινα is never simply used for consecrating any one (but see Levit. xxi. 10, AB Ald. &c.). He also notices the idea of Michaelis, al., that the word in this sense came from the Greek mysteries, and pronounces it to be without proof. Certainly, no such meaning is noticed in the best Lexicons. The word occurs in the sense of 'ad scopum perducere' in Herod. iii. 86, ἐπιγενόμενα δὲ ταῦτα τῷ Δαρείῳ ἐτελέωσέ μιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ συνθέτου τευ γενόμενα) the Leader [Author] (ἀρχηγός is illustrated very copiously by Bleek. In its literal sense it is often found in the LXX (see Trommius). Then we have the sense of the *progenitor of a race*: Τεῦκρος μὲν ὁ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγός, Isocr., Nicocl.: see other examples in Bleek. Then that of one who *precedes others by his example*, they following him. So Herodian vii. 1. 23, ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ἀποστάσεως: 1 Macc. x. 47, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς ἀρχηγὸς λόγων εἰρηνικῶν: Polyb. ii. 40. 2, ἀρχηγὸν . . . τῆς ὅλης ἐπιβολῆς. So ch. xii. 2, τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν κ. τελειωτήν, [where the idea of *Author* and *Completer* is so closely allied to that in our verse, that the word *Author* should have been kept here also.] Hence comes easily the idea of *origination*; and so it frequently occurs in Greek writers, especially later ones, of the person from whom any thing, whether good or bad, first proceeds, in which others have a share: and sometimes so that it very nearly = αἴτιος. So Xen. Hell. iii. 3. 5, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τοῦ πράγματος; Isocr. Panegyr. 16, ἀρχηγὸς ἀγαθῶν: and more examples in Bleek. Hence the usage here, and in Acts iii. 15, where Christ is called ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς, is easily explained: on Him our salvation depends; He was its originator: as Chrys., τουτέστι τὸν αἴτιον τῆς σωτηρίας· ὁρᾷς ὅσον τὸ μέσον· καὶ οὗτος υἱός, καὶ ἡμεῖς υἱοί· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν σώζει, ἡμεῖς δὲ σωζόμεθα. εἶδες πῶς ἡμᾶς καὶ συνάγει καὶ διίστησι· πολλοὺς φησιν υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα· ἐνταῦθα συνήγαγε· τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν· καὶ πάλιν διέστησε. Principally from Bleek's note) of their salvation, through sufferings (i. e. His sufferings were the appointed access to and the appointed elements of, His glory: see more particularly below, on ch. v. 8, 9. Chrys., al., give a beautiful general application: δεικνὺς ὅτι ὁ παθὼν ὑπέρ τινος, οὐκ ἐκεῖνον ὠφελεῖ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς λαμπρότερος γίνεται καὶ τελειότερος). 11—13.] The connexion with the foregoing cannot be made plain, till we have discussed the meaning of ἐξ ἑνός below. It may suffice to say, that the assertion, and the quotations, are subordinate to the πολλοὺς υἱοὺς in ver. 10.

For both the Sanctifier and (notice the τε—καί, which bind closely together in one

H δι ηγ. ABCDH KLMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

r δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ s ἐπαισχύνεται t ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν,

r Luke viii. 47. Acts x. 21. xxii. 24. xxiii. 28. 2 Tim. i. 6, 12. Tit. i. 13 only. L.P.H. Philo de op. mund. § 33, vol. i. p. 23 end. s = and constr., ch. xi. 16. absol., 2 Tim. i. 12. w. ἐπί, Isa. i. 29 Aℵ[1.3b]. usually w. acc., as Mark viii. 38 bis || L. al. Job xxxiv. 19 Bℵ only. t Matt. xii. 49 ||. xxv. 40 al.

category) **the sanctified** (both the participles are in their official substantival sense, as ὁ πειράζων, and the like. The imperfection of our passive in English prevents our accurately expressing a present passive participle: 'they that are being sanctified' is perhaps, though we are obliged sometimes to use it, hardly allowable English. The word **ἁγιάζω** (see reff.) signifies in LXX and N. T. usage the selecting out and adopting for God's service. It is not here, as Bleek infers, = σώζω, but as every where, when used in allusion to Christ's work on His people, involves that transforming and consecrating process, of which His Spirit is the actual agent. Hence, believers are ordinarily not ἡγιασμένοι, but ἁγιαζόμενοι, as here: the difference being, as may be traced in reff., that where their present state is spoken of, the participle is present: where God's purpose respecting them, and Christ's finished work, the perfect. Sanctification is glory working in embryo: glory is sanctification come to the birth and manifested. It is disputed whether the reference of these words is to be considered as general, applying to every case of sanctifier and sanctified, as, e. g., the priest and the people under the old law (so Schlichting, Schöttgen, al.), the firstfruits and the remaining harvest (so Cappellus): or is to be restricted to Christ and His people alone. Certainly the latter seems to be required by the context, and most of all by the assumption of the subject in the next clause tacitly as contained in ὁ ἁγιάζων. The ground on which Christ is our Sanctifier has also been variously alleged. Grotius leaves the connexion very loose, when he says, "Christus nos sanctos facit doctrina sua et exemplo. Ille ex Spiritu sancto conceptus est, et nos per Spiritum sanctum novam adipiscimur naturam; ita communem habemus originem." But this obviously does not reach the depth of the following argument, see especially ver. 17: and we must believe that there is a reference to the expiatory death of Christ: see also ch. x. 10, 14, and more in the note there) (**are**) **of one** (**ἑνός**, as will be seen by the usage in reff., must be taken as *masculine;* not with Carpzov, Abresch, al., supplied by σπέρματος or αἵματος, nor understood "ex communi massa," with Cappellus, al.,—"ex una natura," Calv.,—nor "puritatem conditionis spiritalis," as Cameron, similarly Corn.-a-lapide. And if masculine, what are we to supply? Erasm. (par.), Beza, Estius (as an altern.), Hofmann, al. say, *Adam:* Bengel (whose note is well worth consulting), Peirce, al., *Abraham*. But it seems far better and simpler here, on account of the **πολλοὺς υἱούς** above, and as satisfying fully the force of **ἐκ**, to understand *God* to be meant. So all the patristic Commentators, and almost all the recent ones, including Delitzsch: most of them however giving it the very wide sense of ref. 1 Cor. ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, which is referred to here by Chrys.,—(and so Thdrt., καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον λέγεται, κτιστὴ γὰρ ἡ ληφθεῖσα φύσις· εἷς δέ γε καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτῆς ποιητής). But this can hardly be. For the argument in this particular place is not to shew *by what means*, viz. by becoming man, Christ made men into sons,—but, that sonship of Himself and them towards the Father having been predicated, to justify the use of the common term. And thus we are driven to a sense of υἱοί commensurate with ἁγιαζόμενοι, by which word the Writer takes it up again. So that it is not here the mere physical unity of all men with Christ which is treated, but the further and higher spiritual unity of the ἁγιάζων and the ἁγιαζόμενοι, as evinced by his speaking of them. The same is plain from ver. 14 below: see there. So that it is the higher Sonship of God, common to the Lord and those whom the Father by Him is leading to glory, which must be understood. See John viii. 47: 1 John iii. 10; iv. 6; v. 19: 3 John 11. Note, that the point brought out here is not that the holiness of our Lord's human nature, and our holiness, are both of one, viz. the Father (John x. 36): which, however true, would be introducing a matter not belonging to the argument *here*), **all** (**of them**) (after the τε—καί, **πάντες** forms a sort of pleonastic repetition; but comes with considerable force. On account of the **τε—καί**, it is quite impossible, with Bengel, al., to confine the πάντες to the ἁγιαζόμενοι only: and his argument,—"*utrosque*, dicturus, si *sanctificantem* τῷ πάντες, omnes, includeret,"—goes for nothing: the ἁγιαζόμενοι being not set over against the ἁγιάζων as a second *class*, but thought of in their multitudinous distinctness as individuals. The connexion with ver. 10 will now be plain: 'πολλοὺς υἱούς was the right expression to use of those who are

[12] λέγων [u] Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας [v] ὑμνήσω σε· [13] καὶ [w] πάλιν Ἐγὼ [x] ἔσομαι [xy] πεποιθὼς [y] ἐπ' αὐτῷ· καὶ [w] πάλιν [z] Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ

u Matt. xii. 18. 1 John i. 2, 3. Gospp. & Acts passim. Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 25. 1 Thess. i. 9 only. Ps. lxx. 17, 18. (Psa. xxi. 22.) v Acts xvi. 25 (Matt. xxvi. 30 | Mk.) only. Isa. xii. 4, 5. w ch. i. 5 reff. x 2 Cor. i. 9. Isa. viii. 17. 2 Kings xxii. 3. y Mark x. 24. Luke xi. 32. xviii. 9. 2 Cor. i. 9 only. Ps. ii. 12. z Isa. viii. 18.

brought to glory, *for* they are of the same divine stock—have the same heavenly Father as their ἀρχηγός, the one proper Son of God.' And this will be now illustrated by His own words: **on which account** (reff. especially 2 Tim., Tit.: viz. because they are all of one) **He** (Christ: see above) **is not ashamed** (see ref. ὁρᾷς πῶς πάλιν δείκνυσι τὴν ὑπεροχήν: τῷ γὰρ εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται, δείκνυσιν οὐ τῆς τοῦ πράγματος φύσεως, ἀλλὰ τῆς φιλοστοργίας τοῦ μὴ ἐπαισχυνομένου τὸ πᾶν ὄν, καὶ τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης τῆς πολλῆς, Chrys.) **to call them** (τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους) **brethren** (the Commentators quote from Philo de Septenario, § 8, vol. ii. p. 284, τοὺς μὲν (scil. τοὺς ὁμοεθνεῖς) καλέσας εὐθυβόλως ἀδελφούς, ἵνα μηδεὶς φθονῇ τῶν ἰδίων ὡς ἂν ἐκ φύσεως συγκληρονόμοις ἀδελφοῖς), **saying, I will declare** (LXX, διηγήσομαι) **thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the assembly will I sing of thee** (it will be sufficient to refer, respecting the general sense and prophetic import of Ps. xxii., to what has been before said, on Ps. viii. (above, ver. 6), and on similar citations elsewhere. The Psalm was originally the expression of a suffering saint, in all probability David, communing with his God: laying forth to Him his anguish, and finally triumphing in confidence of His gracious help and deliverance. But by the mouth of such servants of God did the prophetic Spirit speak forth His intimations respecting the Redeemer to come. No word prompted by the Holy Ghost had reference to the utterer only. All Israel was a type: all spiritual Israel set forth the second Man, the quickening spirit: all the groanings of God's suffering people prefigured, and found their fullest meaning in, His groans, who was the chief in suffering. The maxim cannot be too firmly held, nor too widely applied, that all the O. T. utterances of the Spirit anticipate Christ, just as all His N. T. utterances set forth and expand Christ: that Christ is every where involved in the O. T., as He is every where evolved in the N. T. And this Psalm holds an illustrious place among those which thus point onward to Christ. Its opening cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" was uttered by the Lord Himself in His last agony. The most minute particulars detailed in it are by the Evangelists adduced as exemplified in the history of His Passion: see e. g. (Matt. xxvii. 35 rec.) John xix. 24. And, as Bleek well observes, the particulars chosen out of that history by St. Matthew seem to have been selected with an especial view to the illustration and fulfilment of this Psalm. Ebrard, in his note here, insists on the authorship of the Psalm by David, and on its date, as belonging to the time of his persecution by Saul. Then he maintains the exact parallelism of the circumstances with those of the second and greater David, and refers the ἀδελφούς here to the countrymen of David, who were hereafter to be his subjects. I have no positive objection to this view. Subordinately to the deeper and wider one, it might be applicable in individual instances: but that other seems to me both safer and nearer the truth. See especially on the Psalm, Delitzsch, h. l. The particular verse here chosen, the 22nd, forms the transition-point from the suffering to the triumphant portion of the Psalm: and consequently the resolution expressed in it by the Messiah has reference to His triumphant state, in which he is still not ashamed to call his people brethren. It is characteristic of the object of this Epistle with reference to its intended readers, that whereas the Writer might have cited two instances as matters of fact, in which our Lord did call His disciples brethren after His resurrection (see John xx. 17: Matt. xxviii. 10), yet he has not done so, but has preferred to establish his point by O. T. citations).

13.] **And again, I will put my trust in Him** (there is considerable dispute as to the original place from which this citation comes. Most Commentators, and recently Bleek and Delitzsch, have believed it to be taken from Isa. viii. 17, where the words occur in the LXX, immediately preceding the next citation. The only objection to this view is, that it would be hardly likely in this case that the words καὶ πάλιν would have occurred, but the two citations would have proceeded as one. And hence the words have been sought in other places: e. g. in Ps. xviii. 3 (xvii. 2, LXX), where however the LXX have ἐλπιῶ ἐπ' αὐτόν: so Calv., Beza, Limborch, al.:—Isa. xlii. 1,—so Schöttgen; where however, besides the LXX being different (ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ), the words

καὶ τὰ παιδία ἅ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός. [14] ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία

are spoken in a totally different reference. The *same* words are found in the LXX in 2 Sam. (2 Kings) xxii. 3 (πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ); and Isa. xii. 2, where however the Alexandrine recension, with which our Writer mostly agrees, has ἐν αὐτῷ. There is no objection to the first of these passages being the *origin* of our citation; and the alleged non-Messianic character of the Psalm will weigh very light with those who view the Psalms as above set forth. Still, regarding the above-stated objection as of no weight,—owing to the diversity of the two cited clauses, the one expressive of personal trust in God, the other declaratory respecting a relation to others (cf. also ch. x. 30, which is a nearly though not exactly similar case),—I prefer, as the more natural, the opinion which derives both texts from the same place of Isaiah. On the sense then see below): **and again, Behold I and the children which God gave me** (Isa. viii. 18. Considerable difficulty has been made by the Commentators in applying these citations to Christ. I own that the question seems to me to be admirably stated by Theodoret on Ps. xxii., μᾶλλον γὰρ πιστευτέον τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀποστόλοις κ. αὐτῷ τῷ σωτῆρι χρωμένῳ σαφῶς τῷ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ προοιμίῳ ἢ τοῖς παρερμηνεύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν. But this does not preclude our entering on an attempt in each case to give a distinct account of the rationale of the application. In the passage of Isaiah (vv. 11—18), the Prophet is especially blaming the people of Judah under Ahaz, for having called in the help of the Assyrian king against Pekah king of Israel, and Rezin king of Syria. And in these verses (17 f.) the Prophet expresses his own determination, in spite of the reliance of the people on the confederacy, to wait for the Lord, and to remain, he and the children whom God had given him, for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts, which dwelleth in Zion. Then, from Isa. viii. 18 to ix. 7, is set forth the prospect of future deliverance to Judah coming from their God, ending with the glorious anticipation of the great future Deliverer. This confident speech of the Prophet our Writer adopts at once as the words of the greatest of all Prophets—thereby *assuming* the prophetic office of Christ. Thus the matter illustrated (for there is no demonstration here; this verse is a *consequence* of the last, of δι' ἣν αἰτίαν) is, that as the Prophet Isaiah withstood the human dependence of his age, and stood forth, he and the children whom God had given him, and who were begotten in pursuance of the divine command, as a sign to Israel,—so *the great Prophet* himself fulfilled the same office and had the same hopes, and bore the same relation to those among whom He prophesied, praising God with them, leading them in confidence on God, and speaking of them as one family and stock with Himself. So that our passage forms a notable instance of the prophetic office of Christ being taken as the antitype of the official words and acts of all the Prophets, just as His kingly office fulfils and takes up all that is said and done by the theocratic Kings, and His priestly office accomplishes all the types and ordinances of the O. T. Priesthood. There is one difference between Christ and the Prophet, which Ebrard, fully as he enters into the general argument, has missed, owing to his applying πολλοὺς υἱοὺς . . . . ἀγαγόντα, above, to Christ. The παιδία are not the children of Christ (Chrys., Thdrt., vulg.: "*pueri mei*," al.), as they were of Isaiah, but the children of God. John xvii. 6, σοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοὺς ἔδωκας, seems decisive for this. They are God's children, and God has given them to Him. So also Schlichting, Grot., Kuin., Bleek, De W., Lünem., al. See on next verse: and Delitzsch's note here. He agrees in the main with the above, but would restrict the reference to Christ of prophetic words and acts, to those occasions when the Prophets were put eminently forward as signs, as Isaiah in this case. But is not the very fact of being commissioned as a prophet, such a putting forward? Cf. Hofmann's remarks in the Weissagung u. Erfüllung, ii. p. 110).

14.] The connexion and line of argument is this: in ver. 5 it was shewn, that *not to angels, but to* MAN, is the new order of things subjected: in vv. 6—8, that this domination was predicated of man in the O. T.: in ver. 9, that the only case of its fulfilment has been that of Jesus, who has been crowned with glory and honour on account of His suffering death. Then, vv. 10, 11 a, it is shewn that the becoming way for the Redeemer to this crown of glory, the purpose of winning which was to bring many sons of God to it, was, being perfected through sufferings, seeing that He must share with those whom He is to sanctify, in dependence on a common Father. Then vv. 11 b, 12, 13 have furnished illustrations confirmatory of this, from His own sayings in the Scripture. And *now* we are come to the proof, that He who was thus to be the Leader of the salvation of

[a] κεκοινώνηκεν [b] αἵματος καὶ [b] σαρκός, καὶ αὐτὸς [c] παραπλησίως [d] μετέσχεν τῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου

ABCDH KLMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

a w. gen., here only. Prov. i. 11. dat., Rom. xii. 13. xv. 27. Gal. vi. 6. Phil. iv. 15. 1 Tim. v. 22. 1 Pet. iv. 13. 2 John 11 only. b Matt. xvi. 17. 1 Cor. xv. 50. Gal. i. 16. Eph. vi. 12 only. Sir. xiv. 18. xvii. 31. c here only †. (-ον, Phil. ii. 27.) d 1 Cor. ix. 10. x. 17, 21, 30. ch. v. 13. vii. 13 only. Prov. i. 18. Esdr. v. 40 al.

14. rec transp *αιματος* and *σαρκος* (*corrn to more usual order*), with KL rel vulg F-lat D-lat Syr [æth] Thdrt$_4$ [Euthal-ms Damasc Orig-int$_2$ Ambr$_1$] Jer$_1$ Aug$_1$: txt ABC D-gr M[P]ℵ m 17 [47] am(with fuld) syr copt arm Orig[-int$_1$] Eus$_2$ Ath$_2$ Cyr-jer$_1$ Chr$_1$ *Cyr*[-p Thdrt$_1$]. aft *των αυτων* ins *παθηματων* D[1] Eus$_1$ Thdrt$_1$ Jer$_1$, *eorundem passione* D-lat. aft 1st *θανατου* ins *θανατον* D[1].

these many sons, by trusting like them, and suffering like them, must Himself BECOME MAN like them, in order for that His death to have any efficacy towards his purpose. **Since then** (by **ἐπεί**, an inference is drawn from the words immediately preceding: by **οὖν**, the thought is cast back to the argument of which the citations had been an interruption: q. d. and by this very expression in our last citation, **τὰ παιδία**, we may substantiate that which our argument is seeking to prove) **the children** (before mentioned: "Articulus est ἀναφορικός: illi pueri, de quibus versu præcedente dictum." Gerhard, in Bleek:—not *τά* generic, and *τὰ παιδία*, little children, as Valcknaer and Heinrichs, and recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 40, which introduces a thought quite irrelevant: cf. Hofmann: Er von der Menschwerdung Christi sagen wollte, daß er in derselben ein Kind wie andere Kinder, mit Fleisch und Blut, geworden ist) **are partakers of** (lit. "*have been constituted partakers of*,"—in the order established in nature, and enduring still. The **κοινωνία** is not with their *elders*, as Valcknaer (see above), but with *one another*. This absolute use of **κοινωνεῖν** is not often found: we have it in Xen. Mem. ii. 6. 22, 23, *δύνανται πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες ἀλύπως σίτου κ. ποτοῦ κοινωνεῖν . . . . δύνανται δὲ καὶ χρημάτων οὐ μόνον τοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν ἀπεχόμενοι νομίμως κοινωνεῖν* . . . . and Œcon. vi. 3, *ἡδύ γ' οὖν ἐστιν . . . . ὥσπερ καὶ χρημάτων κοινωνήσαντας ἀναμφιλόγως διελθεῖν, οὕτω καὶ λόγους κοινωνοῦντας περὶ ὧν ἂν διαλεγώμεθα συνομολογοῦντας διεξιέναι.* The verb itself is generally found in the N. T. with a dative of the thing shared: in the classics, as here, with a genitive. See many examples in Bleek) **blood and flesh** (this order, instead of the more usual one, *σαρκ. κ. αἷμ.*, occurs in ref. Eph., and Polyænus, Stratagem. iii. 11. 1: *ἐπειδὰν μέλλωμεν μάχεσθαι, μήτοι νομίζωμεν ὡς πολεμίοις συμβάλλοντες, ἀλλὰ ἀνθρώποις αἷμα κ. σάρκα ἔχουσι, κ. τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως ἡμῖν κεκοινωνηκόσιν.* Bleek however suspects that this expression itself, belonging as it does to the time of the Antonines, may be derived from biblical or Jewish usage. It is found frequently in the later Jewish writers. "It betokens," says Bleek, "the whole sensuous corporeal nature of man, which he has in common with the brutes, and whereby he is the object of sensuous perception and corporeal impressions: whereby also he is subjected to the laws of the infirmity, decay, and transitoriness of material things, in contrast to purely spiritual and incorporeal beings." Delitzsch remarks on the order, that it differs from *σάρξ κ. αἷμα* in setting forth first the inner and more important element, the blood, as the more immediate and principal vehicle of the soul, ... before the more visible and palpable element, the flesh: doubtless with reference to the shedding of Blood, with a view to which the Saviour entered into community with our corporeal life), **He himself also in like manner** (*similarly*: the original idea of **παραπλήσιος** being that of lying close together all along: not exactly = **ἴσος**, for the two are not unfrequently found in conjunction, as *δρῶντες στρατὸν ἴσον καὶ* (where we should say, '*or*') *παραπλήσιον τῷ προτέρῳ ἐπεληλυθότα*: Thuc. vii. 42, nor = *ὁμοῖος*: cf. Herod. iii. 101, *χρῶμα φορέουσι ὁμοῖον πάντες καὶ παραπλήσιον Αἰθίοψι*: cf. also Thuc. i. 143, *τὰ μὲν Πελοποννησίων ἔμοιγε τοιαῦτα καὶ παραπλήσια δοκεῖ εἶναι*: but expressing a general similitude, a likeness in the main; and so not to be pressed here, to extend to *entire identity*, nor on the other hand to imply, of purpose, *partial diversity*; but to be taken in its wide and open sense—that He Himself also partook in the main, in like manner with us, of our nature. The ancient expositors dwell justly on the word as against the Docetæ, who held that our Lord's was only an apparent body. So Chrys., and more explicitly Thl.: *οὐκ εἶπε γὰρ μόνον ὅτι μετέσχε σαρκὸς κ. αἵματος ὥσπερ τὰ παιδία, τουτέστιν οἱ λοιποὶ ἄνθρωποι· καίτοι εἰ καὶ τοῦτο εἶπεν, ἱκανὸν ἦν παραστῆσαι ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἐσαρκώθη· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ* **παραπλησίως** *προσέθηκε, ἵνα τὴν ἀπαράλλακτον πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀληθινὴν σάρκωσιν παραστήσῃ.* And Thdrt.: *σφόδρα δὲ ἀναγκαίως καὶ τὸ*

[e] καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ [f] κράτος [f] ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, [g] τουτ- έστιν τὸν [h] διάβολον, [15] καὶ [i] ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους ὅσοι

e = 1 Cor. xv. 24. 2 Thess. ii. 8. 2 Tim. i. 10.
f here only. Herod. iii. 117. w. gen., iii. 69.
g Acts xix. 4. Philem. 12. ch. vii. 5. ix. 11. x. 20. xi. 16. xiii. 15. 1 Pet. iii. 20.
h Heb. here only. Matt. iv. 1, &c. p L. 1 Tim. iii. 6, 7. 1 John iii. 8 al. Job i. 6, &c.
i Luke xii. 58. Acts xix. 12. ordin. with gen., as Wisd. xii. 2, but see Job ix. 34.

15. αποκαταλλαξη A.

παραπλησίως τέθεικεν, ἵνα τὴν τῆς φαντασίας διελέγξῃ συκοφαντίαν) **participated in** (the E. V., "*took part*," is good, but it should be followed by '*in*,' not "*of*," which makes it ambiguous. Bleek remarks that κοινωνέω and μετέχω are almost convertible; and instances Lycurg. cont. Leocrat. p. 187 (154, Bekker), ἐξ ἴσου τῶν κινδύνων μετασχόντες, οὐχ ὁμοίως τῆς τύχης ἐκοινώνησαν: see also Xen. Anab. vii. 6. 28. So that minute distinction of meaning is hardly to be sought for. Notice the aorist, referring to the one act of the Incarnation) **the same things** (viz. *blood and flesh:* not τῶν παιδίων, nor as Bengel, "the same things which happen to his brethren, not even death excepted"), **that by means of his death** (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ὃν ἀνεδέξατο, ὡς σαρκὸς κ. αἵματος δηλαδὴ μετασχών: Thl. "Paradoxon: Jesus mortem passus vicit: diabolus mortem vibrans succubuit:" Bengel. "Death itself, as Death, is that which Jesus used as the instrument of annihilating the prince of Death:" Hofm. Schriftb. ii. 1. 274, whose further remarks there see, and Delitzsch's comments on them, Hebr.-brf. p. 85. The latter quotes from Primasius, "Arma quæ fuerunt illi quondam fortia adversum mundum, hoc est, mors, per eam Christus illum percussit, sicut David, abstracto gladio Goliæ, in eo caput illius amputavit, in quo quondam victor ille solebat fieri." "Dominus itaque noster"—so Gregory the Great on Job xl. 19, "ad humani generis redemtionem veniens velut quemdam de se in necem diaboli hamum fecit . . . Ibi quippe inerat humanitas, quæ ad se devoratorem adduceret, ibi divinitas quæ perforaret: ibi aperta infirmitas, quæ provocaret, ibi occulta virtus, quæ raptoris famem transfigeret." Cf. the remarkable reading in D: and the old Latin epigram, "Mors mortis morti mortem nisi morte tulisset, Æternæ vitæ janua clausa foret") **He might destroy** (bring to nought: see reff. The word is found, besides here, once in Luke (xiii. 7), and twenty-five times in Paul) **him that hath the power of death** (the pres. part. is better taken of the office, q. d. 'the holder of the power,'—than of past time, "*him that had the power*," as E. V. The phrase τὸ κράτος ἔχειν has been abundantly illustrated by Bleek. Among his examples followed by a genitive, as here, are Herod. iii. 142, τῆς δὲ Σάμου Μαιάνδριος . . . . εἶχε τὸ κράτος: Aristoph. Thesmoph. 871, δωμάτων ἔχει κράτος: Jos. Antt. i. 19. 1, οἷς ἐγὼ τὸ ταύτης κράτος τῆς γῆς δίδωμι. It is evident that the gen. **τοῦ θανάτου** must be similarly taken here, and not, as Schlichting, al., as = "*mortiferum*" merely. The reason why this clause comes first, and not τὸν διάβολον, is probably, as Chrys. suggests, to exhibit the paradox mentioned above: τὸ θαυμαστὸν δείκνυσιν, ὅτι δι' οὗ ἐκράτησεν ὁ διάβολος, διὰ τούτου ἡττήθη, καὶ ὅπερ ἰσχυρὸν ἦν αὐτῷ ὅπλον κατὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὁ θάνατος, τούτῳ αὐτὸν ἔπληξεν ὁ χριστός. Thl. mentions some who thought that by τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου was meant *sin*: and Œc. gives this interpretation. But it is hardly worthy of serious consideration), **that is, the devil** (cf. Wisd. ii. 24, φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον: and see Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2. So in the Rabbinical writings, Samael, the chief of the evil spirits, was called the angel of death: and it is said (Debarim Rabb. fin.), "Samael causa fuit mortis toti mundo:" and (Sohar, fol. xxvii. 3), "Filii serpentis antiqui qui occidit Adamum et omnes ab eo descendentes." τὸν διάβολον ὃς ἐκράτει τοῦ θανάτου· πῶς; διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐποίει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκ τῆς πρώτης ἐκείνης παρακοῆς, αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ τὸν θάνατον δημιουργήσας, ὥσπερ τινὶ στρατιώτῃ αὐτῷ κ. ὅπλῳ ἰσχυρῷ χρώμενος κατὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως. Thl.: cf. Rom. v. 12: John viii. 44. Ebrard would make τοῦ θανάτου the subjective genitive, —"the power, which death has over us," and ἔχοντα to signify "*wielding*." But this seems far-fetched and unnecessary.

The Death of Christ brought to nought the agency of the devil in death, because, that Death of His being not the penalty of His own sin, but the atoning sacrifice for the sin of the world, all those who by faith are united to Him can now look on death no longer as the penalty of sin, but only as the passage for them, as it was for Him, to a new and glorious life of triumph and blessedness. But for those who are not united to Him, death, retaining its character of a punishment for sin, retains also therewith all its manifold terrors. Delitzsch, in treating of 'Him that has the power of death,' quotes an important

φόβῳ [j] θανάτου διὰ [k] παντὸς [k] τοῦ ζῆν [l] ἔνοχοι ἦσαν [m] δου-

j gen. obj., Matt. xxviii. 4. John vii. 13. Rev. xviii. 10, 15 al. Ezek. xxxviii. 21 A. Sir. xl. 5.
k here only. τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον τοῦ ζῆν, Jos. Antt. viii. 13. 7, end.
l constr., Matt. xxvi. 66. Mark iii. 29. xiv. 64. 1 Cor. xi. 27. James ii. 10. Isa. liv. 17. dat., Matt. v. 21, &c. only. Deut. xix. 10. Job xv. 5 al.
m Rom. viii. 15, 21. Gal. iv. 24. v. 1 only. Exod. xx. 2 al

remark of Gregory the Great, on Job i. 11, "Satanæ voluntas semper iniqua est, sed nunquam potestas injusta, quia a semet ipso voluntatem habet, sed a Domino potestatem"), **and might deliver** (the construction is somewhat doubtful. The more obvious way of taking the sentence would be, to join **δουλείας** with **ἀπαλλάξῃ** —'*might free from bondage*,' ἀπαλλάττω usually governing a genitive of the thing from which the deliverance is effected: see many examples in Bleek, from which the following may be selected as containing δουλείας: Jos. Antt. xiii. 13. 3, τῆς ὑπὸ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτοὺς δουλείας . . . ἀπαλλάττειν: Isocr. Plataic. 9, δουλείας ἀπηλλάγησαν. And this would also suit the ordinary construction of ἔνοχος with a dative: see reff., and examples from the classics in Bleek. Still, it is hardly natural to suppose that **δουλείας**, standing so far as it would thus from its verb, in a position of so little emphasis, and without any designating article or pronoun, can belong to ἀπαλλάξῃ. We are thus brought to the ordinary construction, viz. the taking **ἀπαλλάξῃ** absolute, and joining **δουλείας** with **ἔνοχοι**. And this latter is by no means an unusual construction, as the reff. will shew. Bleek divides the imports of a gen. after ἔνοχος into three: 1. *the punishment incurred:* so reff. Matt., Mark, Demosth. p. 1229. 11, ἔνοχοι δεσμοῦ γεγόνασι: 2. *the guilt incurred:* so 2 Macc. xiii. 6, τὸν ἱεροσυλίας ἔνοχον ὄντα: Lysias in Alcib. p. 140, ὡς οὐδεὶς ἔνοχος ἔσται λειποταξίου οὐδὲ δειλίας: &c.: 3. *the person or thing wherein the guilt is incurred:* so reff. 1 Cor., James, Isa. So that the construction with the genitive seems to embrace a wider range of meaning than that with the dative, and to put ἔνοχος rather in the place of a substantive, '*the subject of*,' to be interpreted by the context: whereas with a dative it rather stands in a participial connexion, = ἐνεχόμενος (cf. Gal. v. 1, μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε): 'entangled in,' '*liable to*.' Thus we shall here have **ἔνοχοι δουλείας** = those in a state of slavery; as (Bl.) in Sir. prol., οἱ φιλομαθεῖς καὶ τούτων ἔνοχοι γενόμενοι, those who are occupied with such things) **those** (**τούτους** is not, as Bengel, Kuinoel, al., to be referred to the preceding, whether υἱούς, ver. 10, or παιδία, ver. 14, but to the **ὅσοι**, which it designates and brings out. See below) **who all** (this use of **ὅσοι** after a demonstrative pronoun is not very common. It does not in such a case imply the existence of *others who do not* fulfil the thing predicated, but rather takes, so to speak, the full measure of those indicated, being almost = '*who, every one of them*' .... Thus we have it after πᾶς in Æsch. Prom. 975 f., ἁπλῷ λόγῳ τοὺς πάντας ἐχθαίρω θεούς, ὅσοι παθόντες εὖ κακοῦσί μ' ἐκδίκως. In fact it answers, as a relative of quantity, to ὅστις as a relative of quality. These persons whom Christ died to free, were all subject to this bondage induced by the fear of death. And these in fact were, all mankind; to whom the potential benefit of Christ's death extends) **by fear of death** (so Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber, § 17, vol. ii. p. 462, οἰόμεθα τοὺς μὲν ἀσκητὰς τῆς ἐν σώμασιν εὐτονίας ἐπιβεβηκέναι φόβῳ θανάτου: see also ref. Sir. The obj. gen. after φόβος, as θεοῦ, ἀνδρῶν, &c. is common enough) **were through all their lifetime** (= διὰ πάσης τῆς ζωῆς. This substantival use of τὸ ζῆν is found in Æschin. dial. iii. 4, ὥσπερ εἰς ἕτερον ζῆν ἐπιθανούμενος: Ignat. ad Trall. 9, οὗ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν: id. ad Eph. 3, καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν. Bl. But the use with an adjective seems to want other examples. We have something approaching to it in the "Scire tuum nihil est, nisi te scire hoc sciat alter" of Persius) **subjects of** (on the construction of ἔνοχος with a genitive, see above. It is here not merely 'subject to,' so that they might or might not be involved in it, but their actual implication is inferred) **bondage** (Wetst. &c. quote Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber, § 3, vol. ii. p. 448, ἐπαινεῖται παρά τισιν ὁ τρίμετρον ἐκεῖνο ποιήσας — τίς ἐστι δοῦλος; τοῦ θανεῖν ἄφροντις ὤν; (the line is from Euripides, and is cited also by Plutarch. Bl.) ὡς μάλα συνιδὼν τὸ ἀκόλουθον· ὑπέλαβε γάρ, ὅτι οὐδὲν οὕτω δουλοῦσθαι πέφυκε διάνοιαν, ὡς τὸ ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δέος ἕνεκα τοῦ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν ἱμέρου. See also many passages to the same effect in Raphel and Wetstein. Calvin's note is well worth transcribing: "Hic locus optime exprimit quam misera sit eorum vita qui mortem horrent; ut necesse est omnibus sentiri horribilem, qui eam extra Christum considerant: nam tum in ea nihil apparet nisi maledictio. Unde enim mors, nisi ex ira Dei adversus peccatum? Hinc ista servitus per totam vitam, hoc est, perpetua anxietas qua constringuntur in-

λείας. [16] οὐ γὰρ [n] δήπου ἀγγέλων [o] ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ [p] σπέρματος [p] Ἀβραὰμ [o] ἐπιλαμβάνεται. [17] [q] ὅθεν [r] ὤφει-

..αβρααμ H.
ABCDK LMPℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

n here only †. ἴστε μὲν δήπου, Jos. Antt. xv. 5. 3.
o here bis. ch. viii. 9, from Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 32. Matt. xiv. 31. 1 Tim. vi. 12 al. = Sir. iv. 11.
p Luke i. 55. John viii. 33, 37. Acts iii. 25 (from Gen. xxii. 18). vii. 5, 6. Rom. iv. 13. ix. 7. xi. 1. 2 Cor. xi. 22.
q = Matt. xiv. 7. Acts xxvi. 19 (Paul). ch. iii. 1. vii. 25. viii. 3. ix. 18. xi. 19. Judith viii. 20.
r = ch. v. 3, 12. 1 Cor. vii. 36 ‡.

felices animæ. Nam semper ex peccati conscientia Dei judicium observatur. Ab hoc metu nos Christus liberavit, qui maledictionem nostram subeundo sustulit, quod in morte formidabile erat. Tametsi enim nunc quoque morte defungimur: vivendo tamen et moriendo tranquilli sumus et securi, ubi Christum habemus nobis præeuntem. Quod si quis animum pacare non potest mortis contemptu, is sciat parum se adhuc profecisse in Christi fide. Nam ut nimia trepidatio ex ignorantia gratiæ Christi nascitur, ita certum est infidelitatis signum. *Mors* hic non separationem modo animæ a corpore significat, sed pœnam quæ ab irato Deo nobis infligitur, ut æternum exitium comprehendat. Ubi enim coram Deo reatus, protinus etiam inferi se ostendunt."

16.] Epexegetic of ver. 15, by pointing out a fact well known to us all (see on **δήπου** below), that it was to help a race subject to death, that Christ came). **For, as we well know** (**δήπου** is a word of pure classical usage, see Xen., Plut., al. in Bleek: not found except here in the N. T. nor in the LXX. Its force will be reached by combining that of the two simple particles. **δή**, with an assertion, gives decision and confidence: **που** universalizes this decision and confidence: implies the success of an universal appeal for the truth of what is said. See Hartung, ii. 285: Klotz, Devar. p. 427 ff., where the various uses are fully gone into. Bengel compares *πρόδηλον γάρ*, ch. vii. 14), **it is not angels that He helpeth, but it is the seed of Abraham that He helpeth** (I have rendered thus, to preserve the emphasis on the two contrasted words, *ἀγγέλων* and *σπέρματος Ἀβρ.* **ἐπιλαμβάνω**, to receive in addition, 'insuper accipere,' also to take hold of or upon,—is found in the N. T. and the LXX, in the middle form *ἐπιλαμβάνομαι* only; and thus signifies, with the dynamic force of personal agency, to lay hold upon, to seize. It usually, after the analogy of *λαμβάνομαι* itself, has a gen. case: occasionally, e. g. Acts ix. 27; xvi. 19; xviii. 17, an accusative. When a person is the object, it may be used in a bad sense, *to seize hold of*, in order to overpower or lead away, e. g. *ἐπειδάν σου ἐπιλαβόμενος ἄγῃ* (*ὁ δικαστής*), Plato, Gorg. p. 527 A: Luke xxiii. 26 al.: as (more usually) in a good sense, *to take by the hand*, in order to help or lead, e. g. *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς χειρός*, Xen. Rep. Ath. i. 18: Matt. xiv. 31: Mark viii. 23: Luke xiv. 4: see also Jer. xxxi. 32 in our ch. viii. 9. From this latter meaning is easily derived that of *helping*, adopting for protection: e. g. ref. Sir., *ἡ σοφία υἱοὺς ἑαυτῇ ἀνύψωσε κ. ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν*: the Schol. on Æsch. Per. 742 (*ἀλλ' ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις, αὐτὸς χὠ θεὸς ξυνάπτεται*),—*ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις εἰς καλὰ ἢ εἰς κακά, ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνεται.* And thus is the word best explained here: as referring back to the *ἀπαλλάξαι* just spoken of, and exactly answering to the *βοηθῆσαι* below in ver. 18. This help is not by Him rendered to *angels*: He is not the Captain of their salvation. And herein there is no contradiction to Col. i. 20: for the reconciliation which Christ has effected even for the things in the heavens, is not delivering them from fear of death, or bringing them through sufferings to glory, whatever mystery it may involve beyond our power of conception. **σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ** next comes under consideration. And we must here, as ever, render, and understand, according to the simple sense of the words used, regarding the circumstances under which they were used. Accordingly, we must not here understand *mankind*, as some have done: nor again with others, can we suppose the *spiritual* seed of Abraham to be meant (Gal. iii. 7, 29: Rom. iv. 11 f., 16),—because, as Bleek well remarks, the present context speaks not of that *into which* Christ has *made* those redeemed by Him, but of that *out of which* He has *helped* them. *The seed of Abraham* then means, *the Jewish race*, among whom Christ was born in the flesh, and whom He did come primarily to help: and the peculiarity of the expression must be explained with Estius, "Gentium vocationem tota hac epistola prudenter dissimulat, sive quod illius mentio Hebræis parum grata esset, sive quod instituto suo non necessaria:" and with Grotius, "Hebræis scribens satis habet de iis loqui: de gentibus aliter loquendi locus." I must not omit to mention, that the above manner of interpreting this verse, now generally acquiesced in, was not that of the ancient expositors. By them it was generally supposed that **ἐπιλαμβάνεται** referred to our Lord's taking upon Him of our nature: and they for the most part

λεν [s] κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς [t] ὁμοιωθῆναι, ἵνα [u] ἐλεήμων

s Acts xvii. 22. Gal. iii. 20, 22. ch. iv. 15 al. παῖδα αὐτῷ γεννήσεσθαι ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα, Artemidor. i. 14. t = Acts xiv. 11. Rom. ix. 29, from Isa. i. 9. elsw. Mt. Mk. L. only. u Matt. v. 7 only. Exod. xxii. 17.

make it into a past tense, and render as E. V.,—"*He took not upon him the nature of angels, but He took upon him the seed of Abraham,*" so Chrys. (οὐκ ἀγγέλων φύσιν ἀνεδέξατο, ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπων), Thl. (οὐ τῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων φύσεως ἐδράξατο οὐδὲ ταύτην ἐφόρεσεν), Thdrt. (εἰ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἀνειλήφει φύσιν, κρείττων ἂν ἐγεγόνει θανάτου. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνθρώπειον ἦν ὃ ἀνέλαβε κ.τ.λ.), Ambros. (de Fide iii. 11, vol. ii. (iii. Migne) p. 512, al.), Primasius, the Syr. ("Non ex angelis sumsit sed ex semine Abrahami sumsit"): and so also Erasm., Luth., Calv., Beza, Owen, Calov., Wolf, and many others. On this I will give the substance of Bleek's remarks: "This interpretation has been favoured both by the preceding and following context, and also by the circumstance that in the Greek Church the words λαμβάνειν and ἀναλαμβάνειν are in use as representing the union of the two natures in Christ, the divine being the λαβοῦσα or ἀναλαβοῦσα, and the human the ληφθεῖσα or ἀναληφθεῖσα. But supposing that ἐπιλαμβάνειν might be similarly used, certainly the middle ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι with a genitive cannot; and even independently of this, the formula 'to take on him the seed of Abraham, or the angels,' would be a most unnatural way of expressing 'to *take the nature* of either of these.' And the ancients themselves seem to have felt, that this formula of itself could not bear such a meaning. They assume accordingly that the Writer represents man and his nature, through sinfulness, alienated and flying from God and the divine nature, and the Son of God pursuing, overtaking, and drawing it into union with Himself. So Chrys., Œc., Thl.; so the Schol. in Matth.: οὐκ εἶπεν ἀνέλαβεν, ἀλλ' ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι φεύγουσαν τὴν φύσιν ἡμῶν κ. μακρυνθεῖσαν ἐδίωξε καὶ φθάσας ἐπελάβετο αὐτῆς κ. περιεπλάκη ἑνώσας ἑαυτῷ κ. στήσας αὐτὴν τῆς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ φυγῆς: so also Primasius, Erasmus-not., Justiniani, a-Lapide, and Hammond." It needs little to shew how far-fetched and forced this interpretation of the words is, if it is intended to give the sense of *assuming the nature of man*. Nor would the *present* of the verb suit this sense: which present some explain as if it represented the *testimony of Scripture*, i. e. the prophetic or official present, as ὁ ἐρχόμενος, 'No where do we find it in Scripture that Christ has taken, or is to take,' &c. So Erasm., Calvin, Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Wolf. But such sense altogether would be irrelevant in the context. Seeing that it has been in the preceding period maintained, that Christ was flesh and blood like those whom He is to sanctify,—we should not surely have γάρ introducing the same thought again, but this verse must somehow express *why* that other happened. Again, had that former thought been here expressed a second time, the following one could not have been joined to it by an ὅθεν: for the sense would be this: He was to take on Him human nature: therefore must He in all things be made like His brethren, = as they take on them human nature. And even were we, with Œc. and Thl., to lay an emphasis on κατὰ πάντα, thus—seeing that He was to take human nature on Him at all, He must also *in every thing* become like other men,—we might admit such a sense, if succeeded by, 'and therefore must He die,' or the like: but that which here follows, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται κ.τ.λ., would be wholly out of place. The first who detected the error of this rendering was Castellio († 1563), who translates the word "*opitulatur,*" which Beza calls "execranda audacia." Then the R.-Cath. expositors Ribera and Estius took up the true rendering, which was defended more at length and thoroughly by Camero (whose note see in the Critici Sacri) and Schlichting; and so adopted without further remark by Grotius. The conflict against this latter expositor and the Socinians (who all thus explain the word), induced many other Commentators, especially Lutherans, to hold fast obstinately to the old interpretations: see above. But this pertinacity, from the palpable untenableness of the sense, could not prevail widely nor long. The right view is taken by Witlich, Braun, Akersloot, Limborch, Calmet, Bengel, Peirce, Cramer, Michaelis, Ernesti (who however is wrong in saying it was the interpretation of the Greek Fathers), Storr, and the moderns almost without exception. Of these latter, Schulz has ventured to doubt the correctness of it, and to propose a new view—viz. that Death, or the Angel of Death, is the subject of the sentence; "for on angels truly he taketh not hold, but on the seed of Abraham he taketh hold." And this sense is doubtless both allowable and admissible in the context; but it is most improbable that the subject in this verse should be a different one from that in the foregoing,

γένηται καὶ [v] πιστὸς [w] ἀρχιερεὺς [x] τὰ [x] πρὸς τὸν θεόν, [y] εἰς

v = 1 Tim. i. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 2. 1 Macc. xiv. 41. w of Christ, Heb. only, ch. iii. 1. iv. 14 al. (vii. 27, 28 al.) elsw. Gospp. and Acts only. (Lev. iv. 3 only. Esdr. v. 40. ix. 40. 1 Macc. x. 20 al12. elsw. ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας.) x Rom. xv. 17. ch. v. 1. see 2 Pet. i. 3 al. y constr., Acts iii. 19. Rom. i. 11, 20. Gal. iii. 17. ch. vii. 25. viii. 3. xii. 10. xiii. 21.

seeing that the same person, the Son of God, is also the subject, without fresh mention, in ver. 17, which is so intimately connected with this). 17.] Because then He had this work to do for the seed of Abraham (sons of men, in the wider reference),—viz. to deliver them from *fear* of death, He must be made like them in all things, that He may be a merciful and faithful High Priest. Then ver. 18 gives the reason of this necessity. **Whence** (ὅθεν is a favourite inferential particle with our Writer. It never occurs in the Epistles of Paul. On ref. Acts, see Prolegg. to Acts, § ii. 17 δ. It is = δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, ver. 11) **it behoved Him** (not = ἔδει, used of the eternal purpose of God (Luke xxiv. 26):—but implying a moral necessity in the carrying out of His mediatorial work. Compare ch. v. 3, and especially ib. ver. 12, ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον) **in all things** (i. e. all things wherewith the present argument is concerned: all things which constitute real humanity, and introduce to its sufferings and temptations and sympathies. The exception, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, brought out in ch. iv. 15, is not in view here. τί ἐστι κατὰ πάντα; ἐτέχθη φησίν, ἐτράφη, ηὐξήθη, ἔπαθε πάντα ἅπερ ἔχρην, τέλος ἀπέθανε. Chrys.) **to be like** (not, 'made like:' see reff., and compare Matt. vi. 8; vii. 26 al. The aor. expresses that this resemblance was brought about by a definite act, other than His former state: an important distinction, which however we must rather lose in the English than introduce an irrelevant idea by the word 'made') **to his brethren** (the children of Israel, as above: but obviously also, his brethren in the flesh—all mankind), **that He might become** (γένηται, not simply ᾖ, because the High Priesthood of Christ in all its fulness, and especially in its work of mercy and compassion and succour, was not inaugurated, till He entered into the heavenly place: see ch. v. 9; vi. 19, 20; vii. 26; viii. 1, 4. His being in all things like his brethren, sufferings and death included, was *necessary* for Him, in order to his becoming, through those sufferings and death, our High Priest. It was not the death (though that was of previous necessity, and therefore is often spoken of as involving the whole), but the bringing the blood into the holy place, in which the work of sacerdotal expiation consisted: see Levit. iv. 13—20, and passim: and below, on εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκ. κ.τ.λ.) **a merciful** (Luther, Grot., Böhme, Bleek, De W., Tholuck, take ἐλεήμων (formed as τλήμων, αἰδήμων, νοήμων) alone, and not as an epithet to ἀρχιερεύς, and Bl. maintains that grammar requires such a rendering, on account of the order of the words and the interposition of the verb γένηται. On the other hand, Bengel, Cramer, Storr, Ebrard, Hofmann, Delitzsch, take ἐλεήμων with ἀρχ., and Ebrard asserts that, had it been otherwise, πιστός would have followed ἀρχιερεύς. There does not seem to me to be much weight in either argument: and the words might be rendered either way, were it not for the scope and object of our epistle, which is rather to bring out the facts and accessories of Christ's High Priesthood, and all His attributes as subordinate to it, than to place them, abstractedly, by the side of it, as would be the case if ἐλεήμων were to be taken independently here. Cf. ch. vii. 26, where many attributes of the Lord's High Priesthood are accumulated. And especially here, where the first mention of ἀρχιερεύς occurs, would it be unnatural to find a mere attribute contemplated abstractedly and made co-ordinate with the office on which the Writer has so much to say hereafter. I therefore adopt the latter view, joining ἐλεήμων with ἀρχιερεύς. Bengel, with his usual fine tact, accounts for the inversion of the words thus: "De tribus momentis unum, ἐλεήμων, *misericors*, ante γένηται, *fieret*, ponitur, quia ex ante dictis deducitur. Reliqua duo commode innectuntur, quia cum primo illo postmodum tractanda veniunt." Calvin has a beautiful note here: "In sacerdote, cujus partes sunt iram Dei placare, opitulari miseris, erigere lapsos, sublevare laborantes, misericordia inprimis requiritur, quam in nobis generat communis sensus. Rarum enim est ut tangantur aliorum ærumnis qui perpetuo beati fuerunt. Certe hoc Virgilianum ex quotidiana hominum consuetudine sumptum est: 'Non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco.' Non quod experimentis necesse habuerit Filius Dei formari ad misericordiæ affectum, sed quia non aliter persuaderi nobis posset, ipsum esse clementem et propensum ad nos juvandos, nisi exercitatus fuisset in nostris miseriis; hoc enim ut alia nobis datum est. Itaque quoties nos urgent quævis malorum genera, mox succurrat nihil nobis accidere quod non in se expertus sit Filius

τὸ [z] ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ [a] λαοῦ. 18 [b] ἐν ᾧ γὰρ

ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

z constr., here (Luke xviii. 13) only. Ps. lxiv. 3 Bℵ[1]. (A def.) (ἐξιλ., Sir. xxviii. 5.) a = Matt. i. 21. Luke i. 68, 77. ii. 10. b (see note) attr., ch. v. 8. 1 Cor. vii. 1 al.

17. ταις αμαρτιαις A 17 (so in some mss of Ath Chr).

Dei ut nobis condolescat: nec dubitemus ipsum nobis perinde adesse ac si nobiscum angeretur") **and faithful** (true to His office, not only (Delitzsch) as regards God (ch. iii. 5, 6), but as regards men also; to be trusted without fail: see ref., and cf. μαντεῖα πιστά, Soph. Trach. 77: also Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hæres, § 18, vol. i. p. 486, ἀπιστῆσαι γενέσει τῇ πάντα ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἀπίστῳ, μόνῳ δὲ πιστεῦσαι θεῷ τῷ καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν μόνῳ πιστῷ, μεγάλης κ. ὀλυμπίου διανοίας ἔργον ἐστίν: and De Sacr. Abel et Cain, § 28, vol. i. p. 181, τοῦ . . . πιστευθῆναι χάριν ἀπιστούμενοι καταφεύγομεν ἐφ' ὅρκον ἄνθρωποι· ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ λέγων πιστός ἐστιν) **High Priest** (this is the first mention of the sacerdotal office of Christ, of which so much is afterwards said in the Epistle, and which recurs again so soon, ch. iii. 1: see note on γένηται above, and that on εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκ. below) **in matters relating to God** (so in reff., and in many other examples in Bleek, Elsner, and Kypke: e. g. Xen. Rep. Lac. xiii. 11, βασιλεῖ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἔργον καταλείπεται . . . ἢ ἱερεῖ μὲν τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι, στρατηγῷ δὲ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους: Soph. Philoct. 1441, εὐσεβεῖν τὰ πρὸς θεούς: &c. The words must not be referred to πιστός, but to ἀρχιερεύς, as in the example from Xenophon; or rather to the whole idea, ἐλεήμων καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς), **to expiate the sins** (from ἵλαος, propitious, comes ἱλάσκεσθαι, properly used passively of the person to be rendered propitious, see ref. Luke: and 2 (4) Kings v. 18. The expression here and in ref. Ps. is not a strict one: but is thus to be accounted for: God ἱλάσκεται (pass.), is rendered propitious to the sinner, who has forfeited His favour and incurred His wrath. But (see Delitzsch's long and able note here) we never find in Scripture, O. T. or N. T., any such expression as ἱλάσθη ὁ πατὴρ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν διὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, or as χριστὸς ἱλάσατο (or ἐξιλάσατο) τὸν θεὸν (or τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ θεοῦ) διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ: never κατηλλάγη (or ἀποκατηλλάγη) ὁ θεός. "As the O. T. no where says, that sacrifice propitiated God's wrath, lest it should be thought that sacrifice was an act, by which, as such, man influenced God to shew him grace,—so also the N. T. never says that the sacrifice of Christ propitiated God's wrath, lest it may be thought that it was an act anticipatory of God's gracious purpose,—which obtained, and so to speak, forced from God previously reluctant, without His own concurrence, grace instead of wrath." Del. To understand this rightly, is all-important to any right holding of the doctrine of the Atonement. This then is not said: but the sinner is (improperly, as far as the use of the word is concerned) said on his part, ἱλάσκεσθαι, to be brought into God's favour; and if the sinner, then that on account of which he is a sinner, viz. his sin. The word here is middle, used of Him who, by His *propitiation*, brings the sinner into God's favour, = makes propitiation for, expiates, the sin. The Death of Christ being the necessary opening and condition of this propitiation,—the propitiation being once for all consummated by the sacrifice of His death, and all sin by that sacrifice expiated, we must of necessity determine (against the Socinian view of Christ's High Priesthood, which will again and again come before us in this commentary) that His High Priesthood was, strictly speaking, begun, as its one chief work in substance was accomplished, here below, during his time of suffering. That it is still continued in heaven, and indeed finds its highest and noblest employ there, is no reason against this view. The high priest had accomplished his sacrifice, before he went within the veil to sprinkle the blood: though it was that sprinkling of the blood (see on γένηται above) by which the atonement was actually made, as it is by the Spirit's application of Christ's atoning blood to the heart of each individual sinner that he is brought into reconciliation with God) **of the people** (again, the Jewish people, cf. ref. Matt. διὰ τί δὲ οὐκ εἶπε, τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἀλλά, τοῦ λαοῦ; ὅτι τέως περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦν ὁ λόγος τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ διὰ τούτους ἦλθε προηγουμένως, ἵνα τούτων σωθέντων καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σωθῶσιν, εἰ καὶ τοὐναντίον γέγονε. Theophyl.).

18.] Explanation, how the κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι has answered the end, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται κ.τ.λ. **For He Himself having been tempted in that which He hath suffered, He is able to succour them that are** (now) **tempted** (the construction is much doubted. The ordinary rendering is to take ἐν ᾧ as equivalent to '*forasmuch as,*' "*in that,*" E. V., and to justify it by the Hebrew בַּאֲשֶׁר. But it is doubt-

[c] πέπονθεν αὐτὸς [d] πειρασθείς, δύναται τοῖς [d] πειραζομένοις [e] βοηθῆσαι.

III. 1 [f] Ὅθεν, [g] ἀδελφοὶ [g] ἅγιοι, [h] κλήσεως [i] ἐπουρανίου

c see ch. ix. 28 reff.
d Matt. iv. 1 al. fr. Gen. xxii. 1.
e Matt. xv. 25. Mark ix. 22, 24. Acts xvi. 9. xxi. 28. 2 Cor. vi. 2 (from Isa. xlix. 8). Rev. xii. 16 only. Josh. x. 6.
f ch. ii. 17 reff.
g here (1 Thess. v. 27 rec.) only. see Col. i. 2, note.
h 2 Pet. i. 10 reff.
i John iii. 12. Phil. ii. 10. ch. vi. 4. viii. 5. ix. 23. xi. 16. xii. 22. Dan. iv. 23 Theod.-A(οὐρ. B F.). (Eph. i. 20. Ps. lxvii. 14. 2 Macc. iii. 39 only.)

18. *αυτος* bef *πεπονθεν* D. om *πειρασθεις* ℵ[1] (ins ℵ[3]).

ful whether ἐν ᾧ has ever this meaning absolutely. It seems only to approach to it through '*quatenus*,' '*in as far as*,' which is an extension of its strict meaning, '*in that particular in which*,' '*wherein*.' And this slightly extended meaning is preferable in all the places usually cited to justify that other: e. g. Rom. viii. 3: ch. vi. 17: Plato, Rep. v. p. 455 (ἔλεγες τὸν μὲν εὐφυῆ πρός τι εἶναι, τὸν δὲ ἀφυῆ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ μὲν ῥᾳδίως τι μανθάνοι, ὁ δὲ χαλεπῶς). And in places where there is no need even to strain the expression so far as this, it is far better to retain its literal rendering, '*in the thing in which*,' '*wherein*.' See Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 211: Fritzsche on Rom. viii. 3, who though he protests against *quoniam* in this place, seems too lenient to it in other passages.

But the difficulty by no means ends with taking '*wherein*' for ἐν ᾧ. The first clause or protasis is open to several logical arrangements and consequent renderings. 1. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πειρασθεὶς αὐτὸς πέπονθεν, δύναται τοῖς (ἐν αὐτῷ) πειρ. βοηθ., "*for He is able to help those who are tried by the same temptations in which His own sufferings consisted*:" 2. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθεὶς δυν. &c. as before, "*for having been Himself tempted in that which He suffered*," &c.: 3. with the same arrangement of the Greek words, "*for in that which He suffered when He himself was tempted, He is able to succour those who are tempted (in the same)*:" 4. resolving the participial construction, "*for in that in which He himself was tempted and hath suffered He is able*," &c. Of these I much prefer (2); because, α. it keeps together the prominent members of the logical comparison, πειρασθεὶς and πειραζομένους, giving ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν as a qualification of πειρασθείς, and thus explaining wherein His temptation consisted. Nor, β. is it at all open to Lünemann's objection, that it limits the power of Christ to help, to those things merely in which He himself has suffered and been tempted: stating as it does generally the fact πειρασθείς, and then specifying in what, viz. ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν. It also, γ. corresponds exactly in construction with the similar sentence ch. v. 8, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν, in supplying an object after πέπονθεν. And, δ. it seems more natural that an object should be required after the perfect, than that it should be used absolutely. After 'He hath suffered,' we enquire, 'What?' after 'He suffered,'—'When?' Of recent Commentators, Bleek takes nearly as above, after Chr. F. Schmid; and so Delitzsch in loc. (only maintaining that ἐν ᾧ is ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι, "in that He hath suffered," not ἐν τούτῳ ᾧ, "in that which He hath suffered:" so Hofmann also): Ebrard prefers (4): Luther, Casaubon, Valcknaer, Fritzsche, al., take (3): (1) is mentioned by Bleek, but I am not aware that it has met with any fautor. It may be necessary to guard readers against the citation, in Dr. Bloomfield's note, of Ebrard as if he rendered ἐν ᾧ "forasmuch as" or "in that." His rendering is, "Quibus in rebus tentatus ipse (est et) passus est, iis tentatos potest adjuvare." On the sense, see Calvin's note above. Christ's whole sufferings were a πειρασμός in the sense here intended: see ch. iv. 15: James i. 2. The δύναται βοηθῆσαι here is not to be understood of the power to which the Lord has been exalted through death and suffering to be a Prince and a Saviour,—which is not here in question: but of the power of sympathy which He has acquired by personal experience of our sufferings. As God, He knows what is in us: but as man, He feels it also. And by this, wonderful as it may seem, He has acquired a fresh power, that of sympathy with us, and, in consequence, of helping us. See my sermon on this text, in Quebec Chapel Sermons, vol. iii. p. 84. And this is the general view of expositors, both ancient and modern. Chrys. says, ὃ δὲ λέγει τοῦτό ἐστι· δι' αὐτῆς τῆς πείρας ὧν ἐπάθομεν ἦλθε· νῦν οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ τὰ πάθη τὰ ἡμέτερα· οὐ γὰρ ὡς θεὸς μόνον οἶδεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔγνω διὰ τῆς πείρας ἧς ἐπειράσθη· ἔπαθε πολλά, οἶδε συμπάσχειν. And the Schol. in ms. 113, cited in Bleek, τουτέστι, προθυμότερον ὀρέξει χεῖρα τοῖς πειραζομένοις (so far Œc. also)· συγκαταβάσεως δὲ ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸ νηπιῶδες τῶν ἀκουόντων).

CHAP. III. 1—IV. 16.] THE SON OF GOD GREATER ALSO THAN MOSES: AND INFERENCES THEREFROM. The Writer

k μέτοχοι, l κατανοήσατε τὸν m ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα

k ch. i. 9 reff. Clem.-rom. 1 ad Cor. 34.
l = Luke xii. 24, 27. Rom. iv. 19. ch. x. 24. Isa. v. 12.
m of Christ, here only.

ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

CHAP. III. 1. κατανοησετε D¹[-gr].

has arrived through the reasonings of ch. i. ii., at the mention of the High Priesthood of Jesus. He might at once have passed thence to the superiority of His High Priesthood to that of the imperfect priests on earth. But one point yet remains, without which the gospel would not have its entire comparison with the law. The law was given by angels in the hand of a mediator. Moses was that mediator. Moses was above all others the Prophet by whom God had spoken to the Fathers in times past. Christ therefore must be compared with Moses, and shewn to be greater than he. This being done, he returns again to his central idea, the High Priesthood of Christ (ch. iv. 14); and from thenceforward treats of and unfolds it. Ebrard gives the detailed connexion well: "The angel of the covenant came in the name of God before the people of Israel; Moses in the name of Israel before God: the High Priest came in the name of God before Israel (with the name יהוה on his forehead), and in the name of Israel (with the names of the twelve tribes on his breast) before God (Exod. xxviii. 9—29 and 36—68). Now the N. T. Messiah is above the angels, according to ch. i. ii.: α. because in Himself as Son of God He is higher than they, and β. because in Him all humanity is exalted above the angels to lordship in the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, and that by this means, because the Messiah is not only מלאך, but also ἀρχιερεύς,—not only messenger of God to men, but also the propitiatory sacerdotal representative of men before God. Now exactly parallel with this runs our second part. The fundamental thesis, ch. iii. 3, **πλείονος γὰρ οὗτος δόξης παρὰ Μωυσῆν ἠξίωται**, is plainly analogous in form with the fundamental thesis of the first part, i. 4, **τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων**. The N. T. Messiah is above Moses, because He, α. of Himself, as *Son* of the house (iii. 6), is above him who was only the *servant* of the house (cf. with iii. 5, **θεράπων**,—i. 14, **λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα**), and, β. because the work, of bringing Israel into rest, which was not finished by Moses, is now finished by Him (iv. 1 ff.). And this work Christ has finished, by being not, as Moses, a mere leader and lawgiver, but at the same time a propitiatory representative, an **ἀρχιερεύς** (ch. v. 11 ff.). So far does the parallelism of the two portions reach even into details, that as the two divisions of the former part are separated by a hortatory passage, so are those of this part also:—

"I. The Son and the angels.	II. The Son and Moses.
α. The Son of God of Himself higher than the λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα of God, i. 5—14.	α. The Son of the house of Israel higher than the θεράπων of the house, iii. 1—6.
(Hortatory passage, ii. 1—4.)	(Hortatory passage, iii. 7—19.)
β. In Him manhood is exalted above the angels, ii. 5—16.	β. In Him Israel has entered into rest, iv. 1—13.
For He was also High Priest, ii. 17, 18.	Thus He is also our High Priest, iv. 14—16." Comm. pp. 123 f.

Ebrard has perhaps not enough noticed the prevalence of the hortatory mood not only in the interposed passage, iii. 7—19, but all through the section: cf. iv. 1, 11, 14, 16. 1.] **Whence** (i. e. seeing that we have such a helper: it is connected with the result of ch. ii.: not, surely, with ch. i. 1, as De W. The fact just announced in ii. 18, is a reason for κατανοήσατε: see below), **holy brethren** (Michaelis proposed to put a comma at ἀδελφοί, and treat the two as separate,—*brethren* (and) *saints*. But, as Bleek observes, the rhythm seems against this, κλήσ. ἐπουρ. μέτοχοι following. And a graver objection may be found in the choice of the words themselves: for there can hardly be a doubt that both are used in reference to the ἁγιαζόμενοι and ἀδελφοί of ch. ii. 11, 12. Not that the ἀδελφοί here are *Christ's* brethren: but that the use of the word reminds them of that brotherhood in and because of Christ, of which he has before spoken. Whether the idea of common nationality is here to be introduced, is at least doubtful. I should rather regard it as swallowed up in the great brotherhood in Christ: and Bleek has well remarked, that, had the Writer been addressing believing Jews and Gentiles, or even believing Gentiles only, he would have used the same term of address and without any conscious difference of meaning), **partakers** (see on μετέχειν, ch. ii. 14: and reff. here) **of a heavenly calling** (**κλῆσις**, as usual, of the invitation, or summons, of God, calling men to His glory in Christ—and hence of the state

τῆς [n] ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, 2 [o] πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ [p] ποιή-

n = (see note) ch. iv. 14. x. 23. 2 Cor. ix. 13. 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13 only L.P.H.‡ (Lev. xxii. 18 al.)
o Num. xii. 7.
p = (see note) 1 Kings xii. 6.

rec ins χριστον bef ιησ.; ins aft ιησ. C[2 or 3]D[3]KL rel syrr arm Orig$_1$ Chr$_1$ Thdrt$_1$ [Damasc$_1$] Œc Thl Hil$_1$: om ABC[1]D[1]M[P]ℵ 17 [47] latt coptt æth Ath$_6$ Cyr[-p$_2$] Thdrt$_1$ [Euthal-ms Damasc$_1$] Ambr$_1$ Jer Fulg Vig-taps.

which is entered by them in pursuance of that calling: cf. especially Phil. iii. 14, τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Then also **ἐπουρανίου** (see reff.)—a calling made from heaven, see ch. xii. 25: "vocatio quæ de cœlo," Syr. Or it may mean, the calling which proposes a heavenly reward,—whose inheritance is in heaven. By far the best way is, to join the two meanings together: so Bengel, "per Dominum e cœlo factæ, et eo, unde facta est, perducentis." In fact the calling being ἐπουράνιος and proceeding from heaven, must of necessity be *heavenly* in its purport and *heavenward* in its result; eine vom Himmel aus ergangene und gen Himmel rufende: ihr Ausgangsort, ihr Inhalt, ihr Ziel—das Alles ist himmlisch. Delitzsch), **contemplate** (survey, with a view to more closely considering. The word is used of the survey of the spies at Jericho (λαθόντες γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἅπασαν ἐπ' ἀδείας τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν κατενόησαν, τῶν τε τειχῶν ὅσα καρτερὰ κ.τ.λ. Jos. Antt. v. 1. 2: cf. also Gen. xlii. 9, κατάσκοποί ἐστε, κατανοῆσαι τὰ ἴχνη τῆς χώρας ἥκατε, and Num. xxxii. 8, 9); and of fixing the thoughts on any object, see reff. Luke, with whom it is a favourite word. The meaning then of the exhortation here is not, 'pay attention to' ("ut sedule attendant ad Christum," Calv.), 'be obedient to,' but as above) **the Apostle and High Priest** (notice that but one art. covers both ἀπόστ. and ἀρχ., thereby making it certain that both words belong to τῆς ὁμολογίας) **of our profession, Jesus** (**ἀπόστολον**, as superior to the ἄγγελοι, being Himself the angel of the covenant, God's greatest messenger: the word ἄγγελον being, as Ebrard, avoided, on account of its technical use before, to prevent Christ being confused with the angels in nature. He is ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ πατρός: see John xx. 21. (I may remark, that the circumstance of the Writer using ἀπόστολος without scruple, as designating our Lord, may shew that the ἀπόστολοι as a class were not so distinctly marked as they have since been: a view supported also by some expressions of St. Paul: e. g. 2 Cor. viii. 23.) Ebrard well remarks, that all the difficulties which Commentators have found in this term vanish, on bearing well in mind the comparison between Christ and the angels in ch. i. ii. See an instance of this in the elaborate discussion of its meaning on Hebraistic grounds in the last edition of Tholuck; who, by rendering ἀπόστ., "*mediator*," has lost the joint testimony of the two, ἀπόστ. and ἀρχ., to Christ's mediatorship. Bengel says well on the two,—"τὸν ἀπόστ., eum qui Dei causam apud nos agit: τὸν ἀρχ., qui causam nostram apud Deum agit. Hic Apostolatus et Pontificatus uno *mediatoris* vocabulo continentur." **τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμ., of our Christian confession,**—i. e. of our faith: so Thl., τουτέστι τῆς πίστεως· οὐ γὰρ τῆς κατὰ νόμον λατρείας ἀρχιερεύς ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως. And so Thdrt., Œc., and Erasm., Calv., Beza, Grot., al. Tholuck objects, that thus we get no good sense for ἀπόστολος: but he does not seem to have taken into account the parallel with ch. i. 14. Thos. Aquinas, Luther, Camero, Calov., Owen (as an altern.), Wolf, al., and De Wette, and Tholuck, take the words as merely importing "*whom we confess*." But although De W. defends this from ch. iv. 14, it does not seem to agree with the usage there, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας,—nor with ch. x. 23, —nor 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13. To render ὁμολογία by "*covenant*," as Camerar., Tittmann, al., is not according to N. T. usage, which always has διαθήκη for this idea. There is a remarkable passage quoted by Wetst., out of Philo de Somn. i. § 38, vol. i. p. 654, containing the expression ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας: a parallel hardly to be accounted accidental, especially as the ἀρχιερεύς here spoken of is the λόγος (see above, § 37, p. 653, δύο ἱερὰ θεοῦ, ἓν μὲν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἀρχιερεύς, ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος). But Bleek has argued that, there being nothing in the context, or in the usage of Philo elsewhere, which can justify τῆς ὁμολογίας there, the only inference open to us is, that it has been inserted in Philo's text from this passage. **2.**] First, a point of *likeness* between our Lord and Moses is brought out, and that by a reference to an O. T. declaration respecting the latter (μέλλει προϊὼν τὸν κατὰ σάρκα χριστὸν προτιθέναι Μωυσέως. ἀλλ' ἐπειδή, εἰ καὶ πιστοὶ ἦσαν οὗτοι πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος, μεγάλας ἔτι δόξας εἶχον περὶ Μωυσέως, ἵνα μὴ εὐθέως ἀποφράξωσιν αὐτῶν τὰ ὦτα, οὐκ εὐθέως προτίθησι Μωυσέως τὸν

σαντι αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ °οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

ABCDK LMP℞ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

2. om ολω B coptt [Cyr₁] Ambr₁.

χριστόν, ἀλλὰ τέως ἐξισοῖ· εἶτα προϊὼν προτίθησιν. Œc.), **who is** (not, '*was*.' The present participle may always be contemporary with a previously expressed verb, of any tense, provided that verb be absolutely in construction with the participle, as ἀνέβλεψε τυφλὸς ὤν, "*he, being blind, received sight*" = he was blind and received sight. But a present participle standing absolutely, or with a present verb, must retain its present force; as τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω, "*I, being a blind man, now see*," = 'whereas I am (by infirmity, as every one knows, not, "whereas I *was*," as in E. V. in loco, John ix. 25) blind, now I see.' And so the present sense must be retained here. Then a question arises: are we to understand it strictly of present time, of Christ now in heaven,—or as in the case cited, of general designation? Clearly, I think, of the latter: Jesus, whose character it is, that He is πιστός. For the strict present would, to say nothing of other objections, not apply to the ἀπόστολον portion of the Lord's office, but only to the ἀρχιερέα. It, as Lünemann has well expressed it, charakterisirt das Treusein als inhärirende Eigenschaft) **faithful** (it is questioned, whether or not this word refers back to the πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς of ch. ii. 18. The sense is certainly not the same: the faithfulness there being the fidelity wherewith He being like His brethren would, so to speak, reproduce their wants before God,—that here spoken of being His faithfulness to God, over whose house He is set, ver. 6. Still I cannot help thinking that the *word itself* is led to by, and takes up that other. That regarded more the *sacerdotal*, this regards the *apostolic* office of Christ) **to him that made him** (so we must render ποιήσαντι, not, "*that appointed him*." And so D-lat., "fidelem esse creatori suo," Ambrose, de Fide iii. 11, vol. ii. (iii. Migne) p. 512 (quoting as above, he adds, "Videtis in quo creatum dicit; in quo assumsit, inquit, semen Abrahæ, corporalem utique generationem asserit"), Vigil-taps. (contra Varimadum, i. 4, Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. lxii. p. 366, "fidelem existentem ei qui creavit eum"), Primasius ("qui fidelis est eidem Deo Patri qui fecit eum (so vulg.), juxta quod alibi dicitur: qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem (Rom. i. 3)." ibid.), Schulz, Bleek, Lünemann. The ordinary rendering, "who appointed Him" (viz. ἀπόστολον κ. ἀρχιερέα) does not seem to me to be sufficiently substantiated by any of the passages brought in its defence. That ποιεῖν with two accusatives signifies *to appoint, to make into*, of course no one doubts: cf. Gen. xxvii. 37: Exod. xviii. 25: John vi. 15: Acts ii. 36. But our question is not of such constructions: we want to know whether ποιεῖν τινα can ever be filled up with a second accusative out of the context. Two passages are most frequently alleged to prove the affirmative. One is ref. 1 Kings, μάρτυς κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀαρών (אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אֶת־מ׳), καὶ ὁ ἀναγαγὼν τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. But here Bleek, against Gesenius and De Wette, holds fast, and I think rightly, to the original sense of עָשָׂה, and renders "*who made Moses and Aaron*." The other place, Mark iii. 14, ἐποίησε δώδεκα ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν, is less still to the point, because there the ἵνα ὦσιν κ.τ.λ. qualifies the verb, and gives the second accusative, q. d. ἐποίησε δώδεκα τοὺς ἐσομένους κ.τ.λ. And the phrase ὁ ποιήσας αὐτόν, for God the Creator, is so common in the LXX, that had our Writer had that other meaning in his view, his readers would have been sure to misunderstand him. Bleek accumulates instances: cf. Isa. xvii. 7; xliii. 1; li. 13; liv. 5: Hosea viii. 14: Job xxxv. 10: Ps. xciv. 6 (xcv. 7); cxlix. 2: Sir. vii. 30; x. 12; xxxix. 5, and many other places. He also presses the fact that ὁ ποιῶν in the Hellenistic Greek of Philo is the constant designation of God as the Creator. The word thus taken, is of course to be understood of that constitution of our Lord as our Apostle and High Priest in which He, being human, was made by the Father: not of Him as the eternal Word (as even Bleek and Lünemann, explaining it of His generation before the worlds), which would be irrelevant here, besides being against all Scripture precedent. Even Athanasius himself, though arguing against this unwarranted inference of the Arians from the phrases, seems to have understood it as we have done above: for he says, Contra Arianos ii. (iii.) 8, vol. i. (ii. Migne), p. 376, οὐχ ὅτι ὁ λόγος, ᾗ λόγος ἐστί, πεποίηται, νοεῖν θέμις· ἀλλ' ὅτι λόγος ὢν δημιουργὸς ὕστερον πεποίηται ἀρχιερεὺς ἐνδυσάμενος σῶμα τὸ γεννητὸν καὶ ποιητόν. And so also the orthodox Latins, Ambrose, Vigil-taps., Primasius, explaining "*creatio*" by "*corporalis generatio*." The Greek Fathers, generally, repudiate

3 [q] πλείονος γὰρ [r] οὗτος δόξης [s] παρὰ Μωυσῆν [t] ἠξίωται, [u] καθ' [u] ὅσον [q] πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου ὁ [v] κατα-

q ch. xi. 4 reff. r so ch. vii. 4. x. 12. s ch. i. 4 reff. t = & constr., 2 Thess. i. 11. 1 Tim. v. 17. ch. x. 29 only. 1 Macc. xi. 66. see Luke vii. 7 (Acts xv. 38. xxviii. 22). L.P.H. u ch. vii. 20. ix. 27 only. constr., ch. viii. 6. v here 3ce. ch. ix. 2, 6. xi. 7. Mark i. 2. Luke i. 17. vii. 27 ‖ Mt. 1 Pet. iii. 20 only. Num. xxi. 27.

3. rec δοξης bef ουτος, with KLM rel vulg [Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc$_2$]: txt ABC D[P]א m [47] Chr$_1$. μωυσεως D[1].

strongly this view, as was natural, living as they did in the midst of the strife. Chrys. says, τί ποιήσαντι; ἀπόστολον κ. ἀρχιερέα· οὐδὲν ἐνταῦθα περὶ οὐσίας φησίν, οὐδὲ περὶ τῆς θεότητος, ἀλλὰ τέως περὶ ἀξιωμάτων ἀνθρωπίνων. And so Œc. and Thl. Thdrt. even more plainly, ποίησιν δὲ οὐ τὴν δημιουργίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χειροτονίαν κέκληκεν. And Epiphan. Hær. lxix. 38, 39, vol. ii. (Migne), p. 761, distinctly denies any reference even to the humanity of Christ as created,—οὐδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν πλάσιν ἐνταῦθα διηγεῖται τοῦ σώματος, οὐδὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνανθρωπήσεως, οὐ περὶ κτίσεως ὅλως φάσκει, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν ἐνδημίαν τοῦ ἀξιώματος τὸ χάρισμα. See other testimonies from the Fathers in Suicer, ii. p. 788), **as also** (**καί**, to take another instance of faithfulness: thus, with every circumstance of honour, is Moses introduced, before any disparagement of him is entered upon) (**was**) **Moses in all His house** (from ref. Num., οὐχ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστι. 1. It may be well to remark, that the substitution of αὐτοῦ for μου at once indicates to whom αὐτοῦ is to be referred: viz. to God, τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν: see also below on ver. 6. And so most ancient and modern Commentators. Ebrard would make it both times reflexive —"his house," i. e. the house to which he belongs: Bleek, both times to refer to Christ, whose house, as a Son, it is: Thl. gives the alternative, οἶκον τὸν λαὸν λέγει, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰώθαμεν λέγειν, ὁ δεῖνα τῆσδε τῆς οἰκίας ἐστίν· αὐτοῦ δέ, ἤτοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ τοῦ Μωυσέως· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦ Μ. ἐλέγετο ὁ λαός, ὡς τὸ ὁ λαός σου ἥμαρτεν. But this last expression had a special reference, and did not represent a general truth. 2. The circumstance of the quotation makes it far more natural to refer ἐν ὅλῳ τ. οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ to Moses directly, and not to Christ, as Ebrard, al., putting a comma at Μωυσῆς. 3. The ellipsis is to be filled up by πιστὸς ἦν after τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, as in the place cited. 4. The signification of ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ is well illustrated by 1 Tim. iii. 15, πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος. It imports the Church of God: and is one and the same here and in ver. 6; not two different houses, but the same, in the case of Moses taken at one time only,—in that of Christ, in its whole existence and development). 3.] **For** (the **γάρ** is best connected, as commonly, with the κατανοήσατε above: as containing the reason why our attention should be thus fixed on Jesus: *for*, though He has the quality of faithfulness in God's house in common with Moses, yet is He far more exalted and glorious than he. Bleek, understanding αὐτοῦ above of Christ, inclines to connect γάρ immediately with it: "it is *His* house, inasmuch as," &c. But surely a ratiocination so taken up from a pronoun of at least ambiguous reference, would, without something to emphasize αὐτοῦ as = ἑαυτοῦ, be exceedingly obscure to the reader. Others, as De Wette, would join it to the immediately preceding and render it explicatively: but this seems harsh and incoherent) **this person** (the transposition in the later MSS. to δόξης οὗτος has probably been made to bring οὗτος παρὰ Μωυσῆν together and πλείονος δόξης. But it is characteristic of our Writer to separate words constructed together by an emphatic word) **hath been held worthy** (the word includes, with the idea of '*accounting worthy*,' that also of the *actual* bestowal of the dignity. So Philo, of Moses when a child, De Vit. Mos. i. 5, vol. ii. p. 83, τροφῆς οὖν ἤδη βασιλικῆς κ. θεραπείας ἀξιούμενος. And De Decal. § 21, p. 198, τὴν μέντοι προνομίαν ἧς ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν ἑβδομὰς ἠξίωται: Diod. Sic. xix. 11, τὴν δ' Εὐρυδίκην . . . . ἔκρινε μείζονος ἀξιῶσαι τιμωρίας: Arrian, Var. Hist. xii. 10, τῶν ἀριστείων ἠξιώθησαν. See more examples in Bleek. The word refers to the honour and glory wherewith God hath crowned Christ, in His exaltation to His right Hand; which is taken for granted without further explanation, as a fact well known to the readers) **of more glory** (not, "of so much the more:" the construction is as in ch. viii. 6, διαφορωτέρας τέτυχεν λειτουργίας, ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης) **than** (on **παρά** after a comparative, see note, ch. i. 4), **Moses, inasmuch as** (this seems to give καθ' ὅσον very happily, with just the same blending of analogy and inference) **he hath more honour than the house** (so is this gen. to be rendered, and not '*in*,' or '*from the house*,' as D-lat., "quanto majorem honorem habet domus is qui præpa-

w ch. ii. 9 reff. σκευάσας αὐτόν· 4 w πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος v κατασκευάζεται ὑπό ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

ravit eam:" and so vulg., Luther, but combining with it the other rendering also (nachdem der eine größere Ehre am Hause hat der es bereitet denn das Haus). Wolf, Peirce, al. This, that the Founder of the house had more glory from, or in the house, than Moses, was not true in fact of Christ: for they of the house had rejected Him. Cf. a very similar comparison in Philo, de Plant. Noë, § 16, vol. i. p. 340, ὅσῳ γὰρ ὁ κτησάμενος τὸ κτῆμα τοῦ κτήματος ἀμείνων, κ. τὸ πεποιηκὸς τοῦ γεγονότος, τοσούτῳ βασιλικώτεροι ἐκεῖνοι. The majority of Commentators take it as above: e.g. Chrys, πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τῶν ἔργων ὁ τεχνίτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου ὁ κατασκευάζων αὐτόν: and Thdrt., ὅση φησὶ ποιήματος πρὸς ποιητὴν διαφορά, τοσαύτη Μωυσέως πρὸς τὸν χριστόν. For the argument, see below) who established it ("κατασκευάζειν οἶκον," says Bleek, "is not to 'found a household,' so that ὁ κατασκευάσας τὸν οἶκον should designate the paterfamilias,—a meaning which can hardly be defended:—but the formula refers beyond doubt primarily to the erection of an actual house. The word is so used, of the preparation of a building,—a house, or temple, or ship, or town, &c.,—and especially in later Greek. So in our Epistle (in St. Paul it never occurs), besides here and ver. 4,—as in reff. also. 1 Macc. xv. 3, κατεσκεύασα πλοῖα πολεμικά: Jos. Vit. § 12, καθαιρεθῆναι τὸν οἶκον ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου . . . κατασκευασθέντα: Herodian, v. 6. 13, κατεσκεύασε δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ νεὼν μέγιστόν τε καὶ πολυτελέστατον: ib. § 22, πύργους τε μεγίστους καὶ ὑψηλοτάτους κατασκευάσας: Plut. Numa, p. 67 A, ἐνταῦθα κατασκευάζεται κατάγειος οἶκος οὐ μέγας: Diod. Sic. xi. 62, ἄλλας τριήρεις πολλὰς κατεσκεύασαν, &c. In almost all these places, the verb may be so taken as to include not only the erection of the building, ship, &c., but also the fitting up, providing with proper furniture (κατασκευή, σκεύη), as indeed it is found more expressly used in Attic writers: e.g. Xen. Hiero ii. 2, μεγαλοπρεπεστάτας οἰκίας καὶ ταύτας κατεσκευασμένας τοῖς πλείστου ἀξίοις: id. Anab. iv. 1. 8, ἦσαν δὲ καὶ χαλκώμασι παμπόλλοις κατεσκευασμέναι αἱ οἰκίαι, and al.; Demosth. p. 1208, ἔτι δὲ σκεύεσιν ἰδίοις τὴν ναῦν κατεσκεύασα: p. 689, οἷς κατεσκευασμένην ὁρᾶτε τὴν πόλιν: ib., ὥστε τινὲς μὲν αὐτῶν πολλῶν δημοσίων οἰκοδομημάτων σεμνοτέρας τὰς ἰδίας κατεσκευάκασιν οἰκίας. And here also we may say, that κατασκευάζειν means more than οἰκοδομεῖν οἶκον, and includes, besides the building of the house, the fitting it up, and providing it with all requisites. So that to this κατασκευή of the house belong servants, male and female; and so here we may say that the οἰκέται, the servants of the house, are included. The sense then is this: just as he who has built and furnished a house,—for himself namely, as master of the house,—stands higher in honour than the house itself and the individual οἰκέται, so does Christ higher than Moses: and Christ is thus represented as he who has prepared the house of God (and therefore as its lord), to whom Moses also belongs, as an individual οἰκέτης. And so Chrys., Œc., &c." Wetstein and Böhme have proposed a way of taking this verse which is at least specious: viz. to understand ὁ κατασκευάσας not of the Son, but of the Father, and the sentiment to be, inasmuch as he who established the house has more honour than the house, *which honour Christ, as His Son, shares*. But however suitable this idea may be in the next verse (see below), it is well answered by Bleek, al., that the insertion of it here would be quite alien from the object of the Writer, who is clearly comparing, directly, Moses and Christ: and that besides, a reference to a sentiment lying out of the immediate path of the argument would be introduced not by καθ' ὅσον, but by πλήν, or ἀλλά (or δέ, as in ver. 4). I am surprised to find Hofmann and Delitzsch upholding this last-mentioned interpretation as the only right one. Surely the ellipsis of the proposition 'the honour of the Father belongs to the Son also' is not for a moment to be assumed. And besides, to suppose οὗτος in this verse, and ὁ κατασκευάσας, not to refer to the same person, would involve a harshness and carelessness of style neither of which belongs to our Writer. See more on next verse). **4.**] **For** (expansion and justification of ὁ κατασκευάσας) **every house is established by some one** (i. e. it belongs to the idea of a house that some one should have built and fitted it up: arrangement implies an arranger, design a designer): **but** (contrast as passing from the individual to the general) **He which established all things is, God** (= God is he which established all things; θεός being the subject, and ὁ τὰ πάντα κατασκ., the predicate. Before treating of the misunderstanding of this verse by the Fathers, and by many of the moderns, let us endeavour to grasp its true meaning. The last verse brings before us Christ as the κατασκευαστής of

τινός, ὁ δὲ πάντα [v] κατασκευάσας θεός. [5] καὶ Μωυσῆς μὲν [x] πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ [x] οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς [y] θεράπων, [z] εἰς [z] μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων. [6] χριστὸς δὲ ὡς

x ver. 2.
y here only. appl. to Moses, Exod. iv. 10. xiv. 31. Num. xi. 11; xii.

8. Deut. iii. 24. Josh. i. 2(עֶבֶד). (-πεία, Luke xii. 42.) z Matt. viii. 4 ||. x. 18 ||. xxiv. 14 ||. James v. 3. Gen. xxi. 30.

4. rec ins τα bef παντα with C[2 or 3]D[3]L[P] rel [arm Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc[2]]: om ABC[1]D[1]KMℵ 17 Chr-ms.

the house of God. And this He is, in whatever sense οἶκος be taken: whether in the narrower sense which best suits this present comparison, or in the wider sense implied by the faithful centurion in Matt. viii. 9, in which all natural powers are His οἰκέται. But He is this not by independent will or agency. δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, is our Writer's own language of the creation by Christ: nd it is in accord with that of St. John, where he says πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. He, *as the Son*, is ὁ κατασκευάσας the house of God—the Church, or the world, or the universe; but, apparently (cf. ver. 6), the former of these: but it is as one with,—by virtue of his Sonship,—Him who is ὁ πάντα κατασκευάσας, viz. God. And thus the αὐτοῦ, twice repeated in vv. 5, 6, falls into its own place as belonging both times to God: Moses is His servant, part and portion of His household: Christ is His Son, over His household. And by this reference to God as the πρωτοκατασκευαστής, is the expression above, τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, illustrated and justified. So that this verse is not quasi-parenthetic, as almost all the recent expositors make it—e. g. Tholuck, Bleek, Ebrard, Lünemann,—but distinctly part of the argument. The ancient expositors, almost without exception, take θεός as predicate, and ὁ (τὰ) πάντα κατασκευάσας as a designation of Christ—"*now He that founded all things, is* (must be) *God:*" thus making the passage a proof of the deity of Christ. The short-hand writer has apparently here blundered over Chrysostom's exposition, for it is meagre and confused to the last degree; but Thdrt., Œc., and Thl., so explain it, regarding ver. 2 as an assertion of Christ's superiority to Moses *quoad* His human nature, and this verse as regards His divinity. ὅρα πῶς ἤρξατο μὲν τῆς συγκρίσεως ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκός, ἀνέβη δὲ εἰς τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ἀσυγκρίτως ὑπερέχειν τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦ ποιήματος ἔδειξε. And so also Beza, Estius, Cappellus, a-Lapide, Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Bengel (who however as well as Cappellus, takes ὁ as the personal pronoun referring to Christ, and (τὰ) πάντα κατασκευάσας as in apposition; but He, who &c., is God), al. But, apart from the extreme harshness and forcing of the construction to bring out this meaning, the sentiment itself is entirely irrelevant here. If the Writer was proving Christ to be greater than Moses inasmuch as He is God, the founder of all things, then clearly the mere assertion of this fact would have sufficed for the proof, without entering on another consideration: nay, after such an assertion, all minor considerations would have been not only superfluous, but preposterous. He does however, after this, distinctly go into the consideration of Christ being faithful not as a servant but as a son: so that he cannot be here speaking of His Deity as a ground of superiority). **5.]** The argument proceeds, resuming the common ground of ver. 2: **and Moses indeed** (inasmuch as δέ following has the effect of bringing out, and thus emphasizing, χριστός, this μέν may almost be treated as a particle of disparagement: cf. Isocr. Panegyr. p. 178, ἡ καλουμένη μὲν ἀρχή, οὖσα δὲ συμφορά—"which is called indeed . . . but really is . . .") **(was) faithful in all His** (God's, cf. above the words of the citation, on ver. 2) **house, as a servant** (cf. as above; the word θεράπων (see reff.) is often applied by the LXX to Moses. So also Wisd. x. 16: Barnabas, Ep. c. 14, Μωυσῆς θεράπων ὢν ἔλαβεν (τὰς πλάκας), αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν. θεράπων differs from δοῦλος, in embracing all who are, whether by occasion or by office, subservient to another: thus the Etym. Mag.: θεράποντας οὐχ, ὥσπερ οἱ νεώτεροι, δούλους, ἀλλὰ πάντας τοὺς θεραπευτικῶς ἔχοντας, ὡς "Δαναοὶ θεράποντες Ἄρηος·" καί, τὸν ἐν δευτέρᾳ τάξει φίλον, ὡς "Πάτροκλος Ἀχιλλέως θεράπων." Wetst., who also cites Apollonius, Ammonius, and Eustathius, to the same effect. This of course would allow the same person to be called by both names, as Moses is in Josh. i. 1 and 2 F. (not A), and al. Bleek well remarks here, that δοῦλος, had it been used of Moses in the place cited, would have served the Writer's purpose here just as well for the argument, but not for the words εἰς μαρτ. τῶν λαληθησομένων, which here follow, indicating the nature of his θεραπεία), **for testimony of the things which were to be (afterwards) spoken** (these words are not to be joined with θεράπων, as Bleek, Lün.,

a Matt. xxv. 21, 23. (see ch. x. 21.)

υἱὸς [a] ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· οὗ [b] οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐὰν τὴν

ABCDK LMPℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

b 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. iv. 17.

6. for ου, ος D^1M latt $Lucif_1$ $Ambr_1$ (not Did Chr Jer): ου ο 2. 122. rec εανπερ, with $ACD^3KLℵ^3$ rel [Chr_1 Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc $Lucif_1$]: txt BD^1M[P]($ℵ^1$) 17. ($ℵ^1$ has καν (ε above), with the ε written above κ a 1. m.) (*As εανπερ is found*, with no var *in*

al., nor, as Estius, al., with πιστός; but with the whole preceding sentence: the purpose of the faithful service of Moses in God's house was, εἰς μαρτ. κ.τ.λ. In considering the meaning of the words, surely we must look further than the commonly received shallow interpretation which refers them to the things which Moses himself was to speak to the people by God's command. For how could his fidelity ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ θεοῦ, comprehending as it does the whole of his official life, be said to be εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων by him to the people? It seems to me that neither εἰς μαρτύριον (ἐν τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ) nor τῶν λαληθησομένων (τῶν λαληθέντων) will bear such an interpretation. And yet it is acquiesced in by Syr. ("in testimonium eorum quæ loquenda erant in ejus manu"), Chrys. (not perhaps exactly: τί ἐστιν, εἰς μαρτύριον; ἵνα ὦσι, φησί, μάρτυρες, ὅταν ἀναισχυντῶσιν οὗτοι: but this surely will not suit the gen. τῶν λαληθ.), Thdrt. (ἐκεῖνος μὲν πιστὸς ἐκλήθη, ἵνα δειχθῇ ἀξιόχρεως νομοθέτης. τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν, εἰς μαρτ. τῶν λαλ.), Thl. (ἵνα λαλῇ τὰ τοῦ δεσπότου τοῖς λοιποῖς οἰκέταις, κ. μάρτυς ᾖ τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῇ κρίσει τῶν λαληθέντων), Œc., Primas., Est., Corn.-a-Lap., Grot., Hamm., &c., Stuart, De W., Bleek, Lünem. But, 1. the εἰς with μαρτύριον seems best to express an ulterior purpose of the whole of that which is spoken of in the preceding clause: cf. the same combination in reff. Gospp.:—2. the neut. gen. after μαρτύριον is best understood of that to which the testimony referred, as in Acts iv. 33: 1 Cor. i. 6; ii. 1: 2 Tim. i. 8:—and 3. the future participle requires that the λαληθησόμενα should be referred to a time wholly subsequent to the ministry of Moses. This has been felt by some of the expositors, and curiously evaded: e. g. by Jac. Cappellus, "Rationi consentaneum erat ut *statim initio* fidelissimus comperiretur Moses, quo fide dignius esset testimonium *quod postea perhibiturus erat* in monte Sinai." But unfortunately for this view, the incident from which this divine testimony to Moses is quoted, was long subsequent to the delivery of the law from Sinai. If then we are pointed onward to future time for τὰ λαληθησόμενα, what are they? What, but the matter of the divine ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ of our ch. i. 1? The whole ministry of Moses was, εἰς μαρτύριον of these λαληθησόμενα. And when Bleek says that the participle would not be put thus absolutely with such a signification, but would be qualified by ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, or διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, or the like, or expressed τῶν μελλόντων λαληθῆναι, we may well answer that the Writer, having in ch. i. 1 laid down λαλεῖσθαι as a common term for the revelations of the two dispensations, and again taken it up ch. ii. 2, 3, had no need again to qualify it further than by the future participle. I interpret it then to mean the Gospel, with Calvin ("Moses, dum est ejus doctrinæ præco, quæ pro temporis ratione veteri populo erat prædicanda, simul testimonium Evangelio, cujus nondum matura prædicatio erat, reddidit. Nam certe constat, finem et complementum legis esse hanc perfectionem sapientiæ quæ evangelio continetur. Atque hanc expositionem exigere videtur futurum participii tempus"), Owen ("λαληθ. represents things future unto what he did in his whole ministry. This our translation rightly observes, rendering it, 'the things that should be spoken after.' And this as well the order of the words as the import of them doth require. In his ministry he was a testimony, or, by what he did in the service of the house he gave testimony: whereunto? to the things that were afterwards to be spoken, viz. in the fulness of time, the appointed season, by the Messiah: i. e. the things of the gospel. And this indeed was the proper end of all that Moses did or ordered in the house of God"), Cameron, Calov., Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Wolf, Peirce, Wetstein, Cramer, Baumg., al., Ebrard, and, as I have found since writing the above note, Hofmann and Delitzsch): but **Christ** (scil. πιστός (ἐστιν), to correspond with the πιστὸν ὄντα, ὡς καὶ κ.τ.λ. above, ver. 2. Some would supply ἐστιν only, as Erasm. (paraphr.), "At Christus, ut conditor ac filius, administravit suam ipsius domum:" but thus the parallelism would be broken. Then, supplying πιστός, are we to join it with ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκ. αὐτοῦ, as in Matt. xxv. 21, 23, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστός, or to insert it before ὡς υἱός, and take it absolutely? Certainly the latter, as shewn by the order of the words in the previous sentence; the ellipsis here being, to judge by that order, between δέ and ὡς, not between υἱός and ἐπί) **as a Son over his house** (αὐτοῦ here again *of*

[c] παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὸ [d] καύχημα τῆς [e] ἐλπίδος [f] κατάσχωμεν.

c = Eph. iii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 13. ch. iv. 16. x. 19, 35. 1 John ii. 28. iii. 21. iv. 17. v. 14. Job xxvii. 10. d elsw., P. only. = 2 Cor. v. 12. ix. 3. (Rom. iv. 2 al7.) Deut. x. 21. e = ch. vi. 11, 18. vii. 19. x. 23 f = Luke viii. 15. 1 Cor. xi. 2. xv. 2. 1 Thess. v. 21. ver. 14. ch. x. 23 ‡.

the MSS, in ver 14 *and ch* vi. 3, *it is prob here that the other readg is the true one.*) rec aft ελπιδος ins (*as in ver* 14) *μεχρι τελους βεβαιαν*, with ACDKLM[P]ℵ rel [vss]; *μ. τ.* (only) Syr; *in æternum* æth-pl; *μ. τ. κατασχ. βεβ.* 4: om B æth-rom Lucif, Ambr.

God,—not primarily, though of course by inference, of Christ. The house is *God's* throughout: but Christ is of primary authority and glory in it, inasmuch as He is the Son in the house, and actually established the house. This, which I am persuaded is required by the context, is shewn decisively by ch. x. 21, *ἔχοντες . . . ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ*. So Chrys. (*ἐκεῖνος μὲν εἰς τὰ πατρῷα ὡς δεσπότης εἰσέρχεται, οὗτος δὲ ὡς δοῦλος*), Thdrt. (on the following words: *οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ κέκληκε τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν τὴν λέγουσαν, ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.*), D-lat. (but with "*in*,"—"Christus autem tanquam filius in domo ejus:" vulg. has "in domo sua"), Jerome (Ep. 18, ad Damas. § 5, vol. i. p. 49, "Christus autem ut filius super domum ejus"), Corn.-a-Lap., Schlichting, Peirce, Bengel, Storr, Morus, Abresch, Dindorf, al.: and recently, Stuart (but only as a question between *ἑαυτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ*, and apparently without being aware that *αὐτοῦ* may have both meanings), and Lünemann. The greater number of Commentators refer it to Christ: many of them writing it *αὑτοῦ*, to which Bleek well replies, that had the Writer intended the emphatic reflexive pronoun to be understood, writing as he did without accents, he would certainly have used *ἑαυτοῦ*, in a matter so easily confused. Of the rest, some, e. g. Ebrard, take *αὐτοῦ* as referring to Christ: and others, as simply the reflexive pronoun after the generic *υἱός*: "as a son over his (own) house:" thus Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, al. But thus the parallelism is destroyed, and in fact the identity of the house in the two cases, on which depends the strictness of the comparison between Moses and Christ. Most of the expositors have not felt this: but Ebrard has distinctly maintained that two houses are intended: "In the one house serves Moses for a testimony of the future revelations of God, the *οἶκος* itself being part of the *μαρτύριον*: the other *οἶκος*, the *οἶκος* of Christ, are *we*: it is a living house, built of living stones." But this introduces a complicated comparison, and to my mind infinitely weakens the argument. There is but one house throughout, and that one, the Church of God, in which both are faithful; one as a servant, the other as a son: this house was Israel, this house are we, if we are found faithful in the covenant. So also I am glad to see Delitzsch takes the sentence. Dec. 31, 1858), **whose** (not (except by inference) *Christ's*, as Œc., Jac. Cappellus, Estius, Owen, Bleek, De Wette, Ebrard, al., but, *God's*,—as Chrys. (*οἶκος γάρ, φησίν, ἐσόμεθα τοῦ θεοῦ . . ἐάνπερ κ.τ.λ.*), Thdrt. (see above on *αὐτοῦ*), Thl. (as Chrys., recognizing, however, Christ also, as the possessor of the house, *οἶκον ἔχει καὶ ὁ χριστός, ἡμᾶς*), Calvin ("Additur hæc admonitio, tunc eos in Dei familia locum habituros, si Christo pareant"), al., and Delitzsch. Besides the considerations urged above as affecting the question, we have the strong argument from Scripture analogy, cf. besides reff., 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17: 2 Cor. vi. 16: Eph. ii. 22: ch. x. 21; xii. 22: Rev. iii. 12: which alone, especially ch. x. 21, would go very far with me to decide the question) **house** (some, e. g. Bengel who would read *ὃς οἶκος*, urge the omission of the article here as against *οὗ οἶκος*: adducing such expressions as *οὗ τὸ πτύον, ἧς ὁ ἀδελφός, ὧν τὸ στόμα, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα, οὗ ἡ πληγή, ὧν τὰ κῶλα, οὗ ἡ φωνή, οὗ ἡ οἰκία*. But in every one of these the subject is distributed: whereas here *οἶκος* and *ἡμεῖς* are not commensurate, the proposition merely expressing categorical inclusion, and God's house being far wider than *ἡμεῖς*. Compare the precisely similar passage, 1 Pet. iii. 6, *ἧς (Σάῤῥας) ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι κ.τ.λ.*) **are we** (the Writer and his Hebrew readers: = of whose house we are, even as Moses was), **if we hold fast** (reff. Bleek objects to the shorter text here, that the Writer has twice besides used this verb, and both times with a tertiary adjectival predicate: see reff. But such a consideration can hardly override critical evidence) **the confidence** (reff.: not, "*free and open confession*," as Grot. ("professio Christianismi aperta"), Hamm., Limborch, al., which would not suit *κατάσχωμεν*, a purely subjective word) **and the** (notice the article, which shews that this second noun is not merely explicative of the first, nor to be ranked in the same category with it) **matter of boasting** (the concrete: not here to be confounded (although the con-

7 Διό, καθὼς λέγει τὸ [g] πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον [h] Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ [i] ἀκούσητε, 8 μὴ [j] σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας

g ch. ix. 8. x. 15. Acts i. 16. 2 Pet. i. 21.
h Psa. xciv. 7—11.
i constr., ver. 15 & ch. iv. 7, from l. c. ch. xii. 19. 1 John iv. 5, 6 al. fr.
j see note. vv. 13, 15. ch. iv. 7. Acts xix. 9. Rom. ix. 18 only. Jer. xix. 15.

ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

fusion certainly did take place sometimes) with *καύχησις*, the abstract, as is done by Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, &c. As *παρρησία* was subjective, *our confidence*, so is this objective, *the object whereon that confidence is founded:* see notes on reff. 2 Cor., where the same mistake has been made. And *κατάσχωμεν* is no objection to this: we may 'hold fast' an object of faith, though (see above) we could not 'hold fast,' except in a very far-off sense, an outward practice, such as a bold profession) of **our hope** (*καλῶς εἶπε τῆς ἐλπίδος, ἐπειδὴ πάντα ἦν ἐν ἐλπίσι τὰ ἀγαθά· οὕτω δὲ αὐτὴν δεῖ κατέχειν, ὡς ἤδη καυχᾶσθαι ὡς ἐπὶ γεγενημένοις*: Chrys. See reff. and Rom. v. 2). **7—19.**] See the summary at the beginning of the chapter. *Exhortation*, founded on the warning given by the Spirit in Ps. xcv., *not to allow an evil heart of unbelief to separate them from this their participation in the house of God.* **7.**] **Wherefore** (i. e. seeing that they are the house of Christ if they hold fast their confidence and boast of hope. It has been disputed, what verb is to be connected with **διό**. Some (as Schlichting, J. Cappellus, Heinrichs, Cramer, Kuinoel, Ebrard, al.) join it immediately with *μὴ σκληρύνητε*, and regard the Writer as making the Spirit's words his own: but this labours under the great difficulty that in ver. 9 the speaker is God Himself, and so an unnatural break is made at the end of ver. 8 (Delitzsch acknowledges this difficulty, but does not find it insuperable, and adopts the view). Others, as De W. and Tholuck, believe that the construction begun with **διό** is dropped, and never finished, as in Rom. xv. 3, 21: 1 Cor. i. 31; ii. 9: supplying after **διό**, *μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδ. ὑμ.*,—or understanding **διό** more freely, "wherefore let it be so with you, as" &c. But by far the best way is, with Erasm. (annot.), Calv., Est., Pisc., Grot., Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Bengel, Peirce, Wetst., Abresch, Böhme, Bleek, Lünem., al., to take the whole citation, including the formula of citation, as a parenthesis, and join **διό** with **βλέπετε** ver. 12. The length of such parenthesis is no objection to this view: see ch. vii. 20—22; xii. 18—24, where the Writer, after similar parentheses, returns back into the previous construction. Nor again is it any objection, that in the midst of the citation, another *διό* occurs, ver. 10: for that *διό* belongs strictly to the citation, and finds both its preparation and its apodosis within its limits. Nor again, that the sentence beginning with *βλέπετε*, ver. 12, is more an analysis of the citation than an application of it: had this been so, we should more naturally have expected to find *βλέπετε οὖν*,—ch. xii. 25 supporting, instead of impugning (as Tholuck) this last reply to the objection),—**even as the Holy Spirit saith** (in Ps. xcv., Heb. and Eng. This Psalm in the Heb. has no writer's name: in the LXX it is headed, *αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυείδ*. And it is ascribed to David in ch. iv. 7 below. The passage is cited as the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit, speaking through David: cf. reff.), **To-day, if ye hear his voice** ("In the Psalm, according to the Hebrew, the words corresponding to these, הַיּוֹם אִם־בְּקֹלוֹ תִשְׁמָעוּ, the second hemistich of the 7th verse, form an independent sentence, to be taken as a powerful exhortation expressed in the form of a wish, אִם, *o si, utinam*, as often. The sense from ver. 6 is,—'Come let us fall down and bow ourselves, kneel before Jehovah our Creator. For He is our God and we the people of his pasture and the flock of his hand.' Then this sentence follows: 'O that ye might this day hearken to His voice!' הַיּוֹם stands first with strong emphasis, in contrast to the whole past time, during which they had shewn themselves disobedient and rebellious against the divine voice, as e. g. during the journey through the wilderness, alluded to in the following verses: 'to-day' therefore means '*now*,' '*nunc tandem*.' Then in the following verses, to the end of the Psalm, is introduced, in the oratio directa, that which the divine voice, which they are to hear, addresses to them. And it is probable that the LXX took the words in the sense of the Hebrew: at least their rendering of אִם by *ἐάν* elsewhere gives no sure ground for supposing the contrary, seeing that they often give *ἐάν* for אִם as *utinam*, and that, in places where they would not well have understood it otherwise: e. g. Ps. cxxxviii. 19. Yet it would be obvious, with such a translation, to take this period not as an independent sentence, but either in close connexion with the preceding period of the 7th ver., as a declaration of the condition of their being His people,—or in reference to the following, as a protasis to which ver. 8, *μὴ σκληρύνητε κ.τ.λ.*,

ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ [k] παραπικρασμῷ [l] κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ [m] πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, [9] [n] οὗ [o] ἐπείρασαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν [p] δοκιμασίᾳ, καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσεράκοντα

k here and ver. 15 from l. c. only. (-κραίνειν, ver. 16. Ps. lxv. 7. lxvii. 6.)
l of time, Acts xvi. 25. xxvii. 27. Winer, § 49 d. b.
m Matt. vi. 13. Luke iv. 13 al. Deut. vi. 16.
n = (see note) Deut. viii. 15.
o = Acts v. 12. 1 Cor. x. 13. Ps. lxxvii. 46.
p here only †. Sir. vi. 21 only. Xen. Mem. ii. 2. 13 al. in Bleek.

8. for *παραπικρασμω*, *πιρασμω* ℵ.

9. for *οὐ*, *ὁπου* D[1]. rec aft *επειρασαν* ins *με* (*as LXX*-Ed-vat ℵ[3a]), with D[3]KLM [P]ℵ[3] rel vulg [syrr arm] copt-wilk Chr Thdrt [Euthal-ms Damasc] $Ambr_1$: om (*as LXX*-A[B]ℵ[1]) ABCD[1]ℵ[1] 17 copt(Wetst) $Lucif_1$. rec (for *εν δοκιμασια*) *εδοκιμασαν με* (*corrn to LXX*), with D[3]KLℵ[3] rel vulg syrr [æth arm Chr_2 Cyr_1 Thdrt Damasc $Ambr_1$]: txt ABCD[1]M[P]ℵ[1] 17 copt (Clem) [Euthal-ms]. *ιδον* AC[P] 17 Did_1. rec *τεσσαρακοντα*, with B[3] (H in ver 17) KLM[P]: *μ'* D: txt AB[1]Cℵ. (So also in ver 17.)

forms the apodosis. In this last way the Writer of our Epistle appears to have taken the words, from his beginning his citation with them: and yet more clearly from ver. 15, and ch. iv. 7." Bleek: and so De Wette, on the Psalm: and Tholuck and Lünemann: and Calv. as an alternative. *σήμερον* will thus refer to the day in which the Psalm was used in public worship, whenever that might be. See below), **harden not your hearts** (Heb. heart. Bleek remarks, that this is the only place (in Heb. and LXX: *βαρύνειν τ. κ.* of the act of man is found Exod. viii. 15, 32: 1 Kings vi. 6) where this expression 'to harden the heart' is used of *man's* own act: elsewhere it is always of *God's* act, cf. Exod. iv. 21; vii. 3 (vii. 22; viii. 19); ix. 12 (35); x. 20, 27; xi. 10; xiv. 4, 17: Isa. lxiii. 17, and *τὸ πνεῦμά τινος*, Deut. ii. 30; whereas when the hardening is described as the work of man, the formula *σκληρύνειν τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ* is used, Deut. x. 16: Neh. ix. 17, 29: 2 Chron. xxx. 8 (where however B reads *τὰς καρδίας*); xxxvi. 13: Jer. vii. 26 al., or *τὸν νῶτον αὐτοῦ*, 4 Kings xvii. 14. For N. T. usage see reff.), **as in the provocation** (Heb. כִּמְרִיבָה, "as (at) Meribah." In Exod. xvii. 1—7 we read that the place where the children of Israel murmured against the Lord for want of water was called Massah and Meribah,—*καὶ ἐπωνόμασε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου Πειρασμὸς καὶ Λοιδόρησις*, LXX. But the subsequent account of Num. xx. 1—13, makes it plain that the two names refer to two different events and places: and this is further confirmed by Deut. xxxiii. 8, "Thy holy One whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah." In the Psalm these two are mentioned together, and the LXX as usual *translate* the names, using here however the uncommon word **παραπικρασμός**, for *λοιδόρησις*, which is their word in Exod. xvii. 7, *λοιδορία* Num. xx. 24 (so AB), and *ἀντιλογία* in Num. xx. 13 (24 Ald.); xxvii. 14: Deut. xxxii. 51; xxxiii. 8: Ps. lxxx. 7; cv. 32; the only places where they have preserved the proper name, being in Ezek. xlvii. 19 (*μαριμώθ*), xlviii. 28 (*βαριμώθ*). In giving, for the proper names, their meaning and occasion, they have in fact cast light upon the sacred text; though it is rather exegesis than strict translation. The word itself, **παραπικρασμός**, is supposed by Owen to have found its way into the LXX from this citation: but there is no ground whatever for such a supposition. Though the subst. does not again occur, the verb *παραπικραίνω* occurs 35 times, and generally of men provoking God to anger. It has also been conjectured by Michaelis, that the LXX may, as they have never rendered Meribah by this word elsewhere, have read מָרָה, Marah, in their Hebrew text here, which they render *πικρία* in Exod. xv. 23: Num. xxxiii. 8, 9. This may have been so, but is pure conjecture), **in the time of** (the *κατά*, as the Writer takes it, seems, by ver. 16 below, where only the verb *παρεπίκραναν* introduces the question, not *παρεπ. καὶ ἐπείρασαν*,—to be subordinate to the *παραπικρασμός*, and as so often, to signify '*during*,' at the time of: so *οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς*, our contemporaries,—*κατὰ Ἄμασιν βασιλεύοντα*,—*κατ' Ἀλέξανδρον*: see Bernhardy, p. 241: Blomf., Glossary on Agam. 342. In the Heb. this second clause is distinct from the first, and introduces a fresh instance: see below) **the day of the temptation in the wilderness** (Heb., כְּיוֹם מַסָּה בַּמִּדְבָּר, as in the day of Massah in the wilderness: viz. that of the second murmuring against Moses and Aaron for want of water: see Num. xx. 1—13. The place was in the wilderness of Sin, near Kadesh: ib. ver. 1), **where** (we have the same construction of *οὗ* after *τῆς ἐρήμου* in ref. *ὅπου, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἤ, οὗ ἐπείρασαν πειρασμοῦ, ἵνα ᾖ τὸ οὗ ἄρθρον, ἀλλὰ μὴ τόπου δηλωτικόν*. Œc. And in this latter way it is taken by Erasm. Schmid, Francke, Bengel, and Peirce. But the

q (and constr.) ver. 17 only. ἔτη. [10] διὸ [q] προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ καὶ εἶπον Ἀεὶ ABCDK LMPℵ abcde fghkl mno 17. 47

Gen. xxvii. 46. Ps. xxi. 24. Sir. vi. 25 al. w. ἐν, Num. xxi. 5. w. ἀπὸ προσώπου, xxii. 3. absol., Deut. vii. 26.

10. rec (for ταυτη) εκεινη (*corrn to LXX, where there is no var*), with CD³KL[P] rel Chr Thdrt: *ista* D-lat: txt ABD¹Mℵ 17 vulg Clem Did[from the Psalm]. ειπα (*as LXX*-Bℵ) A D²(appy) a c k 17 Chr-ms-corr [Euthal-ms Cyr₁]: ειπαν D¹: txt BCD³KLM[P]ℵ rel Clem Did [Chr Thdrt].

former way seems the more likely, on account of the arrangement of the words: if the latter had been intended, the order would more probably have been τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, οὗ ἐπείρασαν . . . . ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. And the usage of οὗ for ὅπου, though not found elsewhere in this Epistle, is not uncommon in the LXX,—cf. Ps. lxxxiii. 3: Ezek. xxi. 16: Esth. iv. 3: Sir. xxiii. 21,—and is found 24 times in the N. T.) **your fathers tempted by way of trial** (*'tempted (me) in trying,'* or *'proving (me).'* It will be seen that the more difficult reading is sustained by the consent of the most ancient MSS., and expressly supported by Clem.-alex.; who cites the whole passage, and, as is evident by his insertion of διό before προσώχθισα, from our Epistle: and continues, ἡ δὲ δοκιμασία τίς ἐστιν εἰ θέλεις μαθεῖν, τὸ ἅγιόν σοι πνεῦμα ἐξηγήσεται· καὶ εἶδον κ.τ.λ. The idea of such a reading being "an alteration to remove a seeming roughness of style" (Dr. Bloomfield) is simply absurd, the roughness existing not in the received text and LXX, but in the expression ἐπείρασαν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ. It is very difficult to account for such a reading: and Bleek supposes that it may have existed in the Writer's copy of the LXX; ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ, i. e. ЄΔΟΚΙΜΑCΙΑ, being written for ЄΔΟΚΙΜΑCΑ; and instances ch. x. 5, σῶμα, and ch. xii. 15, ἐνοχλῇ, as similar cases. For the usage of the word δοκιμασία, see reff.), **and saw my works** (Heb., גַּם־רָאוּ פָעֳלִי, *"moreover they saw my work"*—i. e. my penal judgments; so Ewald, and Bleek: and so the word פֹּעַל is used in Ps. lxiv. 10: Isa. v. 12: Hab. i. 5; iii. 2: for these penal judgments lasted during the forty years, and it is they which are described in the next sentence. The meaning given by most expositors, *"although they saw my works* (miracles of deliverance, &c.) *for forty years,"* is not so likely, seeing that these provocations happened at the beginning of the forty years. But see below) **forty years** (these words in the Heb. most probably belong, as rendered in our E. V., to what follows: an arrangement rendered impossible here, on account of διό following. But that such arrangement was not unknown to our Writer is plain, from his presently saying, ver. 17, τίσιν δὲ προσώχθισεν τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη; It is therefore likely that he did not choose this arrangement without reason. And if we ask what that reason was, we find an answer in the probability that the forty years' space is taken as representing to the Hebrews their space for repentance; their σήμερον, between the opening of the preaching of the gospel (cf. ch. ii. 2), and their impending destruction. This idea was recognized by the Jews themselves in their books: e.g. Sanhedr. fol. 99. 1, "R. Eliezer dixit: dies Messiæ sunt 40 anni, sicut dicitur, Quadraginta annos &c., Ps. xcv. 10;" and then follows a proof of it from this passage in the Psalm: Tanchuma, fol. 79. 4, "Quamdiu durant anni Messiæ? R. Akiba dixit, Quadraginta annos, quemadmodum Israelitæ per tot annos in deserto fuerunt." "And if," continues Bleek, "this idea of the days of the Messiah was prevalent, that they were the immediate precursors of the עוֹלָם הַבָּא (the age to come) as the time of the great Sabbath-rest, and the completed glory of the people of God,—this is something very analogous to the acceptation of the period of the forty years which seems to underlie what is said of them in our Epistle." If so, it is possible that the meaning of καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου above may be, that they saw My wonderful works and took no heed to them, and thereby increased their guilt).

10.] Wherefore (see above: διό is inserted, to mark more strongly the reference of τεσσ. ἔτη to the preceding. It is impossible, with διό, to join those words to this sentence and understand διό as = διὰ ταῦτα, as Estius, Piscator, Grot., &c. Instead of being so anxious, at the expense of the meaning of words, to put our citations straight to the letter, it is far better to recognize at once the truth, for such it is, which Calvin here so boldly states: "Scimus autem apostolos in citandis testimoniis magis attendere ad summam rei, quam de verbis esse solicitos") **I was offended** (προσοχθίζω and ὀχθίζω are Alexandrine forms peculiar to the LXX. The classical word is ὀχθέω, frequently found in Homer; προσοχθέω is cited in Palm and Rost's Lexicon from Pisid. fragm. (?). The root seems to be ἔχω, from which also we have the cognate word ἄχθος, -ομαι, which, says Passow, differs from ὀχθέω in being always used of a literal and material burden, whereas this is always of a metaphorical and mental one. ἔχθος

[r] πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ, αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς [s] ὁδούς μου· [11] ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου [t] Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς

r = 1 Cor. vi. 9. 2 Tim. iii. 13. Tit. iii. 3 al. Isa. xxix. 24.
s = Acts xiii. 10. Rom. xi. 33. Rev. xv. 3. Ps. xvii. 21.
t = ch. iv. 3, 5, from l. c. Mark viii. 12. Gen. xiv. 23. Num. xiv. 30. Deut. i. 35. 1 Kings iii. 14. xiv. 45. 2 Kings xi. 11. xx. 20 al.

in all probability is another cognate word similarly derived. The substantive ὄχθη does not seem to be any further connected with ὀχθέω and ὀχθίζω than by derivation from a common root. ὄχθη is that which stands out or protrudes: ὀχθέω, to stand out against, to thrust oneself in the way of: "affinis phrasis, *adversum incedere*, Levit. xxvi. 24, 28," Bengel: hence ὄχθαι ποταμοῖο, the banks of a river: so Eustathius, ὄχθος, παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν (ἐξέχειν) τοπικὸν ἐπανάστημα: but no nautical metaphor, as "*infringing* (impinging?) *upon the shore, running aground*" (Stuart, al., after Suidas, προσώχθικε· προσκέκρουκε, προσκέκοφεν· ἀπὸ τοῦ τὰ ἐπινηχόμενα ταῖς ὄχθαις προσκρούεσθαι), is to be thought of. Hesychius interprets προσοχθισμός, πρόσκρουσις, δεινοπάθεια) **with this generation** (the LXX has ἐκείνῃ, as the rec. here: there is no demonstrative in the original Hebrew, בְּדוֹר. I quite think with Böhme and Bleek, that the change is made by our Writer for a set purpose, viz. to extend the saying, by making γενεά thus import the whole Jewish people, over the then living race, as well as that which provoked God in the wilderness. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 34, and note), **and said, They do always err in their heart** (Heb., "*They are a people of wanderers in heart.*" Bleek thinks the ἀεί of the LXX is owing to the taking עַם, people, for עוֹלָם, or עַד, or עוֹד, which last Symmachus has translated ἀεί in Ps. xlix. 10; cxxxix. 18), **but they** (in Heb., merely "*and they,*" and so in the LXX-B, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔγν. Our text agrees with the alex. MS., which marks off the clause more strongly with δέ [so also א]. Bengel justifies this: "הֵם in Hebr. iteratur magna vi. Accentus hic incipiunt hemistichium. Itaque non continetur sub εἶπον *dixi*, sed sensus hic est: illi me sibi infensum esse sentiebant, αὐτοὶ δέ, *iidem* tamen nihilo magis vias meas cognoscere voluerunt. Simile antitheton: *illi*, et *ego*, cap. viii. 9, coll. ver. 10. Sic, *at illi*, Ps. cvi. 43: cf. etiam Luc. vii. 5: Isa. liii. 7 in Hebr.") **knew not** (aor., as their ignorance preceded their wandering, and is treated as the antecedent fact to it. The *not knowing*, where matters of practical religion are concerned, implies the not following) **my ways** (i. e. the ways which I would have them to walk in, דְּרָכָי: so Gen. vi. 12: Exod. xviii. 20, σημανεῖς αὐτοῖς τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐν αἷς πορεύσονται, and passim. The meaning given to the clause by Stuart, al., "*They disapproved of* (?) *God's manner of treating them,*" is quite beside the purpose, and surely not contained in the words: see on Rom. vii. 15: 1 Cor. viii. 3), **as** (this ὡς corresponds to the Heb. אֲשֶׁר, which is often used as a conjunction, with various shades of meaning all derivable from its primitive sense, as 'quod' in Latin. In Gen. xi. 7, which De W. on the Psalm adduces to justify ſo daß, it has a telic force: and so the LXX, ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον. But it seems hardly to bear the ecbatic, "*so that*:" at least I can find no example. The sense here appears to be '*according as,*' 'in conformity with the fact, that:' such conformity not necessarily implying that the excluding oath was *prior* to the disobedience, but only that the oath and the disobedience were strict correlatives of one another. As the one, so was the other) **I sware** (see Num. xiv. 21 reff.; xxxii. 10 ff.: Deut. i. 34 ff.) **in my wrath** (not, '*by* my wrath,' though such a rendering would be grammatical (cf. Matt. v. 34; xxiii. 16: Rev. x. 6: Ps. lxii. 11); for such a method of swearing on God's part is never found), **If they shall enter** (this elliptical form of an oath stands for a strong negative: it is sometimes, when *man* is the speaker, filled up by "The Lord do so to me and more also, if . . ." Cf. ref. Mark: 2 Sam. iii. 35 al. It is interpreted below, ver. 18: τίσιν δὲ ὤμοσεν μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι κ.τ.λ.) **into my rest** (in the Psalm, and in the places referred to above, the *rest* is, primarily, the promised land of Canaan. Œc. says, εἰς τοσοῦτόν φησιν οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου, ἕως εἰς τοῦτό με ἤγαγον, ὥστε ὀμόσαι μὴ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου, τουτέστι τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐν ᾗ εἰσελθόντες ἔμελλον ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ἀναπαύεσθαι. In Deut. xii. 9, 10, the words κατάπαυσις and καταπαύσει ὑμᾶς are used of the promised inheritance of Canaan. But it has been well noticed, that after Joshua had led the people into the land, they never in reality enjoyed entirely the rest which had been promised;—and in consequence, the meaning of that threat of God opened out before them, and it became plain that more was denounced upon the γενεά than one generation merely could exhaust, more also than the mere not entering into

τὴν [u] κατάπαυσίν μου· [12] [v] βλέπετε, ἀδελφοί, μή ποτε [w] ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ [x] ἀπιστίας [y] ἐν τῷ [z] ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ [a] θεοῦ [a] ζῶντος· [13] ἀλλὰ [b] παρακαλεῖτε [c] ἑαυ-

u ver. 18. ch. iv. 1 &c. (6 times.) Acts vii. 49 (from Isa. lxvi. 1) only. v = Matt. xxiv. 4. Acts xiii. 40. 1 Cor. viii. 9. x. 12. Gal. v. 15 ‡. w indic. fut., Mark xiv. 2. Col. ii. 8. Xen. Cyr. iv. 1. 18 al. Winer, § 56. 2. b. a. x = Matt. xiii. 58 ' Mk. xvii. 20 v. r. Rom. iv. 20. ver. 19 al.+ Wisd. xiv. 25 only. y ch. ii. 8 &c. Matt. xiii. 4. Acts iii. 26. z Luke iv. 13. viii. 13. xiii. 27. Acts xii. 10 al. 2 Cor. xii. 8. 1 Tim. iv. 1. 2 Tim. ii. 19. Heb., here only. L.P.H. 2 Chron. xxx. 7. Wisd. iii. 10. a Acts xiv. 15. 2 Cor. iii. 3. vi. 16. 1 Tim. iii. 15. iv. 10. ch. ix. 14. x. 31. xii. 22. Rev. vii. 2. xv. 7. Isa. xxxvii. 4, 17 al. b Heb., ch. x. 25. xiii. 19, 22 only. = Acts xv. 32 al. fr. c = Eph. iv. 32. Col. iii. 13. 1 Thess. v. 13. 1 Pet. iv. 8, 10.

Canaan. Hence the prophetic pregnancy of the oath became evident, and its meaning was carried on in this exhortation by the Psalmist, and is here carried on by the sacred Writer of this Epistle, to a further rest which then remained for Israel, and now still remains for the people of God. Bleek notices the use of *κληρονομεῖν τὴν γῆν* in the Psalms, as a promise of blessings yet future (cf. Ps. xxiv. 13; xxxvi. 9, 11, 22, 29), as pointing the same way: and it is interesting to remember that we have our Lord, in the opening of his ministry, taking up the same strain, and saying, *μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν*):— 12.] **take heed** (on the connexion of this with *διό* above ver. 7, see note there. **βλέπετε** is only again found in our Epistle at ch. xii. 25. This construction with an indicative future (see reff. on *ἔσται*) is hardly, as Bleek, to be explained by the interrogative force of *μή*: but falls under a class of constructions with *ἵνα, ὅπως, ὡς, μή*, in which there is a mingling, in case of *μή*, of the *fear lest it should*, and the *suspicion that it will;* and in case of the other particles, of the purpose that it may, and the anticipation that it will. This logical account of the construction is plainer when a past tense is concerned: as in Thuc. iii. 53, *φοβούμεθα μὴ ἀμφοτέρων ἅμα ἡμαρτήκαμεν*, "We fear lest (*that*,—in English idiom) we have missed both at once." See Hartung, Partikellehre, ii. 140, and Bernhardy, p. 402: and cf. ref. Col.: and the examples in Bleek), **brethren, lest** (on *ποτε* not to be pressed as meaning 'at any time,' see above on ch. ii. 1) **there shall be** (for construction, see above) **in any one of you** (not the same as *ἐν ὑμῖν*. Calvin (see also Schlichting in Bleek) remarks well, "Nec tantum in universum præcipit Apostolus ut sibi omnes caveant, sed vult ita de salute cujusque membri esse sollicitos, ne quem omnino ex iis qui semel vocati fuerint, sua negligentia perire sinant. Atque in eo boni pastoris officium facit, qui ita excubare pro totius gregis salute debet, ut nullam ovem negligat") **an evil heart of unbelief** (the gen. **ἀπιστίας** is possessive; an evil heart (*ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ*) belonging to, characteristic of, unbelief. This is plain, from the consideration that *ἀπιστία* is, throughout, the leading idea,—cf. ver. 19, and ch. iv. 3,—and not the *καρδία πονηρά*. Bleek, al. make it a gen. of origin, which in sense comes to the same, but is not so simple in grammar: Calv. ("Significat, conjunctam cum pravitate et malitia *fore* incredulitatem"), De W., al. a genitive of result (?), "which leads to unbelief:" this latter is logically wrong:—Delitzsch, a qualitative genitive in the widest sense: but this would put *ἀπιστίας* too much in the background. **ἀπιστία** must be kept to its simple primary meaning, not rendered, as Schulz, and Bretschneider and Wahl in their Lexicons, *disobedience;* it was not this, but disbelief in the strictest sense, which excluded them, and against which the Hebrews are warned. That it led on to *ἀπείθεια*, we all know, but this is not before us here), **in** (the element in which the existence of such an evil heart of unbelief would be shewn) **departing** (viz. in the sense indicated by the cognate substantive: apostatizing, falling from the faith: see below) **from** (*ἀποστῆναι* is commonly constructed with *ἀπό* in N. T. and LXX: reff. 1 Tim., and Wisd. are exceptions. The classical writers usually construct it with a genitive only, as in these two last passages: see Demosth. p. 78. 21, and numerous other examples in Reiske's index: and Bleek) **the living God** (by using this solemn title of God, he not only warns them from Whom, and at what risk, they would depart, but also identifies the God whom they would leave, with Him who had so often called Himself by this name as the distinctive God of Israel, and as contrasted with the dumb and impotent idols of other nations. And thus he shews them that Israel, and the privileges and responsibilities of Israel, were now transferred to the Christian Church, from which if they fell away, they would be guilty of apostasy from the God of Israel. Compare the three other places (reff.) where the term occurs in our Epistle, and the notes there),— 13.] **but** (**ἀλλά** after a negative sentence loses its stronger force of '*nevertheless*,' the contrast already lying in the context: and here the preceding exhortation though really a posi-

H αχρις ου... ...γαρ γε e. ABCDH KLMPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

τοὺς [d] καθ' [d] ἑκάστην [d] ἡμέραν, [e] ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ [f] σκληρυνθῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν τις [g] ἀπάτῃ τῆς [h] ἁμαρτίας· 14 [i] μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ χριστοῦ [j] γεγόναμεν, [k] ἐάνπερ τὴν

d here only. Exod. v. 8. 1 Kings xviii. 10 A [not in B]. Esth. ii. 11. iii. 4. Job i. 4. Ps. vii. 11. cxliv. 2. see Acts xvii. 17. e = Luke iv. 13. Acts xiii. 11. xx. 6. 2 Macc. xiv. 10. Xen. Cyr. v. 4. 16, ἄχρις οὗ ἀσφαλὲς ᾤετο εἶναι. f ver. 8. g Matt. xiii. 22 ‖ Mk. Eph. iv. 22. Col. ii. 8. 2 Thess. ii. 10. 2 Pet. ii. 13 only †. Judith ix. 10, 13. xvi. 8 only. (-τᾶν, James ii. 26.) h = Rom. iii. 9, 20. v. 12 al. i = ch. vi. 4. xii. 8. (i. 9 reff.) j Heb., ch. v. 11, 12. vii. 16, 20, 22, 23. xii. 8. k (ver. 6 v. r.) ch. vi. 3 only.

13. καλειτε AC. rec τις bef εξ υμων (*transposn in neglect of emphasis*), with ACHM[P]ℵ m 17 [47 Lucif$_1$]: txt BDKL rel syr Thdrt Damasc.

14. rec γεγοναμεν bef του χριστου, with K L(omg του) e rel (syrr copt) [arm Eus$_1$] Chr Thdrt: txt ABCDHM[P]ℵ m 17 latt Orig$_1$ Eus$_2$ Cyr$_1$ Damasc Lucif$_1$ Hil.

tive one, βλέπετε, passes as a negative one from the sense, as if it were, 'Let there not be,' &c.) **exhort yourselves** (so, in a literal rendering, should the word be given, and not "*one another*," though English idiom may require this latter in a version intended for use. I have already dealt with this supposed ἑαυτ. "*for* ἀλλήλ." on ref. Col.: and Bleek treats of it at some length here. "In the word ἑαυτούς we have merely this: that the action to which the *subject* is united, refers to the *subject itself*, i. e. to ὑμᾶς. Since however this is a plural idea, a multitude consisting of many members,—the words do not express whether an influence is meant which the different members are to exert one upon another, or each one on himself, or each on himself and on others as well: as regards the expression, it is just as general and indefinite as if it were said, ἡ ἐκκλησία παρακαλείτω ἑαυτήν. Still, in the idea of the verb, or otherwise in the context, it may be made clear which of these meanings is intended: and so we find this reflective third person plural frequently used,—whether it imply actually the third person, or the first or second,—where from the context it can only be taken in the second of the above senses, viz. that of an influence to be exerted, in a body consisting of many members, by one member upon another: where, in other words, ἀλλήλων might stand without change of the sense. So in reff.: and in the best Greek writers, e. g. Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 2, εὐμενεστέρους . . . ἑαυτοῖς: § 16, οἵγε ἀντὶ μὲν τοῦ συνεργεῖν ἑαυτοῖς τὰ συμφέροντα, ἐπηρεάζουσιν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ φθονοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις: ib. ii. 7. 12, and De Venat. vi. 12, &c. As regards our passage, this certainly is especially meant, that in the Church one should exhort another: yet not excluding the implication, that each one should himself be exhorted by his exhortation of the Church. In Col. iii. 16, we have the same relation expressed") **day by day** (reff.: so Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 12: De Re Equest. v. 9 al.: generally in the classics καθ' ἑκάστην, or καθ' ἡμέραν, elliptically), **as long as** (ἄχρις, connected with ἄκρος, as μέχρι with μακρός, properly means 'to the height of,' and hence, '*up to*,' of space,—'*until*,' of time. Hence, by a mixed construction, not unfrequently, as here, '*as long as*,' i. e. 'up to the moment of such or such a state enduring in existence:' see in reff.) **the (word) "To-day" is named** (i. e. as long as that period endures, which can be called by the name "*to-day*" as used in the Psalm. That period would be here, *the day of grace*; the short time (see ch. x. 25, 37) before the coming of the Lord. And so Chrys.: τὸ γὰρ σήμερον, φησίν, ἀεί ἐστιν ἕως ἂν συνεστήκῃ ὁ κόσμος:—on the other hand, many Commentators understand, *the term of their natural life*; so Basil (Ep. 42. 5, vol. iv. p. 130), Thdrt., Thl., Primasius, Erasm., Corn. a-Lapide, al. But the words themselves, τὸ σήμ. καλεῖται, are somewhat ambiguous in meaning. De W. with several others, take σήμερον as indicating the whole passage of which it is the first word, and καλεῖται as = κηρύσσεται: so Bengel, "Dum Psalmus iste auditur et legitur." But this seems neither so simple nor so applicable: seeing that, ch. iv. 7, he again calls attention to this σήμερον not as indicating the whole passages, but as πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζον ἡμέραν), **that from among you** (emphatic, as contradistinguished from οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ver. 9. This not having been seen, the transposition, as in rec., has taken place) **no one be hardened** (as they, ver. 8) **by deceit of** (arising out of, belonging to) **his sin** (cf. Rom. vii. 11, ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία . . . . ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ . . . . ἀπέκτεινεν. See also Eph. in reff. ὁρᾷς, says Chrysostom, ὅτι τὴν ἀπιστίαν ἡ ἁμαρτία ποιεῖ. And Œc., ἀπατηθεῖσα διὰ τῆς ἀπιστίας ἣν νῦν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκάλεσεν. In ch. xi. 25; xii. 4, ἁμαρτία is similarly used for defection from God). 14.] A reason given for βλέπετε κ.τ.λ., enforcing the caution; since it is only by endurance that

ἀρχὴν τῆς [l] ὑποστάσεως [m] μέχρι [m] τέλους [n] βεβαίαν [o] κατάσχωμεν, [15] [p] ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς

ABCDH KLMPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

l = 2 Cor. ix. 4. xi. 17. ch. i. 3, xi. 1 only. Ruth i. 12. Ps. xxxviii. 7. Ezek. xix. 5. m here only. ἄχρι τ., ch. vi. 11. Rev. ii. 26. ἕως, 1 Cor. i. 8. εἰς τέλος, Matt. x. 22. xxiv. 13. n ch. ii. 2 reff. o ver. 6. p ver. 12.

aft υποστ. ins αυτου A 71. 219 vulg Jer_1[(om_1) $Lucif_1$] Vig-taps.

we can becoem partakers of Christ. **For we have become** (Bleek remarks, "Our Writer loves the use of this word γέγονα, where he designates a state to which any one has attained, even where it would have been sufficient to have expressed by εἶναι simply the being (das sich befinden) in that state." See reff. But here it is rather perhaps proleptic, looking on to the fulfilment of the condition to be stated) **partakers of Christ** (some, e. g. Michaelis, Paulus, Bretschn., De Wette, take these words as τοὺς μετόχους σου ch. i. 9, to signify "*fellow-partakers with Christ;*" but as Bleek remarks, in all the places where our Writer *himself* uses μέτοχος with a gen. (ch. i. 9 being a citation), it ever signifies partaker '*of,*' and not '*with,*' that genitive noun. So μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, ch. vi. 4; also ch. iii. 1; xii. 8;—and μετέχειν τινός, ch. ii. 14; v. 13; vii. 13. So Chrys. (μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ φησιν κ.τ.λ.), Thl. (μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ ὡς σῶμα κεφαλῆς), Œc., Primas., Luther, Bengel, Bleek, Lünemann, &c.), **if, that is** (περ is originally the same as περί, and is found as an enclitic in Latin as well as in Greek, in 'paulisper,' 'parumper,' 'semper,'—bearing the sense of 'omnino,' or the German prefixed all, in allda, allwo, also, &c., and in our '*although.*' See an interesting chapter in Hartung ii. 327—344, and Donaldson's New Cratylus, p. 231 ff. ἐάνπερ does not occur in St. Paul, nor his usual εἴπερ in this Epistle. We have it in Herod. vi. 57, πατρούχου τε παρθένου πέρι, ἐς τὸν ἱκνέεται ἔχειν, ἢν μή περ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτὴν ἐγγυήσῃ, *if, that is* .. '*si omnino*' . . .), **we hold fast** (see on ver. 6) **the beginning of our confidence** (the earlier Commentators, down to Calvin, do not seem to have been aware that **ὑπόστασις** has in Hellenistic Greek the signification of '*confidence.*' That it has, is now proved beyond a doubt. Thus Polyb. iv. 54. 10, οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι, θεωροῦντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν, πραγματικῶς διενοήθησαν πρὸς τὸ καθικέσθαι τῆς προθέσεως: ib. vi. 55. 2, οὐχ οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν, ὡς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τόλμαν καταπεπληγμένων τῶν ἐναντίων: Diodor. Sic. Excerpta de Virt. et Vit. p. 557, ἡ ἐν τοῖς βασάνοις ὑπόστασις τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ καρτερικὸν τῆς τῶν δεινῶν ὑπομονῆς περὶ μόνον ἐγενήθη τὸν Ἀριστογείτονα. See more examples in Bleek and Lünemann. Diod. Sic. also uses ὑποστατικός of one who is of a confident nature (xx. 78), and Polyb. v. 16. 4, ὑποστατικῶς. See also notes on reff. 2 Cor.: and our ch. xi. 1, and the reff. in the LXX. The Greek Fathers mostly give **ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως** the sense of "our faith:" and Chrys. and Thl. explain how they came by this meaning: τὴν πίστιν λέγει δι' ἧς ὑπέστημεν. The Latins also, as vulg., "initium substantiæ ejus," or as Primasius, "fidem Christi per quam subsistimus et renati sumus, quia ipse est fundamentum omnium virtutum." And thus, or similarly, many of the moderns, even recently Bisping, "*the beginning of the subsistence of Christ in us.*" Calvin himself gives it "fiduciæ vel subsistentiæ."

It is somewhat doubtful, whether τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστ. is to be understood '*the beginning* of our confidence,' i. e. our incipient confidence, which has not yet reached its perfection,—or, 'our *former* confidence,' τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, as 1 Tim. v. 12, τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν [cf. also Rev. ii. 4]. This latter is taken by very many, as Grot., Wolf, Tholuck, Delitzsch, al.: but the other is far better, inasmuch as it keeps the contrast between ἀρχή and τέλος; '*if we hold fast this beginning* of our confidence firm until the *end.*' Otherwise, by making ἀρχὴν τῆς = ἀρχαίαν, the contrast vanishes) **firm unto the end** (see reff. The *end* thought of is, not the death of each individual, but the coming of the Lord, which is constantly called by this name),— **15.**] The whole connexion and construction of this verse is very difficult. I. *a.* Chrys., Œc., Thl., Erasm. (annot.), Grot., al. suppose a new sentence to begin, and a parenthetical passage to follow from the end of this verse to ch. iv. 1, where the sense is taken up again by φοβηθῶμεν οὖν. Besides the contextual objections to this (which see in the connexion below) there are these: 1. that δέ or some such connecting particle would thus be wanted here; 2. that thus the οὖν of ch. iv. 1 would be very unnatural. *β.* Semler, Morus, Storr, De W., Bleek, Tholuck, Lünem., Delitzsch, Winer (§ 63. I. 1, edn. 6), al. still regarding it as the beginning of a new sentence, believe the apodosis to follow at τίνες γάρ, the first question: and justify this use of γάρ at the beginning of a question. But here again the omission of δέ (ἐν

αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ [q] σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ [q] παραπικρασμῷ. [16] τίνες [r] γὰρ ἀκούσαντες [s] παρεπί-

q ver. 8.
r Matt. xxiii. 17, 19. Luke xiv. 28 al. fr.
s here only. Ps. lxxvii. 17, 40. Ezek. ii. 3. (-ρασμός, vv. 8, 15.)

15. σκληρυνετε D[1].
16. rec τινές, with LM[P] latt syr copt [Euthal-ms]: txt (*see note*) o Syr Chr Thdrt.

δὲ τῷ λέγ.) would be unnatural, besides that such a γάρ in a question does not seem precedented, when that question is in an apodosis with an ellipsis of λέγω or the like. γ. J. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, al. beginning also a sentence at ἐν τῷ λ., believe the apodosis to commence at μὴ σκληρύνητε, from which words they conceive that the Writer adopts the words of the Psalm as *his own*. But thus no good sense is given: 'Harden not your hearts, because (or while) it is said "To-day &c."' And we should hardly find, in this case, ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ thus standing without further explanation. II. The second class of interpreters are those who join ἐν τῷ λέγ. with the *foregoing*. And of these, δ. Bengel, Michaelis, al. regard ver. 14 as a parenthesis, and join ἐν τῷ λέγ. with ver. 13; "exhort one another," "as it is said,"—or "while it is said," or even, "by saying." This must be confessed to be very flat and feeble. ε. The Peschito ("sicuti dictum est"), Primasius, Erasm. (par.), Luther, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Corn. a-Lap., Calov., Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Wolf, Paulus, Lachmann (in his punctuation), Ebrard, take ἐν τῷ λέγ. as immediately connected with what preceded. Of these some, as e. g. Thl., Primasius, Luther, Calvin, Estius, al., connect it with ἕως τέλους—"*till the end, while or as long as it is said*," &c. Others connect it with the whole of the preceding sentence—"*if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence, seeing that it is said*," or "*exhorted by what is said*," or "*observing what is said*." Ebrard takes the words as a proof that we must hold fast &c. in order to be μέτοχοι χριστοῦ. And I own that this seems to me by far the most natural way, and open to none of the objections which beset the others. I would render then '*since it is said*,' or in more idiomatic English, **for it is said, To-day, if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.** Thus the context goes on smoothly, and the purpose of the whole is to shew, as is summed up in ver. 12, that it is the καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας which they have above all things to avoid. This argument is now carried forward by taking up the word παραπικρασμῷ, and asking, in a double question, who they were that provoked, and with whom it was that He was offended. But here we are met by a curious phænomenon in Scripture exegesis. It is remarkable that, while all expositors ancient and modern are agreed to take the second τίσιν interrogatively, as indeed the form of the sentence renders necessary, the whole stream of interpreters down to Bengel, and many since, have taken τινες demonstratively, not interrogatively. The sense thus obtained would be as follows: indeed, as in E. V., "*For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses*:"—the exceptions being, Caleb and Joshua, and all under twenty years old, and the women and Levites. But if we come to examine, 1. what contextual sense such a sentence can bear, or even, 2. how our Writer would probably have expressed such a meaning, we shall find reason at once to reject the interpretation. For, 1. the purpose here is clearly not to bring out the *exceptions* to those who were included in this saying, a process which would have quite defeated the purpose of the exhortation, seeing that the rebellious would be designated merely by τινές, and the exceptions would appear to be by far the greater number: and so every reader might shelter himself under the reflection that he was one of the faithful many, not one of the rebellious τινές. Nor again, 2. would this, as mere matter of fact, have been thus expressed by the Writer. For it obviously was not so. The τινές were the faithful few, not the rebellious many: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν ηὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός, 1 Cor. x. 5. As regards the context, the course of thought is in fact just contrary to what this construction would require. The faithful exceptions are overlooked, and the whole of Israel is included in the παραπικρασμός, to make the exhortation fall more forcibly on the readers.

16.] **For** (on our understanding of the connexion of ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι (see above) this **γάρ** is not the elliptic γάρ so often accompanying an interrogation, as on Bleek's rendering, but the ordinary γάρ, rendering a reason. 'You need indeed to be careful against unbelief:—*for* on account of this very unbelief all our fathers were excluded') **WHO, when they had heard** (in immediate reference to ἐὰν ἀκούσητε above), **provoked** (scil. God: see reff. and Ezek. xx. 13 A)? **nay, was it**

κραναν; [t] ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωυσέως; 17 τίσιν δὲ [u] προσώχθισεν τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη; οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν, ὧν τὰ [v] κῶλα [w] ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; 18 τίσιν δὲ [x] ὤμοσεν μὴ [y] εἰςελεύσεσθαι εἰς τὴν [y] κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς [z] ἀπειθήσασιν; 19 καὶ

..μη εισε H. ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

t = Luke xvii. 8. Matt. xi. 9 (see note). u ver. 10. v here only. = LXX, for פֶּגֶר, cadaver, Lev. xxvi. 30. Num. xiv. 29, 32, 33. 1 Kings xvii. 46 bis. Isa. lxvi. 24 only. w = Luke xxi. 24. Num. as above (v). x w. inf., here only. see Acts ii. 30. Tobit ix. 3 [not ℵ]. y ver. 11. z Acts xiv. 2. xix. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8. = Deut. i. 26 al. fr. in LXX.

17. aft τισιν δε ins και A D-lat. for αμαρτ., απειθησασιν A 47. επεσαν D Cyr$_3$: επεσον a b f g k l Chr$_1$: txt ABCHKLM[P]ℵ Bas$_1$ Mac$_1$ [Euthal-ms] Damasc. (17 def.)

not (this **ἀλλά**, in a question which itself answers a question, is elliptical, and may be explained in two ways: 1. '*was it not, not a few but*' . . . . . : 2. by regarding the **ἀλλά** as expressing a negation of the uncertainty implied in the question—a ground why the question should not have been asked at all. And this is by far the better account: cf. ref. Luke: τίς δὲ . . . . ἐξ ὑμῶν . . . . ὃς ἐρεῖ . . . ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ; q. d. 'what need to ask such a question?' Xen. Cyr. ii. 2. 21, καὶ τί δεῖ . . . . ἐμβαλεῖν λόγον περὶ τούτου, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ προειπεῖν ὅτι οὕτω ποιήσεις; Aristid. Panath. i. p. 169, ἆρ' ἴσον τὸ κεφάλαιον, ἢ μικρὸν τὸ διάφορον; ἀλλ' οὐ πᾶν τοὐναντίον;) **all who** (Bengel and several others would take **πάντες οἱ** to signify "*meri*," "*only those who*," a meaning which it cannot by any possibility bear. As above noticed, the exceptions are put out of sight, and that which was true of *almost all*, asserted generally) **came out from Egypt by means of Moses** (the construction is somewhat unusual. We should expect with **διά** a passive participle, like ἐξαχθέντες. Lünemann refers to δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε 1 Cor. iii. 5)? **and** (we cannot otherwise express in English this **δέ**, which simply brings out the very slight contrast of a second and new particular. It is "*but*" in the E. V.: but that is because they take ver. 16 in the manner above rejected, as an *assertion*) **with WHOM was He offended forty years** (see on vv. 9, 10 for the verb **προσώχθισεν**, and the consonance, in the connexion of **τεσσ. ἔτη** with it, with that in the Psalm, which was there departed from)? **Was it not with those who sinned** (some, as Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Knapp, Vater, set the interrogation here, and take ὧν τὰ κῶλα κ.τ.λ. as an affirmative sentence. But it seems unnatural to insert an affirmative clause in the midst of a series of interrogatories, and therefore better to keep the interrogation for the end of the sentence, including that clause in it), **whose carcases** (**κῶλα** any members of the body, but especially the legs: taken also for the legs and arms, i. e. limbs: see example in Wetst. from Galen. The LXX, see reff., use it for פְּגָרִים, *corpses*: but probably with the meaning that their bodies should fall and perish limb from limb in the wilderness: so Beza: "Hoc vocabulo significatur, illos non tam sic ferente mortalitate vel quovis morbo, sed tabescentibus sensim corporibus in deserto veluti concidisse") **fell in the wilderness** (cf. 1 Cor. x. 5, κατεστρώθησαν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. The words here are exactly those of Num. xiv. 29. Again, we must remember, in explaining these words, that the Writer is not bearing in mind at this moment the exceptions, but speaking generally. So Calvin: "Quæritur, an Moses et Aaron ac similes in hoc numero comprehendantur. Respondeo, apostolum de universo magis corpore quam de singulis membris loqui")? **And to whom** (not "*concerning whom*," as Syr., al.: the dative after verbs of swearing or asserting is common, as expressing those towards whom the act is directed. So that it is not a dativus incommodi, as Lünemann) **sware He that they should not enter into His rest** (the construction here is somewhat anomalous with regard to the *subject* of the verb εἰσελεύσεσθαι. Ordinarily, the subject of the verb of swearing is identical with that of the verb expressing the act to which he binds himself. So in Xen. Hel. iii. 4. 6, Τισσαφέρνης μὲν ὤμοσε τοῖς πεμφθεῖσι πρὸς αὐτὸν . . . . ἦ μὴν πράξειν ἀδόλως τὴν εἰρήνην· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἀντώμοσαν . . . . Τισσαφέρνει, ἦ μήν, ταῦτα πράττοντος αὐτοῦ, ἐμπεδώσειν τὰς σπονδάς. See other examples in Bleek. But here the persons to whom the oath is directed, are the subject of the future εἰσελεύσεσθαι. We seem to want either a τό before μὴ εἰσελεύσ., or an αὐτούς after it. The latter construction is found in ref. Tobit, ὀμώμοκε Ῥαγουήλ, μὴ ἐξελθεῖν με), **except to those who disobeyed** (not, as vulg., "*increduli fuerunt*:" E. V., "*believed not*:" and so Luther, Estius, Calov., al.: this was a fact, and was indeed the root of their ἀπείθεια: but ἀπειθής, ἀπειθεῖν, are most commonly used of *practical* unbelief, i. e. disobedience: even in the passages in the Acts

[a] βλέπομεν ὅτι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰςελθεῖν δι' [b] ἀπιστίαν.
IV. [1] Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν μήποτε [c] καταλειπομένης [d] ἐπαγγελίας [e] εἰςελθεῖν εἰς τὴν [y] κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, [f] δοκῇ τις ἐξ

a ch. ii. 9. x. 25.
b ver. 12.
c = Luke xx. 31. Rom. xi. 4, from 3 Kings xix. 18. Ps. xlviii. 10. see ver. 9.
d = ch. vi. 12 &c. vii. 6 al9. Luke xxiii. 49. Acts i. 4. Rom. iv. 13 &c. 1 Macc. x. 15.
e constr. inf., Winer, § 44. 1, edn. 6.
f = (see note) here only. see 1 Cor. x. 12.

Chap. IV. 1. καταλιπομενης D[1][ℵ] Mac₁ Thdrt. ins της bef επαγγ. D[1].

(reff.), where the meaning approximates the nearest to unbelief, it is best understood of 'contumacia.' Ref. Deut. seems decisive of the meaning here: see also Deut. ix. 7, 23, 24: Josh. i. 18 al.)? 19.] **And (thus) we see** (Grot., al. give it, "ex historia cognoscimus:" but Bleek quotes from Seb. Schmidt, and it seems the correcter view, "βλέπομεν non de lectione aut cognitione historiæ, sed de convictione animi e disputatione seu doctrina præmissa") **that they were not able to enter in** (however much they desired it: they were incapacitated by not fulfilling the condition of inheriting all God's promises, belief and resulting obedience) **on account of unbelief** (see above on ver. 12. This verse forms a kind of 'quod erat demonstrandum' (as Ebrard), clenching the argument which has been proceeding since ver. 12. The Writer now proceeds to make another use of the example on which he has been so long dwelling).

Chap. IV. 1—13.] *In the Son, Israel enters into the true rest of God.* On the mingling of the hortatory form with the progress of the argument, see the summary at ch. iii. 1. 1.] **Let us fear therefore** (Bleek remarks that the words φοβεῖσθαι μή, commonly used,—see Acts xxvii. 29: 2 Cor. xi. 3; xii. 20: Gal. iv. 11,—of fear of something happening, here include also the desire to avoid that contingency. It might have been σπουδάσωμεν, as ver. 11, or βλέπωμεν μήποτε, as ch. iii. 12, or ἐπισκοπῶμεν, as xii. 15. But the word seems purposely chosen to express the fear and trembling, Phil. ii. 12, with which every servant of God, however free from slavish terror and anxiety, ought to work out his salvation) **lest** (on μήποτε as only indefinite, not expressing, 'lest at any time,' see above on ch. iii. 12), **a promise being still left us** (notice the *present*—not καταλειφθείσης. On the force of this present, very much of the argument rests. Many Commentators, as Erasm., Luther, Calv., Est., Schlichting, Limborch, al., have mistaken this participle to mean "derelicta seu neglecta per infidelitatem ac diffidentiam pollicitatione divina" (Est.). The term καταλείπειν ἐπαγγελίαν might *perhaps* bear this meaning, which however is not substantiated as to the verb by Acts vi. 2, nor as to the *object* of the verb by Baruch iv. 1. But it is decisive against this interpretation, 1. that the participle is *present*, not past, which it certainly in that case must have been: 2. that ἀπολείπεται in vv. 6, 9 takes up again this word: 3. that the article would be wanted before καταλειπ., or it would stand τῆς ἐπαγ. τῆς κατ. The meaning given above, 'to leave behind for others,' so that καταλείπεσθαι = 'superesse,' is common enough. Bleek gives many examples: e. g. Xen. Cyr. iii. 1. 6, καλὸν . . . κ. αὐτὸν ἐλεύθερον εἶναι, κ. παισὶν ἐλευθερίαν καταλιπεῖν: and often in Polybius, καταλείπεται ἐλπίς: and οὐ μὴν κακῶν αἱρέσεως καταλειπομένης: see Raphel. Again, as to construction, some, as Cramer and Ernesti, make this genitive governed by the verb ὑστερηκέναι. But against this the want of the article is, if not decisive, a very strong presumption. Our Writer would certainly have expressed this τῆς ἐπ. τῆς κατ. It remains then to take it as a gen. absolute, representing the present matter of fact) **of entering** (compare ἐξουσίαν περιάγειν, 1 Cor. ix. 5: ὁρμὴ ὑβρίσαι, Acts xiv. 5: and such expressions as ὥρα ἀπιέναι, κωλύματα μὴ αὐξηθῆναι. The more usual construction would be ἐπαγγελία τοῦ εἰσελθ. See Winer, in reff.) **into His rest** (it is to be observed, that in the argument in this chapter, the Writer departs from the primary sense of the words κατάπαυσίν μου in the Psalm, and lays stress on αὐτοῦ, making it *God's* rest, the rest into which God has entered: see below on ver. 10. And this is very important as to the nature of the rest in question. So Estius: "Hic per requiem promissam non intelligit terram Chanaan de qua secundum literam Psalmus locutus est, sed patriam cœlestem, quam illa terrena quies mystice significavit." Of course all references of the rest spoken of to the period after the destruction of Jerusalem, as Hammond (see Whitby's note against him), or to the cessation of Levitical ordinances, as Michaelis (on Peirce: he does not however repeat it in his other works), are inadequate and out of the question), **any one of you** (although the communicative form has been used before in φοβηθῶμεν, the second

ὑμῶν [g] ὑστερηκέναι. [2] καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν [h] εὐηγγελισμένοι [i] καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ [j] ὠφέλησεν ὁ [k] λόγος τῆς [kl] ἀκοῆς

ABCDK LMPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

g = Luke xxii. 35. Rom. iii. 23. 2 Cor. xi. 5. ch. xii. 15. Ps. xxxviii. 4. h pass., = ver. 6. Matt. xi. 5 ‖ only (1 Pet. i. 25 al.). 2 Kings xviii. 31. Joel ii. 32. i w. καί, Rom. iv. 6. 2 Cor. i. 14. 1 Thess. iii. 6, 12. iv. 5 only. see ch. v. 4. j = 1 Cor. xiv. 6. Gal. v. 2. Prov. x. 2. k 1 Thess. ii. 13. see Jer. x. 22. l = Rom. x. 16, from Isa. liii. 1.

person is here returned to; and of purpose. A similar change is found in ch. x. 24, 25: and in Rom. xiv. 13. The reading ἡμῶν (mss. 5. 56 vulg.-sixt. Thdrt.) is too obvious an alteration to what might be expected, to come into the text except on overwhelming authority, which it has not) **appear** (see below) **to have fallen short of it** (i. e. be found, when the great trial of all shall take place, to have failed of, = to have no part in,—the promise. So **δοκῇ** is, as so many both of ancients and moderns have taken it, a mild term, conveying indeed a sterner intimation behind it. The Latin will bear the same idiom—"ne quis videatur non assecutus esse"—expressed without the softening word, "ne quis evadat non assecutus." So, but not exactly, Thl.: *ἱλαρώτερον δὲ καὶ ἀνεπαχθέστερον τὸν λόγον ποιῶν οὐκ εἶπε· μὴ ὑστερήσῃ, ἀλλά· μὴ δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι.* I say, not exactly; for I should rather say that *δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι* is used, not for *ὑστερήσῃ*, which would rather require the present, *δοκῇ ὑστερεῖν*, but for *ἐλεγχθῇ*, or *φανερωθῇ, ὑστερηκώς*. We thus fully account for the perfect, which almost all the Commentators who take *δοκῇ* as pleonastic or as softening, have not attempted, or have failed to do. Another and wholly different interpretation of **δοκῇ** (and indeed of **ὑστερηκέναι**) has been given by Schöttgen, Baumgarten, Schulz, Wahl, Bretschneider (both under *ὑστερέω*), Paulus, and recently taken up and defended with much spirit, and, as is his wont, with no little confidence, by Ebrard: "*lest any of you think that he has come too late for it*"—i. e. should suppose that, all the promises having been now fulfilled, he has been born too late to have any share in this one. As far as mere usage of individual words is concerned, this interpretation might stand: for **δοκεῖν** has often, and in our Epistle, this meaning, e. g. ch. x. 29, *πόσῳ δοκεῖτε κ.τ.λ.* And **ὑστερεῖν** has this meaning—*ὑστερήσαντες τῆς μάχης*, Polyb.; *ὑστεροῦν τῆς βοηθείας*, Diod. Sic. p. 391 c; *ὑστερεῖν τῆς πατρίδος*, Xen. Ages. ii. 1. And this view also seems favoured by the perfect *ὑστερηκέναι*. As indeed against the general idea of the pleonastic *δοκῇ*, the perfect would be a strong argument for it. But it is very difficult to persuade oneself that it suits either the mode of expression, or the context. For if this were the object of the caution, why put so prominent a solemn *φοβηθῶμεν*? would not the exhortation rather have been expressed in a reassuring form, *μὴ οὖν τις ᾖ* (or *ἔστω*) *φόβος*, or *μὴ οὖν φοβηθῶμεν*, or *μὴ δοκῶμεν*, or the like? Again, what end would so solemn a caution serve, if merely to explain to the Hebrew converts the fact that the promise had yet a fulfilment waiting for them? This fact indeed the Writer does prove in the subsequent verses; but it is introduced with **a καὶ γάρ**, and only subserves the purpose already enounced in this verse, that of awakening in them a fear lest their unbelief should be found in the end to have excluded them from the participation of that promise. The meaning here assigned to **ὑστερέω**, that of *falling short of*, is quite borne out: cf. Thucyd. iii. 31, *ὁ δ' οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἐνεδέχετο, ἀλλὰ τὸ πλεῖστον τῆς γνώμης εἶχεν, ἐπειδὴ τῆς Μιτυλήνης ὑστερήκει* (since he had failed of Mitylene), *ὅτι τάχιστα τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ πάλιν προσμῖξαι*: Jos. Antt. ii. 2. 1, *οὐδενὸς ὅλως ὑστερεῖν*. For the usage of **δοκέω**, the Commentators quote Jos. Antt. ii. 6. 10, *οὐδ' ὧν εἰς ἐμὲ δοκεῖτε ἁμαρτάνειν, ἔτι μνημονεύω*: which is a fair instance, notwithstanding Ebrard's nur auf eine Stelle des schwülstigen Josephus: and in Latin, Cic. de Off. iii. 2. 6, "ut tute tibi defuisse videare." The usage in Gal. ii. 9, though not identical, is not very dissimilar, carrying the force of softening the verb to which it is attached). **2.**] The former half of this verse substantiates the **καταλειπομένης** of the last verse. The stress is not, '*we*, as well as *they*,' which would require *ἡμεῖς* to be expressed: but lies on **εὐηγγελισμένοι**, which includes both us and them.

For good tidings have been also announced (**καὶ γάρ** is often used where the **γάρ** in fact belongs to the chief word in the sentence, but is transposed back to the **καί**, because it cannot well stand third: see Hartung, i. 138. This passive use of **εὐαγγελίζομαι** is found in reff.) **to us, as likewise to them** (they were not the *same* good tidings in the two cases: but the Writer treats them as the same. To them indeed it was primarily the inheritance of the land of promise: but even then, as proved below, the **κατάπαυσίς μου** had a further meaning, which meaning reaches even down to us): **nevertheless the word of their hearing** (**τῆς ἀκοῆς**,

ἐκείνους, μὴ m συγκεκερασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. m 1 Cor. xii. 24 only†. 2 Macc. xv. 39 only.

2. rec συγκεκραμενος, with vulg(with demid hal harl) Syr Thdrt-ed, *verbum auditus non temperatus fidem auditorum* D-lat Lucif(*fidei*): συνκεκερασμενος ℵ: συγκεκραμενους D³KL[P] rel(-μμ- d k l¹ n) arm Mac, Chr Cyr[-p₁] Thdrt Phot [Thl Œc]: συνκεκρασμενους 17[(appy) Cyr-ms-p₁(-κεκερ-)]: txt ABCD¹M m Thdor-mops [Euthal-ms], *non admixtis fidei* am(with fuld tol F-lat), *cum non admixti essent fidei qui audierant* syr, *quia non confusi sunt in fide cum iis qui audiverunt* copt. (συνκ. AB¹CD¹[ℵ].)
for τοις ακουσ., των ακουσαντων D¹ syr-mg Lucif; *ex his* [*iis* vulg] *quæ audierunt* am(with fuld [demid] F-lat): τους ακουσαντας Chr-ms: τοις ακουσθεισιν 71 Thdor-mops$_{expr}$ Thdrt(appy).

gen. of apposition; the word and the ἀκοή being commensurate: '*the word of* (consisting in) *that which they heard.*' See note on ref. 1 Thess., where however ἀκοή is connected with παρ' ἡμῶν. Delitzsch says here: "The classical use of ἀκοή (e.g. ἀκοὴν ἔχω λέγειν τῶν προτέρων, i.e. a tradition from the ancients, Plato, Phædr. p. 274 c) does not by itself explain the apostolic; but we must refer to the Heb. שְׁמוּעָה, that which is received by hearing, the tidings (with the gen. of the thing declared 2 Sam. iv. 4, or of the declarer ref. Isa.). That is so called, which the Prophet hears from Jehovah and announces to the people, Isa. xxviii. 9: Jer. xlix. (xxix., LXX) 14: and thus there could not be a more appropriate word for that which is heard immediately or mediately from the mouth of the ἀκούσαντες (ch. ii. 3), and thus for the N. T. preaching, so that the λόγος ἀκοῆς, considered as one idea (ref. 1 Thess.), betokens the N. T. word preached. The expression of this idea not being of itself a N. T. one, it may, without supposition of any reference to such passages as Exod. xix. 5 (ἐὰν ἀκοῇ ἀκούσητε τῆς φωνῆς μου), be used of God's word spoken to Israel in the time of Moses") **did not profit them, unmingled as they were in faith with its hearers.** The passage is almost a locus desperatus. The question of *reading* may be solved by consulting the digest. The nominative, which *apparently* makes the sense so easy, "*the word, not being mingled with faith in them that heard it,*" rests on no manuscript authority, except that of the Codex Sinaiticus, but mainly on the Peschito and ancient Latin versions. It is notwithstanding retained by Mill, and Tischendorf ed. 7 [and 8], and defended, purely on subjective grounds, by Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, Ebrard, and Delitzsch. I own that the temptation is strong to follow their example: but the evidence on the other side is very strong, and internal grounds seem to me as decisive in its favour as external. No doubt the difficulty is great: but not, I think, so great in reality, as on the other more tempting and apparently easy construction. I will first discuss this latter, and thus approach the question of the real meaning. The above rendering, "*the word, not being mingled with faith in them that heard it,*" is that of the great majority of modern expositors: who take τοῖς ἀκούσασιν as a dative either, α. commodi, "*for,*" or "*with*" ("*chez*") the hearers; β. as = ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων, the dative of the subject after a passive; or, γ. as = "*with,*" i.e. so that the hearers are they *with whom* the word was not mingled in, or by, faith. This latter appears to be the sense of the Syr.: "*quoniam non commixtus erat per fidem cum iis qui eum audierant:*" (Etheridge's rendering however is "because not contempered with faith in them that heard it:") and the general understanding of this has been, that as food profits not, unless assimilated and mingled with the body of the eater, so the word did not profit, there being no assimilation of it by faith with (or, according to (α) and (β), it not being mingled with faith in) the hearers. Ebrard, alone of all Commentators, strikes out confidently and with some assumption a different path, and, taking this reading, understands that not the non-receptivity of the hearers, but the incapacity of the O. T. word itself to carry faith with it, is meant. I need hardly remind the reader that such a sense is directly against the argument, which knows of but *one* word,—and against the plain assertion of ver. 12, which Ebrard tries, without the least indication in the text itself, to interpret of the N. T. word only. It is indeed lamentable that an able expositor, such as Ebrard on the whole is, should suffer himself to be so often carried away by unworthy crotchets, and when so carried away, to speak so confidently of them. But let us now discuss this whole class of renderings. The first objection to it appears to me to be, that it connects μὴ συγκεκραμένος with λόγος. Bleek felt this, and tried to help the sense by the conjecture τοῖς ἀκούσμασιν, originally suggested, from Thdrt.'s

n particip. aor., 2 Thess. ii. 12. Jude 5 al.

³ εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν ʸ κατάπαυσιν οἱ ⁿ πιστεύσαντες, ABCDK LMP א a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

3. εισερχωμεθα AC m[1] 17. for γαρ, ουν ACMא [47] copt. om 1st την BD[1].

explanation, by Nösselt. It would be surely unnatural that the *word itself*, and not the hearers, should be alleged as in any way the ground of *their rejection*. And if it be replied, that it is not the word itself, but the circumstance of its being not mixed with faith in them, I answer that such may have been the *fact*, but considering what our Writer says of the word of God in ver. 12, it seems to me very unlikely that *he should so have expressed it*. Then again the μή presents a difficulty on this interpretation. The usages of μή with participles are very difficult to limit accurately, amidst all the varieties of subjectivity introduced by personification and hypothesis: but I think we may safely say, that the occurrence of μὴ συγκεκραμένος applied to λόγος, and indicative of mere historical matter of fact, would not be so likely as that of μὴ συγκεκρασμένους, where *persons* are treated of. And yet more: it seems hardly probable from the form of the sentence, that **ἐκείνους** and **τοῖς ἀκούσασιν** should refer to the same persons, as they must do, in case of the nominative reading being adopted. Why not in this case αὐτοῖς, or ἐν αὐτοῖς, or simply τῇ πίστει? I feel however another, and a still weightier objection, to the art. **τῇ**, in that case. It *might* doubtless be there, and capable of a good meaning: but when we examine the habit of our Writer, we find that he *never* uses ἡ πίστις for '*faith*,' abstract, but always for '*the faith*,' concrete, of some person spoken of. And this usage is very marked: for in ch. xi. 1, where he gives a definition of Faith in the abstract, it is ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, not ἡ δὲ πίστις ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ. The other places where he uses it with the art. are ch. xi. 39, μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως, "by their faith:"—xii. 2, εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν, "of the faith:"—and xiii. 7, ὧν μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν, "whose faith" . . . So that I conceive we cannot understand here otherwise than, 'in their faith,' although the word 'their' may be too strong when expressed in English, as almost implying the existence of real faith in them, which did *not* exist. And I own this consideration sets so strong a barrier against the rec. reading συγκεκραμένος, that, it seems to me, no difficulty consequent on adopting the other reading can bear me over it. On these grounds then, as well as external evidence, I feel that the accusative plural should be inflexibly maintained. Then, *how are we to understand the sentence?* The modern Commentators all declare that it cannot be understood at all. The Fathers, with the exceptions of Cyr.-alex. once, Thdrt. in one edition (both unreal ones, see Bleek, p. 505),—and Lucifer of Cagliari, all read the accus.; and mostly explain the clause, that *they* (ἐκεῖνοι) *were not mingled in* (in respect of) *faith with those who really listened and obeyed*, viz. Joshua and Caleb. So Chrys.: but his homilies on this Epistle have been so imperfectly reported, that he seems not unfrequently very confused: here, e. g., making Caleb and Joshua those who were not mixed with the multitude; so that Thl., who himself takes the above view, naïvely says of Chrys., τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην αὐτοῦ κ. βαθεῖαν σοφίαν ὁ ἅγιος οὗτος εἰπών, ἐμοὶ γοῦν τῷ ἀναξίῳ οὐκ ἔδωκε νοῆσαι πῶς αὐτὸ εἶπεν. And so Œc. and Photius (in Bleek), Hammond, Cramer, Matthæi, &c. But the objection to this reference will already have been seen by the student. The exceptions to the general unbelief are not brought out by our Writer, anxious to include all under it for the greater warning to his readers. Theodoret, though quoting ἀκούσασιν, seems to have read ἀκούσμασιν or ἀκουσθεῖσιν, for he interprets μὴ πιστῶς δεξαμένους, κ. τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμει τεθαῤῥηκότας, κ. οἷον τοῖς θεοῦ λόγοις (one ms. reads θεολόγοις) ἀνακραθέντας. And Theodore of Mopsuestia says, οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τοῖς ἐπαγγελθεῖσι συνημμένοι· ὅθεν οὕτως ἀναγνωστέον· μὴ συγκεκραμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν, ἵνα εἴπῃ ταῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς γεγενημέναις ἐπαγγελίαις τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ Μωυσέως. We have also a testimony from Irenæus of a character hardly to be doubted, pointing to the same reading. It occurs iii. 19. 1, p. 212, "Qui nude tantum hominem Eum dicunt ex Joseph generatum, perseverantes *in servitute pristinæ inobedientiæ moriuntur, nondum commisti verbo* Dei Patris." If we could set aside the objection to ἀκουσθεῖσιν, that it has next to no external authority in its favour, it would be a not improbable reading, for we have this very participle in ch. ii. 1; and in Stobæus xlv. 8, we find these lines from Menander: δεῖ τὸν πολιτῶν προστατεῖν αἱρούμενον τὴν τοῦ λόγου μὲν δύναμιν οὐκ ἐπίφθονον, ἤθει δὲ χρηστῷ συγκεκραμένην ἔχειν. But at present, it cannot

καθὼς [o] εἴρηκεν [p] Ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου [p] Εἰ εἰςελεύσονται εἰς τὴν [p] κατάπαυσίν μου· [q] καίτοι τῶν [r] ἔργων

.. εις την ... bl.

o ch. i. 13 reff. p Psa. xciv. 11. ch. iii. 11 (reff.). q Acts xiv. 17 (xvii. 27 v. r.) only. καίτοιγε, John iv. 2. r Gen. ii. 2. = ch. i. 10. 2 Pet. iii. 10.

[καθως ειρ. bef οι πιστ. P. om ως A[1](appy).] om ει A o 108: η C[1] 17(ἡ).

come into question as a reading at all. Besides which, there would be this objection to it, that ἀκούσαντες has already occurred in this passage, and as implying those who heard the word, ch. iii. 16. Taking then τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, and rejecting the idea that it means Caleb and Joshua, or implies yielding assent and obedience, we have but this way open to us, which, though not without difficulty, is yet neither sinnlos nor contextwidrig. ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς having been mentioned in the general sense of '*the word heard*,' οἱ ἀκούσαντες is also in the general sense of '*its hearers*,' and the assumption is made, that the *word heard* has naturally *recipients*, of whom the normal characteristic is 'faith.' And so these men received no benefit from 'the word of hearing,' because they were not one in faith with its hearers; did not correspond, in their method of receiving it, with faithful hearers, whom it does profit. So that I would take τοῖς ἀκούσασιν not as historical, 'those who heard it,' but as categorical, 'those who have heard it,' as in John v. 25, οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσονται . . . . κ. οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται. I fairly own that this interpretation *does not satisfy me*: but it seems the only escape from violation either of the rules of criticism or of those of grammar: and therefore I am constrained to accept it until some better is suggested.

3.] **For** (taking up again τῇ πίστει in ver. 2: not the καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας of ver. 1, as rendering a new reason for it, as Bengel: nor the καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν &c. of ver. 2, as De W. and Delitzsch. It may certainly be said, that the emphatic position of εἰσερχόμεθα includes *also* ver. 1 in that to which γάρ applies: but then it must not be forgotten that οἱ πιστεύσαντες is equally, if not more emphatic, and thus ver. 2 is included, at the very least) **we do enter** (are to enter, as ὁ ἐρχόμενος and the like. On the reading εἰσερχώμεθα, see on Rom. v. 1. Some Commentators have seen a communicative and conciliatory tone in the first person here. So Calvin: "In prima persona loquendo majori eos dulcedine allexit, ab alienis ipsos separans." But Bleek and Lünem. well remark that it is not so; for οἱ πιστεύσαντες brings out a class distinct from the rest, as in ch. vi. 18; xii. 25) **into the** (aforesaid) **rest** (not only, as E. V., "*into rest*," abstract), **we who believed** (the aor. is proleptical, the standing-point being the day of entering into the rest: so in reff. It was unbelief which excluded them: the promise still remains unfulfilled, see below: they who at the time of its fulfilment shall be found to have believed, shall enter into it), **even as He hath said** (this citation evidently does not refer to the whole of what has just been said, but only to the fact, that the rest has not yet been entered into in the sense of the promise. The condition, πιστεύσαντες, is not yet brought into treatment, but follows below in ver. 11 in hortatory form, having in fact been demonstrated already in ch. iii. 12—19. Œc. and Thl. understand the πιστεύσαντες as also substantiated by our verse: so also Bengel: "An vero ex hoc testimonio efficitur, nos per fidem ingredi in Dei regnum? minime id quidem per se: sed ita est si omnia connectas, tum praecedentia tum sequentia: nam si infidelitas arcet ab aditu, fides certe introducit." But this seems unnatural: see the connexion below), **As I sware in my wrath, If** (see above on ch. iii. 11) **they shall enter into my rest: although** (the context is much disputed. I believe it will be best taken thus: the Writer is leading on to the inference, that the entering into *God's rest* is a thing YET FUTURE for God's people. And this he thus brings about. ἡ κατάπαυσίς μου is not a thing future for God:—He has already entered therein,—καίτοι to αὐτοῦ end of ver. 4. Still (ver. 5) we have again, after God had thus entered in, the oath, They shall not, &c. Consequently, since (ver. 6) it remains that *some* must enter in, and they to whom it was first promised did not, on account of unbelief,—for that they *did not* (i. e. none of them did), is plain by His repeating in David, after the lapse of so many centuries, the same warning again (ver. 7), which He would not have done if Joshua had led Israel into that rest (ver. 8):—since this is so, the sabbatism of God's people is YET FUTURE (ver. 9), and reserved for that time when they shall rest from their labours, as God from His (ver. 10). Then follows a concluding exhortation, vv. 11—16. Thus all is clear, and according to the progress of the argument. The other views have been, *a*. that of Lyra, Calvin, Beza, Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Kuinoel,

[s] ἀπὸ [st] καταβολῆς [s] κόσμου γενηθέντων. 4 [o] εἴρηκεν γάρ [u] που περὶ τῆς [v] ἑβδόμης οὕτως, Καὶ [w] κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

s Matt. xiii. 35. xxv. 34. Luke xi. 50. ch. ix. 26. Rev. xiii. 8. xvii. 8. πρό, 1 Pet. i. 20 reff.
t alw. w. κόσμ. (see above), exc. ch. x. 11 +. 2 Macc. ii. 29 only.
u so ch. ii. 6. εἶπε γάρ που Ὅμηρος, Xen. Symp. iv. 7.
v = here only. Lev. xxiii. 16 A. τὴν ἑβδ., ἣν Ἑβραῖοι σάββατα καλοῦσι, Philo de Abr. § 5, vol. ii. p. 5.
w Gen. ii. 2. vv. 8, 10. Acts xiv. 18 only. intr., Gen. viii. 22. Ezek. i. 24.

al., most of whom understand a second *κατάπαυσιν* before *τῶν ἔργων*,—and render **καίτοι**, "*idque*," "*and that*"—"in requiem meam, nempe illam ab operibus a fundatione mundi factis," as Seb. Schmidt. But this involves two mistakes: *καίτοι* can never mean *nempe* or *idque*, and this meaning would require **τῶν** *ἀπὸ κατ. κ.* &c., without which article it is of necessity a primary, not a secondary predicate. And indeed thus some of the above (Limborch, Cramer) take it, and construe, still however forcing *καίτοι*,—"namely, into the rest which came in when the works were finished," &c. *β*. That of Calvin ("tametsi operibus a creatione mundi perfectis. Ut definiat qualis sit nostra requies, revocat nos ad id, quod refert Moses, Deum statim a creatione mundi requievisse ab operibus suis, et tandem concludit hanc esse veram fidelium requiem, quæ omnibus sæculis durat, si Deo sint conformes"), Beza, Böhme, &c. And there is some portion of truth in this, but it does not rightly represent the context. For the *fact*, that God's rest is that into which we are to enter, is *not proved*, nor *concluded*, but taken for granted, and underlies the whole argument, the object of which is to shew that that **κατάπ. μου** is, though not a future rest *for God*, a future rest *for us* to enter into, when we have finished our works, as He his. *γ*. That of Erasm.(par.), a-Lapide, Grot., Hamm., Calov., and many others, who hold that *two*, or as Chrys., Œc., Thdrt., Thl., that *three* different rests are spoken of (e. g. Thl., ὥσπερ τὸ σάββατον κατάπαυσις λέγεται παρὰ τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐκώλυσε κατάπαυσιν μετὰ ταῦτα λεχθῆναι καὶ τὴν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας εἴσοδον· οὕτως οὐδὲ νῦν κωλύει μετὰ ταύτην πάλιν κατάπαυσιν κληθῆναι τὴν μέλλουσαν, τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν φημι βασιλείαν, εἰς ἣν οἱ ἀπιστήσαντες οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται). But this is manifestly wrong: there is not a word nor a hint of a second or third rest: the *ordinance* of the Sabbath is not so much as alluded to: *ἡ κατάπαυσίς μου* is, all through, the rest *into which God has entered*; and the object, to shew that into this, God's people *have yet to enter*. The fact that men did not, by the ordinance of the Sabbath, enter into it, lies, as an easily to be assumed thing, beneath the surface, but is not asserted nor even implied. *δ*. It would be hardly worth while to mention Ebrard's view, were it not for his name and ability. It is strange in the last degree:—**ἔργα** are "*man's works*:" not exactly *good works*, for we have none: not the *works of the law*, for they came afterwards: but *all human works* (alles das, was ἔργα gennant werden könne), which had been going on since the creation, yet were not sufficient to bring us into God's rest, but required a new way of salvation, viz. not one of works, but of faith, to effect this. So that *τῶν ἔργων* is a contrast to *πιστεύσαντες*: and in ver. 4, *τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ* a contrast to *τῶν ἔργων* here, the one God's, the other man's, works. I need but state this to the reader, to shew him how utterly preposterous it is, and foreign from the context, in which not a word is indicated of the contrast between works and faith, but every thing of that between belief and unbelief) **the works** (viz. of God: an expression borrowed from the citation which follows) **were constituted** (i. e. finished. What Ebrard says against this meaning, that it is making the aorist participle = *γεγενημένων*, the perfect, is altogether without force. That the 1 aor. pass. of *γίνομαι* may almost always be tracked to its original *passive* meaning, once maintained in note on 1 Thess. i. 5, does not appear to be a safe assertion: see note there in 3rd and subsequent Edns. of Vol. III. In our Epistle, however, it may generally be done: e.g. ch. v. 5; vi. 4 (x. 33; xi. 34). This being so, *τὰ ἔργα ἐγενήθη* will simply mean, 'the works were constituted,' 'were settled in their established order,' 'were made;' and so by consequence 'were finished.' The word seems to be taken from the constant repetition of *ἐγένετο* in Gen. i., and the passive used because the agent is here in question) **from the foundation** (**καταβολή** occurs in the N. T. only in this connexion, except ch. xi. 11. See on ch. vi. 1) **of the world** (i. e., as explained above on *καίτοι*, and substantiated in next verse, though God Himself had not that rest *to enter into*, and did not mean this by **ἡ κατ. μου**, but had entered into the rest of which He speaks: the key verse to this being ver. 10). **4.**] *Substantiation of the last assertion.* **For he** (God, not Moses, nor *ἡ γραφή*: see above on *εἴρηκεν*: see ch. xiii. 5) **hath spoken somewhere** (see

εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ· 5 καὶ [x] ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, [p] Εἰ εἰςελεύσονται εἰς τὴν [p] κατάπαυσίν μου. 6 ἐπεὶ οὖν [y] ἀπολείπεται τινὰς εἰςελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν, καὶ οἱ πρότερον [z] εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰςῆλθον διὰ [a] ἀπείθειαν, 7 πάλιν τινὰ [b] ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, Σήμερον [c] ἐν

x see ch. v. 6. y = ver. 9. ch. x. 26 only. (2 Tim. iv. 13. Jude 6 al.) ἐλπὶς ἀπολείπεται σωτηρίας, Polyb. p. 696. Bl. see ver. 1. z ver. 2. a Rom. xi. 30, 32. Eph. ii. 2. v. 6. Col. iii. 6. ver. 11 only†. b Luke xxii. 22. Acts ii. 23. x. 42. xi. 29. xvii. 26, 31. L. only, exc. here & Rom. i. 4. Num. xxxiv. 6. c = Mark i. 2. Rom. ix. 25. see Rom. xi. 2.

4. om εν τη ημ. τη εβδ. A. 5. om ει D[1] d o 123. 8-pe: *et* D-lat.
6. (δια, so ACL a.) for απειθειαν, απιστιαν ℵ[1] [vulg Cyr$_1$].
7. οριζει bef τινα ℵ[1].

above on ch. ii. 6) **concerning the seventh day** (so in Hellenistic Greek constantly for the Sabbath: as e.g. in the title of one of Philo's treatises, *περὶ τῆς ἑβδόμης*: and elsewhere: see Bleek. In 2 Macc. xv. 1, the Sabbath is called ἡ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρα) **on this wise, And God rested** (in classical Greek *καταπαύω* is transitive, with an accusative of the person and a genitive of the thing: so Xen. Cyr. viii. 5. 25, *ἥν τις ἀρχῆς Κῦρον ἐπιχειρῇ καταπαύειν*. For this other usage, see ver. 10, and reff. LXX. The rest here spoken of must not be understood only as that of one day after the completion of creation; but as an enduring rest, commencing then and still going on,—into which God's people shall hereafter enter. Still less must we find here any discrepancy with such passages as John v. 17: Isa. xl. 28: God's rest is not a rest necessitated by fatigue, nor conditioned by idleness: but it is, in fact, the very continuance in that upholding and governing, of which the Creation was the beginning) **on the seventh day from all His works:**

5.] **and in this** (place: but it is hardly necessary to fill up the ellipsis: Bleek quotes from Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 20, *μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν τῷδε*. See reff. *τούτῳ* here means, not, *this which follows*, but *this passage* about which we are treating: our present passage) **again** (i. e. *on the other hand:* a citation which shall qualify and explain that other, making it impossible that men should have already entered into it), **If they shall enter into my rest** (these words are to be taken exactly as before, in a strong negative sense; not, as D[1](see var. read.), and Primas., Böhme, al., indicatively. The point raised is, that in the days of Moses, nay long after, of David, men had not yet, in the full sense at least, entered into that rest, because it was spoken of as yet *future:* it being of no import to the present argument, whether that future is of an affirmative or negative proposition: the negative denunciation in fact implying in itself the fact, that *some would* enter therein. So Calov. (in Bleek), "Et in dicto paulo ante loco iterum loquitur Spiritus Sanctus de requie sua, 'Non ingredientur in requiem meam,' significans scilicet hac comminatione, quandam adhuc quietem restare sperandam iis, qui non sunt increduli nec comminationi prædictæ obnoxii"). 6.] **Since then it yet remains** (see reff.: this is the sense in all three places in our Epistle: *remains over*, not having been previously exhausted. *ἀπολείπεται, ἀπομένει*, Hesych. The time indicated by the present here is that following on the threat above) **that some enter into it** (viz. by the very expectation implied in the terms of the exclusion—'*These shall not:*' therefore there are that shall: because, the *εἰςελεύσεσθαι τινάς* being a portion of God's purposes, the failure of these persons will not change nor set aside that purpose. This latter consideration however does not logically come into treatment, but is enthymematically understood;—"since what God once purposed, He always purposes."
We must beware of Delitzsch's inference, that the *τινάς* implies that some *had on each occasion entered into it*, meaning, "there are some left yet to enter." For thus the reasoning, as such, would be quite invalidated; which is concerned in establishing, not that *some part* of the entrance is yet future, but that the entrance itself, as such, is so. That *some have entered* in, as matter of fact, is true enough; but even they not yet perfectly, ch. xi. 39 f.; and the *τινάς* here is used, not in respect of others who *have entered in*, but in respect of those who *did not*, when the words were used on the former occasion), **and those who were formerly** (as contrasted with David's time, and with the present) **the subjects of its announcement** (viz. the Israelites in the wilderness) **did not enter in on account of disobedience** (not, "*unbelief:*" see on ch. iii. 18. The first clause—*ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολ. τινὰς εἰςελθ.*, was a deduction from the terms

d = Rom. ix. 29. Gal. i. 9. 2 Pet. iii. 2. Jude 17.
e Psa. xcix. 7. ch. iii. 7, 8 reff.
f so ch. viii. 8.
g trans., Acts xiv. 18 only. Exod. xxxiii. 14. Deut. iii. 20. v. 33. Josh. i. 13 al.
h = ver. 6 reff.

Δαυεὶδ λέγων, μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον, καθὼς [d] προείρηται [e] Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ [e] σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. [8] εἰ γὰρ [f] αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς [g] κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας· [9] ἄρα [h] ἀπο-

ABCDK LPℵ abcd fghkl mno 17. 47

rec ειρηται, with D³KL rel (æth) Damasc [Thl]: προειρηκεν B 73. 80: txt ACD¹ℵ[P 47] 17 latt syr copt arm Chr₁ [Euthal-ms] Cyr₁ Thdrt Lucif₁.
8. for ουκ αν, ουκ αρα B: *non* D-lat Lucif: *nunquam* vulg. μετ' αυτα C.
9. om ver ℵ¹(ins ℵ-corr¹).

of the divine denunciation, as to God's general purpose; and now this second clause is a particular concrete instance in which that general purpose was not carried out. Since *some must*, and *they did not*, the implied promise is again found recurring many centuries after), **again** (emphatic: *anew*) **He limiteth** (reff.: and Demosth. p. 952. 20, ὁ μὲν τοίνυν νόμος σαφῶς οὑτωσὶ τὸν χρόνον ὥρισεν—*has fixed*, specified, assigned, limited the time. See many more examples in Bleek) **a certain day** (Valcknaer and Paulus make τινα interrogative, the former ending the question at ἡμέραν, the latter, at χρόνον. But this cannot well be, with the emphatic πάλιν prefixed), **saying "To-day"** (He begins his citation here with the word σήμερον; but having interrupted it by ἐν Δ. λέγων, μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον, καθὼς προείρηται, takes it up again below. This is much the simplest way to take the sentence (so also Delitzsch): not, as Calv., Beza, Grot., Jac. Cappell., Bleek, De W., Bisping, to make the first σήμερον a terminus in apposition with τινὰ ἡμέραν, "a certain day, viz. 'To-day,'" and then to go on from ἐν to προείρηται before coming to the citation: nor again to understand with Heinrichs, al. and E. V., the first σήμερον as the whole of the first citation, and then to start with the second at καθὼς (προ)είρηται) **in David** ('in,' as in reff.: as we say, '*in Isaiah*,' meaning, 'in the book of Isaiah.' This is better and more natural than, with Luther, Grot., Lünem., Delitzsch, al., to understand ἐν instrumental (?), "*by David*;"—or with Bengel, al., as *he* understands ch. i. 1, ἐν προφήταις, ἐν υἱῷ, i. e. as *local*, dwelling in, inspiring,—though this is better than the other) **after** (the lapse of) **so long a time** (viz. the time between Joshua and David. The blunder of understanding the words, "*after such a time as we have before mentioned*, viz. *forty years* (?)" has been endorsed by Dr. Bloomfield from Whitby, although in his previous note he had given the right interpretation, and although he puts καθὼς εἴρηται in a parenthesis in his text), **as it has been said before** (viz. ch. iii. 7, 15. According to the reading προείρηται, there can hardly be a question that the reference of the words is backward, to what has been already cited, not forwards to the words which follow. This latter being imagined, the readings προείρηκεν and εἴρηται have arisen), **To-day, if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts.**

8.] Confirmation of the above, as against an exception that might be taken, that notwithstanding the exclusion of many by unbelief, those who entered the promised land with Joshua *did enter* into that rest of God. **For if Joshua** (Ἰησοῦς is the constant Greek form of the name יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, or as in the later books, Chron., Ezra, and Nehemiah, יֵשׁוּעַ. It does not appear that any parallel between the typical and the great final Deliverer is intended: but it could hardly fail to be suggested to the readers. Our translators, in retaining the word "Jesus" here, have introduced into the mind of the ordinary English reader utter confusion. It was done in violation of their instructions, which prescribed that all proper names should be rendered as they were commonly used) **had given them rest** (led them into this rest of which we are treating: for the usage of καταπαύω, see above, on ver. 4: and compare reff.), **He** (God: the subject of ὁρίζει and λέγων above) **would not speak** (not "*have spoken*," as E. V. Compare Thuc. iii. 55, εἰ δ' ἀποστῆναι Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἠθελήσαμεν (if we had not consented &c.) ὑμῶν κελευσάντων, οὐκ ἠδικοῦμεν (we should be doing no wrong),—and John xv. 24, εἰ τὰ ἔργα μὴ ἐποίησα ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἃ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἐποίησεν, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχοσαν, "If I had not done &c.,—they would not have sin") **after this of another day.**

9.] *Consequence from the proposition* in ver. 6. *Some* must enter therein: some, that is, analogous to, inheriting the condition of and promises made to, those first, who did not enter in because of disobedience. These are now specified as '*the people of God*,' cf. reff., doubtless with a reference to the true spiritual character of Israelites indeed, represented under

λείπεται [i] σαββατισμὸς τῷ [j] λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. [10] ὁ γὰρ εἰς-ελθὼν εἰς τὴν [k] κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς [l] κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥςπερ ἀπὸ τῶν [m] ἰδίων ὁ θεός.

i here only +. (-ίζω, Exod. xvi. 30. Lev. xxvi. 35.)
j ch. xi. 25. 1 Pet. ii. 10. see Rom. xi. 1.
k ch. iii. 11 reff.
l intr., ver. 4 (reff.).
m so ch. vii. 27. ix. 12. xiii. 12.

απολειται B.

10. aft 1st απο ins παντων D[1] syr Cyr[-p_2] : πα is written over τω̄ by ℵ[3] but erased.

their external name: and their rest is no longer a *κατάπαυσις*, but (see below) is called by a higher and nobler name. **Therefore** (see above) **there remains** (see on ver. 6: remains as yet unexhausted, unoccupied, unrealized) **a keeping of sabbath** (as regards the word, it is only found, besides here, in Plut. de Superstitione, c. 3, ὦ βάρβαροι ἐξευρόντες, Ἕλληνες κακὰ τῇ δεισιδαιμονίᾳ, πηλώσεις, καταβορβορώσεις, σαββατισμούς, ῥίψεις ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, αἰσχρὰς προκαθέσεις, ἀλλοκότους προσκυνήσεις. It is regularly formed from *σαββατίζω* (reff.), as *ἑορτασμός* from *ἑορτάζω*. It is used here to correspond to the *κατάπαυσίς μου*, specified and explained in ver. 4. God's rest was a *σαββατισμός*; so also will ours be. Thdrt. remarks: σαββατισμὸν δὲ τὴν κατάπαυσιν κέκληκεν, ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ὧν ἐποίησεν, ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι δὲ βίῳ ἄλυπος ἔσται ζωὴ κ. πόνων ἐλευθέρα καὶ φροντίδων ἀπηλλαγμένη. σαββατισμὸν τοίνυν ὠνόμασε τὴν τῶν σωματικῶν ἔργων ἀπαλλαγήν. τοῦτο γὰρ δηλοῖ τὰ ἑξῆς. The idea of the rest hereafter being the antitype of the Sabbath-rest, was familiar to the Jews: see the quotations in Schöttg., Wetst., and Bleek. They spoke of the tempus futurum as the "dies qui totus est sabbathum." It is hardly probable that the sacred Writer had in his mind the object which Calvin mentions: "Non dubito quin ad Sabbathum data opera alluserit apostolus, ut Judæos revocaret ab externa ejus observatione: neque enim aliter potest ejus abrogatio intelligi, quam cognito spirituali fine." Still more alien from the sense and context is it to use this verse, as some have absurdly done, as carrying weight one way or the other in the controversy respecting the obligation of a sabbath under the Christian dispensation. The only indication it furnishes is negative: viz. that no such term as *σαββατισμός* could then have been, in the minds of Christians, associated with the keeping of the Lord's day: otherwise, being already present, it could not be said that it ἀπολείπεται) **for the people of God** (the well-known designation of Israel the covenant people. It occurs again, ch. xi. 25. Here it is used of that veritable Israel, who inherit God's promises by faith in Christ: cf. Gal. vi. 16. So Photius: καὶ αὕτη οὐ τοῖς τυχοῦσι, ἀλλὰ τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀφιερωμένη, λαὸς δὲ ἀληθῶς τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν κ. φυλάσσοντες τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ).

Ver. 10 is taken in two ways (not to mention the untenable interpretation of Schulz, which refers ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθών to the people of God, "for, when it has entered," &c. This would be εἰσελθὼν γάρ without the article): 1. as a general axiom, justifying the use of the word *σαββατισμός* above: **For he that has entered into his** (God's) **rest, has himself also rested from his** (own) **works, like as God rested from his own.** This has been the usual explanation. Thl. says, ἑρμηνεύει πῶς σαββατισμὸν ὠνόμασε τὴν τοιαύτην κατάπαυσιν· διότι φησὶ καταπαύομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἡμετέρων, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ θεός, καταπαύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν εἰς σύστασιν τοῦ κόσμου, σάββατον τὴν ἡμέραν ὠνόμασεν. This explanation labours under two difficulties: α. the aorist *κατέπαυσεν*, which thus is made into a perfect or a present. De Wette regards it as a reminiscence of the same word in ver. 4: so Delitzsch: but this is most unsatisfactory: β. the double reference of *αὐτοῦ*, first to God, and then to the man in question, especially when God's works are taken up by the strong term *τῶν ἰδίων*. 2. The other interpretation has been that of Owen, Alting, Stark, and more recently Ebrard, who refer ὁ εἰσελθών to Christ: **For He that entered into his** (own or God's) **rest, Himself also rested from His works like as God rested from His own**: and therefore, from our Forerunner having entered into this sabbatism, it is reserved for us, the people of God, to enter into it with and because of Him. Thus, as Ebrard says, Jesus is placed in the liveliest contrast to Joshua, who had not brought God's people to their rest; and is designated as 'That one, who entered into God's rest.' And to this view I own I am strongly inclined, notwithstanding the protest raised against it by Bleek, Lünemann, and Delitzsch. My reasons are, in addition to those implied above, α. the *form* of the assertion, as regards Joshua here and Jesus in ver. 14. That a contrast

11 [n] σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν [k] κατάπαυσιν, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις [o] ὑποδείγματι [p] πέσῃ τῆς [q] ἀπειθείας. 12 [r] ζῶν γὰρ ὁ [s] λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [t] ἐνεργής, καὶ

n = 2 Pet. i. 10 reff. o bad sense, 2 Pet. ii. 6. good, John xiii. 15. James v. 10 (ch. viii. 5. ix. 23 only) †. Sir. xliv. 16. 2 Macc. vi. 28, 31 only. p Luke viii. 7. Ps. xxxiv. 8. Ezek. xxvii. 27. q ver. 6 reff. r = Acts vii. 38. John vi. 51. 1 Pet. i. 23. s see note. t 1 Cor. xvi. 9. Philem. 6 only †.

H ζων γαρ... ABCDH KLPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

11. aft εισελθειν ins αδελφοι D[1]. om τις ℵ[1]. for απειθειας, αληθειας D[1], *a veritate* D-lat: απαθειας o.

12. ζω C. εναργης B, *evidens* Jer_1: *efficax* vulg Jer_2.

is intended between the Ἰησοῦς who did not give them rest, and the ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, seems very plain. And if so, it would be easily accounted for, that Christ should be here introduced merely under the designation of ὁ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τ. κατάπ. αὐτοῦ. β. The introduction of the words **καὶ αὐτός**, lifting out and dignifying the subject of this clause as compared with ὁ θεός, in a way which would hardly be done, had the assertion been merely of any man generally. γ. Scripture analogy. This rest, into which the Lord Jesus entered, is spoken of, Isa. xi 10, καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτοῦ, τιμή: and this work of His, in Isa. xl. 10, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, and by Christ Himself, John ix. 4, ἐμὲ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νύξ, ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι. δ. The expression **ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν** below, which stands harshly insulated unless it refers to the κατάπαυσιν in this verse. ε. The whole context: see summary at ch. iii. 1. Render then: **For He that entered into his** (either, 'God's;' or more probably merely 'his,' reflective, as in Isa. xi. 10 above: see also Matt. xxv. 21, 23, where the χαρά is τοῦ κυρίου σου) **rest, He Himself also** (on this, see above) **rested from his works** (see above) **as God from his own** (**τῶν ἰδίων** not with any distinction of kind, but used only to mark distinction of possession). **11—13.**] *Exhortation*, so frequently interspersed in the midst of the argument: see on ch. iii. 1. **Let us therefore** (consequence from vv. 3—7; seeing that the promise is held out to us, as it was to them, and that they failed of it through disobedience) **earnestly strive** (not, as vulg., "*festinemus*:" see reff.) **to enter into that rest** (viz. that mentioned in ver. 10, into which Christ has entered before, cf. ver. 14; ch. vi. 20), **lest any one fall into** (so vulg., Luth., Beza, Corn. a-Lap., Grot., Abresch, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al., and rightly, both from usage and from the position of the verb. Had **πέσῃ** been absolute, '*fall*,' = ἐκπέσῃ, as Chrys., Œc., Thl., Calv., Schlichting, Wolf, Bengel, Bleek, De W., Thol., al., its position in the sentence certainly must have been more prominent. As it stands, it holds the most insignificant place, between the genitive in government and the word governing it. And usage abundantly justifies the idiom πίπτειν ἐν, for 'to fall into.' Cf. πεσεῖν ἐν ὕπνῳ, Pind. Isthm. iv. 39: ἐν ὀρφανίᾳ, Isthm. viii. 14: ἐν ἀφύκτοισι γυιοπέδαις πεσών, Pyth. ii. 75: τίνων ποτ' ἀνδρῶν ἐν μέσοις ἀρκυστάτοις πέπτωχ' ὁ τλήμων; Soph. El. 1476: ἐν κλύδωνι καὶ φρενῶν ταράγματι πέπτωκα δεινῷ, Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1092. The construction is simply a pregnant one—πίπτειν εἰς, so as to be ἐν) **the same example** (**ὑπόδειγμα** is found fault with by the Atticists: παράδειγμα λέγε, μὴ ὑπόδειγμα, Thom. Mag.: and similarly Phrynichus. But Bleek shews that it is in frequent use, from Xenophon downwards. Its proper meaning is, *something shewn in a light and merely suggestive manner*: so in ch. viii. 5, οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἐπουρανίων. But it is oftener used, as here, to signify a *pattern* or *example*, good or bad: cf. besides reff., Jos. B. J. vi. 1, καλὸν ὑπόδειγμα βουλομένῳ σώζειν τὴν πατρίδα σοι πρόκειται βασιλεὺς Ἰουδαίων Ἰεχονίας: and other examples in Bleek) **of disobedience** (not, *unbelief*: see on ch. iii. 18. It was οἱ ἀπειθήσαντες who failed to enter in). **12, 13.**] Apart from the difficulties of some terms used, we may give the connexion thus: Such an endeavour is well worth all our σπουδή—*for* we have One to do with, who can discern and will punish every even the most secret disobedience. **For the word of God** (in what sense? 1. The λόγος ὑποστατικός, Personal Word, has been understood by many, e. g. the Fathers in general (see the copious reff. in Bleek's note here), Œc., Thl. (as commonly supposed, but see below, and judge), Thdrt. (by no means certain), Thom. Aquin., Lyra, Cajetan, Corn. a-Lap. ("Longe aptius et melius alii intelligunt Dei Filium"), Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Le Clerc, al. To this the first obvious objection is, that this mode of expression is confined to St. John among the N. T. writers. This, however, though clearly not to be met by alleging

[u] τομώτερος [v] ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν [w] δίστομον, καὶ

u here only +. ὅπλον τοι λόγος ἀνδρὶ τομώτερόν ἐστι σιδήρου, Callim. Hymn. in Del. 94. v constr., Luke xvi. 8. 2 Cor. xii. 13 only. 3 Kings xix. 4. Judg. xi. 25 [24] B. w w. μάχ. here only. Judg. iii. 16. Prov. v. 4. elsw. w. ῥομφαία, Rev. i. 16. ii. 12 only. Ps. cxlix. 6. Sir. xxi. 3.

such passages as Luke i. 2 and Acts xx. 32, is not decisive. For our Epistle, though perhaps anterior to all the writings of St. John, is yet so intimately allied to the Alexandrine terminology, that it would be no matter of surprise to find its Writer using a term so nearly ripe for his purpose as we find ὁ λόγος in Philo (see below). The real objections to the Personal λόγος being simply and directly here meant, lie in the Epistle, and indeed in the passage itself. *In the Epistle:* for we have no where in it this term used with any definiteness of our Lord, nor indeed any approach to it; not even where we might have expected it most, in the description of His relation to the Father, ch. i. init. Every where He is the Son of God, not His Word. And in ch. vi. 5; xi. 3, that expression is changed for ῥῆμα θεοῦ, when, especially in the latter place, had the idea of the personal λόγος been familiar to the Writer, he would almost certainly have said νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας λόγῳ θεοῦ, not ῥήματι θ. *And in the passage itself:* for such adjectives as ἐνεργής and κριτικός, and even ζῶν, as matter of emphatic predication, would hardly be used of the Personal λόγος: and, which to my mind is stronger evidence still, had these words applied to our Lord, we should not have had him introduced immediately after, ver. 14, as Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. But, 2. some of the ancient, and the great mass of modern Commentators, have understood by the term, *the revealed word of God*, in the law and in the gospel: or in the gospel alone, as contrasted with the former dispensation. And so even some of those who elsewhere in their writings have understood it of Christ: e.g. Origen (on Matt. xix. 12, tom. xv. 4, vol. iii. p. 656, εἰ τὸν λόγον τις ἀναλαβὼν τὸν ζῶντα κ. ἐνεργῆ κ.τ.λ., ... ἐκτέμνοι τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς παθητικόν: on Rom. xii. 7, lib. ix. 3, vol. iv. p. 650: "Verbum Dei omnia, etiam quæ in occulto sunt, perscrutatur: maxime cum vivens sit, et efficax &c. . . . . etenim cum moralis in ecclesia sermo tractatur, tunc uniuscujusque intra semetipsam conscientia stimulatur" &c.), Euseb., Aug. Civ. Dei xx. 21. 2 (vol. vii.) al. But neither does this interpretation seem to meet the requirements of the passage. The qualities here predicated of the λόγος do not appear to fit the mere written word: nor does the introduction of the written word suit the context. I should be rather disposed with Bleek to understand, 3. *the spoken word of God*, the utterance of His power, by which, as in ch. xi. 3, He made the worlds,—by which His Son, as in ch. i. 3, upholds all things. This spoken word it was, which they of old were to hear and not harden their hearts: σήμερον, ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε κ.τ.λ.: this spoken word, which interdicted them from entering into His rest —ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου. It seems then much more agreeable to the context, to understand this *utterance* of God, so nearly connected with God Himself, the *breath of his mouth:* and I would not at the same time shrink from the idea, that the Alexandrine form of expression respecting the λόγος, that semi-personification of it without absolutely giving it hypostatical existence, was before the mind of the Writer. Indeed, I do not see how it is possible to escape this inference, in the presence of such passages as this of Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 26, vol. i. p. 491, ἵνα ἐννοῇς θεὸν τέμνοντα, τάς τε τῶν σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων ἑξῆς ἁπάσας ἡρμόσθαι καὶ ἡνῶσθαι δοκούσας φύσεις, τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, ὃς εἰς τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκονηθεὶς ἀκμήν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὰν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διεξέλθῃ κ.τ.λ.: and again, ib. § 27, p. 492, οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἀκονησάμενος τὸν τομέα τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγον, διαιρεῖ τήν τε ἄμορφον καὶ ἄποιον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν. See, on the whole, Delitzsch's note. The idea of Ebrard, that this word, meaning the gospel, is introduced to give weight to σπουδάσωμεν —"Let *us* do our part, for the gospel of God is not wanting in power on its part," is too absurd to need refutation or even mention, were it not for his name) **is living** (not, *in contrast with the dead works of the law* (Ebr.), of which there is no question here; nor, as Carpzov, *nourishing*, and able to preserve life: nor *enduring*, as Abresch and Schlichting: but as E. V., *quick*, i.e. having living power, in the same sense in which God himself is so often called "the living God," e.g. ch. x. 31. So in reff.: so Soph. Œd. Tyr. 482, speaking of the prophecies, τὰ δ' ἀεὶ ζῶντα περιποτᾶται, where the Schol. has, ἰσχύοντα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Thl., who besides

x here only. Exod. xxvi. 28. xxxvi. 33 F. (not in AB) only. x διϊκνούμενος y ἄχρι z μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος ABCDH KLPℵ abcd fghkl mno 17. 47

y = Acts xxii. 4. Rev. ii. 10. xii. 11. z ch. ii. 4 (reff.) only.

δεικνυμενος D[1]. αχρις D. rec aft ψυχης ins τε, with DK rel [Œc]: om AB CHL[P]ℵ b d[1] k 17 [47 (vss)] Orig[3] Eus[2] Ath[2] Epiph[1] Cyr[5] [Cæs[2] Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]. (*None om τε aft αρμ.*)—om ψυχης ℵ[1] corrd "eadem ut videtur manu."

finds in ζῶν a proof of the hypostatic Personality, says well: *ὥσπερ τότε, φησίν, οὐ πόλεμος, οὐ μάχαιρα αὐτοὺς ἀπώλεσεν, ἀλλ' ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, αὐτόματοι γὰρ κατέπιπτον, οὕτω καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἔσται. ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ ἐκείνους ἐκόλασε καὶ ἡμᾶς κολάσει· ζῇ γὰρ ἀεὶ καὶ οὐκ ἔσβεσται.* The emphatic position of ζῶν, the omission of ἐστι, the frequent repetition of καί, all tend to increase the rhythm and rhetorical force of the sentence. Some have thought that the Writer was citing from some other source: but for this there does not appear any reason) and active (=ἐνεργός, which is the commoner form (see Bleek), found in Xen., Demosth., and often in Polybius, in which latter however the mss. often give us ἐνεργής. In one place, xi. 23. 2, this latter seems undoubted,—*ἐνεργῆ ποιούμενοι τὴν ἔφοδον.* It is a word of the κοινή or Macedonian dialect. This *activity* is the very first quality and attribute of *life:* so that the predicates form a climax: *not only living, but energizing: not only energizing, but τομώτερος κ.τ.λ.: and not only that, but διϊκνούμενος κ.τ.λ.: nor that only, but reaching even to the spirit, κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων κ. ἐννοιῶν καρδίας*), and **sharper** (**τομός**, an adj. formed from τέμνω, is found in Plato, Tim. 61 E: Plut. Sympos. vi. 8; viii. 9: its comparative in ref., and Lucian, Toxar. ii. al.: the superlative, in the well-known exordium of Ajax's dying speech, Soph. Aj. 815) **than** (Bleek has shewn that the construction **τομώτερος ὑπὲρ μάχαιραν**, for τόμος ὑπὲρ μ. or τομώτερος μαχαίρας, is not Hebraistic; for in Heb. there is no comparative; we have it in ref. Judges, ἀγαθώτερος σὺ ὑπὲρ Βαλὰκ υἱὸν Σεπφώρ: and the similar construction with παρά in ch. i. 4, where see remarks) **every two-edged sword** (lit. two-*mouthed:* meaning, sharpened on both sides, both edge and back. The expression (reff.) is found in classic poetry, e. g. δίστομον ξίφος, Eurip. Hel. 992: δίστομα φάσγανα, id. Orest. 1296, and other instances in Bleek. The more usual word is ἀμφήκης, Il. κ. 256: Soph. Aj. 286: Electr. 485. We have ἀμφίθηκτος, Antig. 1309. As regards the comparison itself, of the word of God or of men to a sword, it is common in Scripture: see Ps. lvii. 4; lix. 7; lxiv. 3: Wisd. xviii. 15, 16: Rev. i. 16: and above all, Eph. vi. 17. It has been questioned, whether the office here ascribed to the word of God is *punitive*, or merely *searching:* whether it regards the foes, or the servants of God. There seems no reason why we should separate the two. The same WORD, to which evidently by the succeeding clause is attributed the searching power, is powerful also to punish. The μάχαιρα belongs to the surgeon, and to the judge: has its probing as well as its smiting office. And so Chrys.: *αὐτὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ κρίνει· ἐκεῖ γὰρ διαβαίνει καὶ κολάζων καὶ ἐξετάζων.* Bleek points out the close relation of this similitude to a series of passages in Philo, especially in the treatise Quis Rerum Divinarum Hæres. There, in speaking of Abraham's sacrifice, and explaining διεῖλεν αὐτὰ μέσα, which act he refers to God, he says: *τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ· ὅς, εἰς τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκονηθεὶς ἀκμήν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὰν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διεξέλθῃ, πάλιν ἀπὸ τούτων τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς ἀμυθήτους καὶ ἀπεριγράφους μοίρας ἄρχεται διαιρεῖν οὗτος ὁ τομεύς*, § 26, vol. i. p. 491. And further on, he divides these διχοτομήματα made by the λόγος into triads, and says, *ψυχὴ γὰρ τριμερής ἐστι, δίχα δὲ ἕκαστον τῶν μερῶν, ὡς ἐδείχθη, τέμνεται· μοιρῶν δὲ γινομένων ἕξ, ἕβδομος εἰκότως τομεὺς ἦν ἁπάντων, ὁ ἱερὸς καὶ θεῖος λόγος.* From these and similar passages (cf. esp. Quod Deterior Potiori Insid. § 29, p. 212: De Cherubim, § 9, p. 144 ff.), we may reasonably infer, that the writings of Philo were not unknown to the Writer of this Epistle. The same conclusion has been also drawn by Grotius and Bleek. See Prolegg. § i. 155), **and reaching through** (so *ἱκνεῖται λόγος διὰ στήθεων*, Æsch. Sept. c. Theb. 515: *διικνεῖσθαι δι' ὤτων ποτὶ τὰν ψυχάν*, Tim. Locr. p. 101 A: *ἡ δόξα διΐκτο μέχρι βασιλέως*, Plut. Dem. 20) **even to dividing of soul and spirit, both joints and marrow** (there has been considerable diversity in the taking of these genitives. I have regarded them as follows: **ψυχῆς** and **πνεύματος**, not coupled by τε καί, but only by καί, denote two separate departments of man's being, each subordinate to the process indicated by **μερισμοῦ**. The λόγος pierces to the dividing, not of the ψυχή *from* the πνεῦμα, but of the ψυχή itself and of the

[a] ἁρμῶν τε καὶ [b] μυελῶν, καὶ [c] κριτικὸς [d] ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ

a here only †. Sir. xxvii. 2 only. b here only. Gen. xlv. 18. Job xxi. 24 only. c here only †. d Matt. ix. 4. xii. 25. Acts xvii. 29 only †. Job xxi. 27 Symm. (-μημα, Jer. vii. 24 al.)

ενθυμησεως C[1]D[1], *animi* D-lat Lucif$_1$ Ambr$_2$. for και εννοιων, ενν. τε D[1].

πνεῦμα itself: the former being the lower portion of man's invisible part, which he has in common with the brutes, the ἄλογον τῆς ψυχῆς of Philo; the latter the higher portion, receptive of the Spirit of God, the λογικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς of the same; *both which* are pierced and divided by the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. Then, passing on to ἁρμῶν τε κ. μυελῶν, I do not regard these terms as co-ordinate with the former ψυχῆς κ. πνεύματος, but as subordinate to them, and as used in a spiritual sense, not a corporeal (as many Commentators and recently Delitzsch): implying that both the ἁρμοί and the μυελοί of the ψυχή and of the πνεῦμα are pierced and divided by the λόγος. This I conceive is necessitated both by the τε, expressed in this second clause, and by the sense, which otherwise would degenerate into an anti-climax, if ἁρμῶν τε κ. μυελῶν were to be understood of the body. (The metaphorical sense of μυελός is amply justified by such expressions as εἰςδεδυκυῖα (ὀδύνη) εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν μυελὸν τῆς ψυχῆς, Themist. Orat. 32, p. 357: χρῆν γὰρ μετρίας εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλίας θνητοὺς ἀνακίρνασθαι καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς, Eur. Hippol. 255 ff. And ἁρμός is not an anatomical, but a common term, which might be applied to any kind of compages, as ἁρμὸς θύρας, Dion. Hal. v. 7: ἁρμοὶ λίθων, ref. Sir. &c.) This, which is in the main the sense given by Grot., Kuin., Bl., De W., Lünem. (nearly also of Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. p. 258 f., who somewhat harshly makes the genitives ψυχῆς κ. πνεύματος dependent on ἁρμῶν τε κ. μυελῶν), being laid down, I proceed to examine the divergences from it. 1. That which regards the μερισμός as being a division of the *soul from the spirit, the joints from the marrow* (on this latter see below). This is given as early as by Chrys. as an alternative: ἢ γὰρ ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα διαιρεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς, λέγει· ἢ ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀσωμάτων διικνεῖται. And Œc., understanding πνεῦμα of the Holy Spirit: ἡγοῦμαι οὖν νῦν τοῦτο εἰρῆσθαι, ὅτι χωρισμὸν ἐργάζεται τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, κ. ἀφαιρεῖται αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς: and so, but giving the alternative, Thl. And so Erasm.-paraph. ("adeo ut dissecet animam a spiritu"), J. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, al. The objections to this are both psychological and contextual. It has been rightly urged (see especially Ebrard's note here) that the soul and spirit cannot be said to be separated in any such sense as this: and on the other hand, the ἁρμοί and μυελοί could not be thus said to be separated, having never been in contact with one another. 2. Many Commentators, who hold the division of soul from spirit, are not prepared to apply the same interpretation to the ἁρμῶν τ. κ. μυελῶν; although, reading the former τε, it becomes philologically necessary that the two clauses should be strictly parallel. Not reading the former τε, it becomes possible to make ἁρμῶν τε κ. μυελῶν dependent, not on μερισμοῦ but on ἄχρι, which has been done by Cyril of Alexandria, de Fest. Pasch. Hom. xxii. vol. x. p. 275 b, καθικνεῖται δὲ καὶ μέχρις ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, and De Adorat. xvi. vol. i. p. 561, μέχρις ἁρμῶν τε κ. μυελῶν τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθικνεῖσθαι λόγον, and Schlichting (see below), C. F. Schmid, Paulus, al. But certainly, had this been meant, the ἄχρις would have been repeated before ἁρμῶν. Otherwise it would be exceedingly harsh. 3. Many understand μερισμοῦ to mean, not the act of division, but the *place where the division occurs*. So Böhme, "Ita ut per intervalla, si quæ sint, animæ animique, et compagum medullarumque penetret, seque insinuet:" Schlichting, "Ad loca usque abditissima ubi anima cum spiritu connectitur, itemque ubi sunt membrorum compages et medullæ." And so, more recently, Ebrard. The objection to this is, partly the omission of what would in that case be the requisite article before μερισμοῦ, and partly as before, that thus ἁρμ. τ. κ. μυ. must be constructed with ἄχρι: see above. 4. One meaning is given by Œc. (after Cyril: ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Κύριλλος ἐν προσφόρῳ χωρίῳ καὶ οὕτως ἐδέξατο . . . τὸ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ κήρυγμα διαιρεῖ φησὶ καὶ μερίζει τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς μέρη, δεκτικὴν ποιῶν κ. χωρητικὴν τῶν ἀκουομένων), and Thl. (but not approved by the latter, as Bl. who has been misled by the Latin: for he says τινὲς δὲ οὕτως ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν οὐκ ἀκολούθως τῷ ἀποστολικῷ σκοπῷ, and then proceeds as Œc., except that he puts τοῦ μυστηρίου for τῶν ἀκουομένων). But clearly this cannot be the meaning, with γάρ after a caution), and a judger (or, discerner: not as Kuinoel, *condemner*. The word is good Greek, as a simple predicate: so Plato, Pol. 260 c, τὸ κριτικὸν μέρος: with a gen., it seems to be of later usage: Palm and Rost

[e] ἐννοιῶν καρδίας· [13] καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν [f] κτίσις [g] ἀφανὴς [h] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, πάντα δὲ [i] γυμνὰ καὶ [j] τετραχηλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ· [k] πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ [k] λόγος.

ABCDH KLPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

e 1 Pet. iv. 1 only. Prov. xxiii. 19 (there also w. καρδ.) al. f = Rom. i. 25. viii. 39. Judith ix. 12. xii. 6 al. g here only †. Sir. xx. 30. 2 Macc. iii. 34 only. h Heb., ch. xiii. 21 only. = Luke i = Job xxvi. 6. j here only †. (see note.) k 3 Kings ii. 14. 4 Kings ix. 5.

13. κρισις D[1][-gr].

quote ὀφθαλμοὶ κριτικοὶ τοῦ κάλλους from Basil the Great: but the government of a gen. by verbals in -ικός is regular: we have παρασκευαστικὸς τῶν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, κ. ποριστικὸς τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, Xen. Mem. iii. 1. 6: διδασκαλικὸς τῆς αὑτοῦ σοφίας, Plato, Euthyph. p. 3 c: see Kühner, § 530 h b; it is the genitivus materiæ) of (the) **thoughts** (ἐνθύμημα is the commoner word: but Thucyd. (i. 123), Eurip. (Frag. 20), Isæus, and Aristotle (Bl.) use -ησις in much the same sense; -ησις being properly the action of the thought itself, -ημα the thing conceived or thought of. But these two become frequently confused in later Greek) **and ideas** (this seems the nearest term to ἔννοια. Plato gives rather a mysterious definition of it—συντονία διανοίας. But the usage, where the word wavers, as here, between the process in the mind itself and that which is the result of the process, points very much to our '*idea*.' Thus ἔννοιαν λαμβάνειν τινός, Demosth. p. 157. 18: ἡ κοινὴ ἔννοιά τινος, Polyb. x. 27. 8. In ib. i. 4. 9, we have ἔννοια distinguished from ἐπιστήμη: ἔννοιαν μὲν γὰρ λαβεῖν ἀπὸ μέρους τῶν ὅλων δυνατόν· ἐπιστήμην δὲ καὶ γνώμην ἀτρεκῆ ἔχειν, ἀδύνατον. Certainly the "*intentiones*" of the vulg. ("*intents*," E. V.), though apparently answering to the Platonic definition, does not give it here (though this seems the sense in 1 Pet. iv. 1), nor does "*consilia*" of Erasmus: "*conceptus*" of Crell. is better. Bengel says, "ἐνθύμησις, *intentio*, involvit affectum; ἔννοια, *cogitatio*, quæ dicit simplicius, prius et interius quiddam." But though strictly speaking this might be the meaning of ἐνθύμησις (ἐν θυμῷ), it does not carry so much in ordinary usage) **of the heart** (the inner and thinking and feeling part of man in Scripture psychology; die innere Mitte des menschlichen Wesenbestandes, in welcher das dreifache Leben des Menschen zusammenläuft, Delitzsch, biblische Psychologie, § 12 init., which see; and Beck, Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre, p. 63 ff.): **13.**] **and there is not a creature** (for the concrete κτίσμα, as so often, see reff. The term embraces all created things, visible and invisible, cf. Col. i. 16) **unseen** (a classical word: see Palm. and Rost's references) **in his presence** (first as to the gen. pron. αὐτοῦ: to what does it refer? to ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, or to τοῦ θεοῦ itself? The idea of its referring to *Christ* falls with the untenableness of the personal meaning of λόγος: although Calov., Schöttgen, al., abandoning that, yet hold it. Then of the two other, it seems much the more obvious to refer it to τοῦ θεοῦ, especially in the presence of τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, and πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος below. Nor is there any harshness in this; from speaking of the uttered word of God, whose powers are not its own but His, the transition to Himself, with Whom that word is so nearly identified, is simple and obvious. The expression ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, common in the N. T. and especially in St. Luke, is apparently Alexandrine, and borrowed from the LXX, where it answers to the Heb. לִפְנֵי): **but** (δέ, in the strongly adversative sense which it several times has in our Epistle: cf. ch. ii. 6, and note there, also ver. 15 below; ch. ix. 12; x. 27; xii. 13. This it gains by its force of passing altogether to a new subject, excluding entirely from view that which is last treated: q. d. "tantum abest, ut . . . . ut . . . .') **all things are naked** (it had been said by Böhme, that this metaphorical meaning of γυμνός was unknown to the Greeks: but see Herod. viii. 19, ταῦτα μὲν εἰς τοσοῦτο παρεγύμνου: also i. 126; ix. 44: and γυμνῶν τῶν πραγμάτων θεωρουμένων, Diod. Sic. i. p. 69. The herald in the Areopagus forbade the witnesses ληρεῖν πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ περιπέττειν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ὡς γυμνὰ τὰ γεγενημένα οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται βλέποιεν, Lucian, Gymnas. p. 401. And Marc. Antonin. xii. 2, says, in language very similar to this, ὁ θεὸς πάντα τὰ ἡγεμονικὰ γυμνὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν αγγείων καὶ φλοίων καὶ καθαρμάτων ὁρᾷ) **and prostrate** (see at the end of this note: *resupinata, manifesta;* πεφανερωμένα, Hesych. The various meanings given to this difficult word τραχηλίζειν, form a curious chapter in the history of exegesis. Its first and most common classical acceptation seems to be, to *take by the throat*, as an adversary in a struggle, or an athlete in wrestling might do, for the purpose of overthrowing. So (to give merely one example among many which will be found in Wetstein, and better arranged in Bleek) ὁρᾶτε τὸν ἀθλητὴν ὑπὸ παιδισκαρίου τραχηλιζόμενον, Plut. de Curiositate, p. 521 b. And

[14] Ἔχοντες οὖν [l] ἀρχιερέα [m] μέγαν [n] διεληλυθότα τοὺς

l ch. ii. 17 reff. m = ch. x. 21. xiii. 20. Acts viii. 9 al. Lev. xxi. 10 al. fr. n Luke ii. 15. viii. 22 al. fr. (see note).

14. διεληλυθα (sic) ℵ.

thus some have interpreted it here: "*laid open*," as an athlete, caught by the neck and overthrown, lies for all to see. But as Bl. remarks, this last particular, which does in fact carry the whole weight of the comparison, comes in far too accidentally and subordinately. Another meaning has beeu proposed by Perizonius (on Ælian, Var. Hist. xii. 58) derived from the practice of stripping and bending back the necks of malefactors, that all might see their faces and shame, so producing the very opposite of the privacy which a man seeks when ashamed, by bowing down his head and covering his face. Thus Sueton. Vitel. 17: "(Vitellius) relegatis post terga manibus, injecto cervicibus laqueo, veste discissa, seminudus in forum tractus est—reducto coma capite ceu noxii solent, atque etiam mento mucrone gladii subrecto, ut visendam præberet faciem, neve submitteret." And Pliny, Panegyr. 34. 3: "Nihil tamen gratius, nihil sæculo dignius, quam quod contigit desuper intueri delatorum supina ora retortasque cervices, agnoscebamus et fruebamur, quum velut piaculares publicæ sollicitudinis victimæ supra sanguinem noxiorum ad lenta supplicia gravioresque pœnas ducerentur." And this is the interpretation followed by Elsner, Wolf, Baumgarten, Kuinoel, Bretschneider, Bleek, De Wette, al. But here again, though the *meaning* is apposite enough, we have no precedent for the Greek word being thus used, or for any such custom being familiar to Greeks. So that this interpretation can hardly be the true one. The ancients give very various renderings. Chrys. says: τετραχηλισμένα εἶπεν ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν δερμάτων τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν σφαζομένων ἱερείων ἐξελκομένων: but does not justify such an application of the word. Œc.: τετραχηλισμένα δέ φησι τὰ γυμνά, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ τραχήλου ἠρτημένων κ. γεγυμνωμένων τῆς δορᾶς· ἢ . . ἀντὶ τοῦ κάτω κύπτοντα κ. τὸν τράχηλον ἐπικλίνοντα, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἰσχύειν ἀτενίσαι τῇ δόξῃ ἐκείνῃ τοῦ κριτοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ. Thdrt.: ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τέθεικε τῶν θυομένων ζώων, ἃ παντελῶς ἄφωνα κεῖται, τῆς σφαγῆς τὴν ζωὴν ἀφελομένης, καὶ μετὰ τῆς ζωῆς τὴν φωνήν. οὕτω, φησί, καὶ ἡμεῖς κρινόμενοι θεώμεθα μὲν ἅπαντα τὰ δυσσεβῶς παρ' ἡμῶν ἢ παρανόμως γεγενημένα· σιγῶντες δὲ τὴν τῆς τιμωρίας δεχόμεθα ψῆφον, ἅτε δὴ τὸ δίκαιον αὐτῆς ἐπιστάμενοι. Thl.: ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἐκδερομένων προβάτων. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκείνων τραχηλισθέντων, ἤτοι κατὰ τοῦ τραχήλου τὴν μάχαιραν δεξαμένων καὶ σφαγέντων, μετὰ τὸ καθελκυσθῆναι τὸ δέρμα πάντα καὶ τὰ ἔνδον ἐκκαλύπτεται· οὕτω καὶ τῷ θεῷ πάντα δῆλα. τινὲς δέ, τετραχηλισμένα, τὰ ἐκ τοῦ τραχήλου, ἢ μᾶλλον κατὰ τοῦ τραχήλου κρεμάμενα ἐνόησαν. He then mentions the second alternative of Œc. above, and ends, σὺ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον δέξαι. I have given all these to shew how various have been the renderings, and how universally acknowledged the difficulty of the word. The objection to the *sacrificial* rendering is, that the word never seems to have been used of any such process:—see all the meanings given in Palm and Rost sub voce. In seeking for a way out of the difficulty, it seems to me that the frequent use of the word by Philo, ought, in a passage cast so much, as we have seen, in Philo's mode of rhetorical expression, to enter as a considerable element into our decision. Wetst. gives us twenty passages in which the word and its compound ἐκτραχηλίζω occur in that writer: and the uniform meaning is, to *lay prostrate*, generally in a metaphorical sense: e. g. De Cherub. § 24, vol. i. p. 153, μηδ' ὅσον ἀνακύψαι δυνάμενος, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπιτρέχουσι καὶ τραχηλίζουσι δεινοῖς ὑποβεβλημένος: De Vita Mos. i. 54, vol. ii. p. 127, τραχηλιζόμενοι δὲ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις πάντ' ὑπομένουσι δρᾶν τε καὶ πάσχειν: Quod Omnis Probus Liber, § 22, p. 470, ὑφ' ἡδονῆς δελεάζεται, ἢ φόβῳ ἐκλύει, ἢ λύπῃ συστέλλεται, ἢ ὑπ' ἀπορίας τραχηλίζεται. And as we have seen in the beginning of this note, this is the simplest and most frequent sense in the classical writers. See also very numerous examples in Wetstein. I would therefore accept this metaphorical sense here, and regard the word as signifying entire prostration and subjugation under the eye of God: not only naked, stripped of all covering and concealment,—but also laid prostrate in their exposure, before His eye. I own myself not thoroughly satisfied with this, but I am unable to find a better rendering which shall at the same time be philologically justified) **to His eyes** (dat. commodi: for His eyes to see); **with Whom we have to do** (there could not be a happier rendering than this of the E. V., expressing our whole concern and relation with God, One who is not to be trifled with, considering that His word is so power-

o Eph. iv. 10. ch. vii. 26. viii. 1 al. [o] οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, [p] κρατῶμεν τῆς

p Heb., ch. vi. 18 only (there also w. gen.). Prov. xvii. 21. = w. acc., Paul, Col. ii. 19. 2 Thess. ii. 15. also Mark vii. 3, 8. Rev. ii. 13 al.

ful, and His eye so discerning. And so Calv., Beza, Bengel, Kuin., Bleek, De W., Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. The ancients, without exception, confined this relation to one solemn particular of it, and rendered, "*to whom our account must be given:*" so Chrys.: ἀντὶ τοῦ αὐτῷ μέλλομεν δοῦναι εὐθύνας τῶν πεπραγμένων. And many of the moderns also take this view: e. g. Erasm. (par.), Michaelis, Bretschneider, Stuart, al. Others suppose it to mean, "concerning whom is our discourse," referring to ch. v. 11, περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. So Luther, a-Lapide, Schlichting, Grot., Wolf, al. But, even conceding that πρός may well bear this meaning, which has not been shewn (see Bleek, p. 591 note), the meaning itself is far too vapid here, and finds no fit representation in the Epistle itself, which cannot be said to be, in any such sense, πρὸς θεόν or περὶ θεοῦ.

As regards the punctuation, and emphasis, it seems better to make πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος an independent clause and to set a colon at αὐτοῦ, than as commonly done, to join αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὅν. For by so doing, we weaken very much the force of the sentence, in which, after the predicative clause, the stress is on ἡμῖν: and besides, we violate the strict propriety of αὐτοῦ, making it = ἐκείνου). 14—16.] *Hortatory conclusion of this second course of comparison* (see summary at ch. iii. 1); taking up again by anticipation that which is now to be followed out in detail, viz. *the High Priesthood of Jesus.* This point is regarded by many (e.g. Bl., De W., Lünem., Thol., Hofm.,—Schrb. ii. 1. 44,—after Beza, who says: "Hinc potius oportuerat novam sectionem aperiri") as the opening of the new portion of the Epistle: but on account of its hortatory and collective character, I prefer regarding it, with Ebrard, as the conclusion of the preceding: being of course at the same time transitional, as the close connexion of ch. v. 1 with our ver. 15 shews. It is much in the manner of the Writer, to *anticipate*, by frequently dropped hints, and by *asserting* that, which he intends very soon to *demonstrate.*

14.] **Having therefore** (οὖν refers rather to the whole exhortation than to the ἔχοντες: see Delitzsch) **a great High Priest** (the fact of this being Christ's office is as yet *assumed:* see above ch. ii. 17; iii. 1; and Philo cited in note there:—but now with more points of contact with what has been already said; e. g. ver. 10, where the εἰσελθὼν εἰς τ. κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ has close connexion with the High Priest entering within the veil. μέγαν, as in ch. xiii. 20, τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν: answering very much to the use of ἀληθινός, in St. John,—ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή,—ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν:—one archetypal High Priest,—one above all) **passed through** (not "*into,*" as E. V., Calvin, al.: see below) **the heavens** (as the earthly high priest passed through the veil into the holiest place, so the great High Priest *through* the heavens to God's throne (on this, and its bearing on the Lutheran doctrine of Christ's ubiquity, see Bleek, Tholuck, and Delitzsch in loc.): cf. ch. ix. 11: with reference also to ver. 10, the entering of Jesus into His rest. In this fact, His greatness is substantiated. On οὐρανούς, plur., see on ch. i. 10. "Per cœlos intelliguntur omnes cœli, qui inter nos et Deum sunt interjecti: nempe et tota aeris regio, quæ etiam cœlum in scriptura vocatur, et cœli in quibus sunt sol, luna, cæteræque stellæ ac mundi luminaria, quibus omnibus Christus sublimior est factus, infra vii. 26: Eph. iv. 10. Post hos omnes est cœlum illud, in quo Deus habitat, immortalitatis domicilium, quod ingressus est pontifex noster, non supergressus." Schlichting. Thl. gives another expansion of the reference of this clause which may also have been intended: οὐ τοιοῦτος οἷος Μωυσῆς· ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ οὔτε αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν, οὔτε τὸν λαὸν εἰσήγαγεν· οὗτος δὲ διεληλυθὼς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς συνεδριάζει τῷ πατρί, κ. δύναται ἡμῖν τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς εἴσοδον δοῦναι, καὶ τῆς ἐν ἐπαγγελίαις καταπαύσεως κληρονόμους ποιῆσαι), **Jesus the Son of God** (certainly not so named in this connexion without an allusion to the Ἰησοῦς above mentioned. We cannot conceive that even a careful ordinary writer would have used the *same name* of two *different persons*, so designating the second of them, without intention. At the same time, there is no reason for supposing that such an allusion exhausts the sense of the weighty addition. It brings out the majesty of our High Priest, and justifies at the same time the preceding clause, leading the mind to supply 'to God, whose Son He is.' Besides which, it adds infinite weight to the exhortation which follows), **let us hold fast** (not as Tittmann, al., "lay hold of:" it is the opposite to παραπίπτειν, ch. vi. 6; παραρυῆναι, ii. 1. On the genitive, see reff. In ch. vi. 18, the aor. gives the sense '*lay hold of*') **the**

[q] ὁμολογίας. [15] οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον [r] συνπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, [s] πεπειρασμένον δὲ [t] κατὰ πάντα [u] καθ' [uv] ὁμοιότητα [w] χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.

...ασθεν. ημων H. ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

q ch. iii. 1 reff. r here only †. Symm. Job ii. 11. συμπάσχειν, Rom. viii. 17. 1 Cor. xii. 26. s Matt. iv. 1 al. fr. 3 Kings x. 1. t ch. ii. 17 reff. u ch. vii. 15 only. Gen. i. 11, 12. v as above (u). Wisd. xiv. 19 only. w = Matt. xiii. 34. Heb., ch. vii. 7 all. Luke xi. 49. Paul, Rom. iii. 31 al15.

15. (συνπαθησαι, so AB[1]CD[1]Hℵ.) Steph πεπειραμενον, with CKL[P] rel Orig$_2$ [Syn-ep-Ant] Epiph$_3$ Cyr[-p$_1$] Nyss$_2$ Chr-3-mss Thdrt: txt ABDℵ Orig$_3$ Damasc [Thl].

confession (viz. of our Christian faith: not merely of Christ's ascension, nor merely of Christ as our High Priest: cf. ch. iii. 1 and note, and ch. x. 23, which gives more the subjective side, here necessarily to be understood also. See also ch. iii. 6. Corn. a-Lapide gives a beautiful paraphrase: "Agite Hebræi, persistite in fide Christi, ad requiem in cœlis properate: esto cœli longe a nobis absint, facile eos conscendemus et penetrabimus, duce Christo, qui eos penetravit, eosque nobis pervios fecit, dummodo confessionem, i. e. professionem, scilicet fidei et spei nostræ, constanter retineamus"). **15.] For** (how connected? certainly not as grounding the facts just stated; but as furnishing a motive for κρατεῖν τῆς ὁμολογίας. The effort is not hopeless, notwithstanding the majesty of our High Priest, and the power of the Word of our God: *for* we are sympathized with and helped by Him. As Schlichting, "Occupat objectionem. Poterat enim aliquis dicere: quid me magnus iste Pontifex dura confessionis nostræ causa patientem juvabit, qui quanto major est, quanto a nobis remotior, tanto minore fortassis nostri cura tangetur?" To suppose, as some have done, that a contrast to the Jewish high priests is intended, is to contradict directly ch. v. 2. Rather is our great High Priest in this respect expressly identified with them) **we have not a high priest unable** (thus better than "who is not able," τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον) **to sympathize with** ("The verb συμπαθέω, immediately from συμπαθής, as by the same analogy ἀντιπαθέω, δυσπαθέω, εὐπαθέω, ἡδυπαθέω, μετριοπαθέω, ὁμοιοπαθέω, is like all these derivative forms, good Greek. Stephanus states it is to be found in Isocrates: ὥστε καὶ ταῖς μικραῖς ἀτυχίαις ἕκαστος ἡμῶν πολλοὺς εἶχε συμπαθήσοντας. Philo de Septenar. § 18, vol. ii. p. 290: τῷ δὲ ἀπόρως ἔχοντι συνεπάθησε καὶ μετέδωκεν ἐλέους κ.τ.λ. In St. Paul, we have συμπάσχειν (reff.) which our Epistle has not, but in a somewhat different meaning, that of actual community in suffering with another, whereas our word is spoken of one *sympathizing*, taking part in heart with the sufferings of another. Erasmus (annot.): 'Est affici moverique sensu alieni mali.' συμπάσχειν might indeed be used in this sense, but hardly συμπαθεῖν in the other." Bleek) **our infirmities** (not *sufferings*, as Chrys., Thdrt., al. For the idea would be here out of place, and the word cannot have this meaning. Bleek has well examined its region of significance; and shewn that it can only betoken primarily the inner and a priori weakness,—be that *physical*, and thereby leading to exposure to suffering and disease, which itself is sometimes called by this name (see John xi. 4: Luke v. 15; viii. 2 al.: ch. xi. 34), —or *spiritual* and moral,—whereby misery arises, and sin finds entrance, as in ch. v. 2; vii. 8. Both these, indeed *all* human infirmities, are here included. With all does the Son of God sympathize, and for the reason now to be given), **nay rather** (on δέ being a stronger adversative than ἀλλά, see on ver. 13 above), **(one) tempted** (Ebrard has a good note on the subject of our Lord's temptations) **in all things** (see on ch. ii. 17) **according to (our) similitude** (ἡμῶν is the natural word to supply. So in ch. vii. 15, κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ. It might be πρὸς ἡμᾶς: so Aristot. de Mundo (Bl.), κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ταῦτα ὁμοιότητα: Philo de Profugis, § 9, vol. i. p. 553, κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ἄλλα ὁμοιότητα, see ref. Gen. St. Paul uses ὁμοίωμα, not ὁμοιότης: cf. Rom. i. 23; v. 14; vi. 5; viii. 3: Phil. ii. 7) **apart from sin** (so that throughout these temptations, in their origin, in their process, in their result,—sin had nothing in Him: He was free and separate from it. This general reference is the only one which fully gives the general predication, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. And so it has been usually taken. But there are considerable divergences. Œc.: ὅτι οὐχ ἁμαρτιῶν ἐτίννυε δίκην ταῦτα, φησί, πάσχων. So Thl. altern.: Schlichting, "Ut ostendat, Christum innoxium prorsus fuisse, nec ullo modo hæc mala quæ passus est commeritum:" al. But this would require πεπειρασμένον to be confined in its meaning to such sufferings as might be inflicted on account of sin: and would altogether deprive it of the meaning '*tempted*,' 'solicited towards, but short of sin.' Again, very many Commentators take the words to imply, that He was

16 [x] προσερχώμεθα οὖν [y] μετὰ [z] παῤῥησίας τῷ [a] θρόνῳ τῆς [a] χάριτος, ἵνα [b] λάβωμεν [bc] ἔλεος καὶ [d] χάριν [d] εὕρωμεν εἰς [e] εὔκαιρον [f] βοήθειαν. V. 1 Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀν-

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

x see note. 1 Pet. ii. 4. Jer. vii. 16. y Mark iii. 5. Luke xxiv. 52. Eph. iv. 2 al. fr. 1 Chron. xxix. 23. z = ch. iii. 6 reff. a see ch. viii. 1 reff. b here only. c = 2 Tim. i. 18. Jude 21. d Luke i. 30. Acts vii. 46 only. Deut. xxiv. 3 (1) al. fr. e Mark vi 21 only. Ps. ciii. 28. 2 Macc. xiv. 29. xv. 20 only. f = here (Acts xxvii. 17) only. Ps. vii. 10 al.

16. rec ελεον, with C^2D^3L rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt ABC^1D^1K[P]ℵ g l 17 $Antch_1$. om ευρωμεν B. om εις D^1: om εις ευκαιρον f.

tempted in all other points, but not in sin: "*sin only excepted.*" So Jac. Cappellus, Storr, Ernesti, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider, and al. But the words certainly do not lead to any such interpretation. They would rather in this case be, εἰ μὴ καθ' ἁμαρτίαν, or χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας would stand before καθ' ὁμοιότητα. The Commentators refer to passages of Philo in which he states the High Priesthood and the sinlessness of the λόγος in a manner very similar: e. g. De Profugis, § 20, p. 562: λέγομεν γάρ, τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἑκουσίων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον). 16.] *Exhortation to confidence, even in our guilt and need, grounded on this sympathy of our great High Priest.* **Let us therefore approach** (προσέρχεσθαι, only once used by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 3, and that in a totally different sense, προσέρχεσθαι ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις, is a favourite word in this Epistle, cf. ch. vii. 25; x. 1, 22; xi. 6; xii. 18, 22, and generally in the same sense as here, that of approach to God, either, as under the O. T., by sacrifices, or, as under the N. T., by the one sacrifice of Christ. The same idea is expressed Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12, by the word προσαγωγή: see also reff.) **with confidence** (ref. and note there) **to the throne of grace** (i. e. not, as Seb. Schmidt, al., Christ Himself,—nor, as Chrys., Œc., Thl., Thdrt., Primasius, Limborch, al., the throne of Christ,—nor is there any allusion to the lid of the ark of the covenant as the mercy-seat, which both would here be alien from the immediate context, and would introduce a confusion of metaphors in a purely spiritual passage: but, by the analogy of this Epistle, it is the *throne of God*, at the right hand of which (ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, ch. viii. 1; ἐν δεξ. τ. θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, xii. 2) Jesus our Forerunner is seated. That it is here called the throne of *grace*, is owing to the complexion of the passage, in which the grace and mercy of our reconciled God are described as ensured to us by the sympathy and power of our great High Priest), **that we may receive** (λαμβάνειν here clearly in its passive recipient sense, as ch. ii. 2 al.) **compassion** (corresponding to that συμπάθεια of our High Priest above spoken of: but extending further than our ἀσθένειαι, to the forgiveness of our sins by God's mercy in Christ), **and may find grace** (we have εὑρίσκειν ἔλεος, in ref. 2 Tim. εὑρ. χάριν is common in the LXX. The meaning is not very different from λαβεῖν ἔλεος. Many distinctions have been set up, but none appear to hold. Both, the receiving ἔλεος and finding χάριν, apply to the next clause) **for help in time** (i. e. σήμερον, while it is yet open to us: as Chrys., ἂν νῦν προσέλθῃς, φησί, λήψῃ καὶ χάριν καὶ ἔλεον· εὐκαίρως γὰρ προσέρχῃ. ἂν δέ ποτε προσέλθῃς, οὐκέτι· ἄκαιρος γὰρ ἡ πρόσοδος· οὐ γάρ ἐστι τότε. θρόνος χάριτος· θρόνος χάριτός ἐστιν ἕως κάθηται χαριζόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, ὅταν δὲ ἡ συντέλεια γένηται, τότε ἐγείρεται εἰς κρίσιν,—Thl., Calvin, referring to 2 Cor. vi. 2 (from Isa. xlix. 8), καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐπήκουσά σου . . . . ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος,—Estius, al., Bleek, De W., Lünem., Ebrard, Tholuck. This is decidedly the right interpretation, and not as many Commentators and the E. V., "*in time of need,*" "*as often as we want it,*" which would be both flat, and hardly justified by usage, cf. ref. Mark. Delitzsch objects to the above view as weder dem Ausdruck noch der Situation recht entsprechend: but his own, that they were to apply for help which might come in good time, before the danger which surrounded them became so pressing that they must sink under it from inability to resist,—surely comes nearly to the same. There is no reason why the two should not be united: εὔκαιρον,—while the throne of grace is open, and you yourselves not overwhelmed by the danger).

CHAP. V. 1—X. 18.] THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST: and this in several points of view. That which has before been twice by anticipation hinted at, ch. ii. 17; iii. 1; iv. 14, 15, is now taken up and thoroughly discussed. First of all, vv. 1—10, two necessary qualifications of a high priest are stated, and Christ is proved to have fulfilled both: *a.* vv. 1—3, *he must be taken from among men, capable, in respect of infirmity, of feeling for men,* and, *β.* vv. 4—10, *he must not have taken*

θρώπων [g] λαμβανόμενος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων [h] καθίσταται [i] τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα [klm] προςφέρῃ [l] δῶρά τε καὶ [m] θυσίας [n] ὑπὲρ [n] ἁμαρτιῶν, 2 [o] μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς [p] ἀγνοοῦ-

g = Num. viii. 6. Acts xv. 14. Xen. Cyr. ii. 2. 15. h = Luke xii. 14. Tit. i. 5. ch. vii. 28. viii. 3. Exod. ii. 14. 1 Chron. xii. 18. i ch. ii. 17 reff. k Heb., vv. 3, 7 al17. Paul never. l Matt. ii. 11. v. 23, 24. viii. 4. ch. viii. 3, 4. ix. 9. Lev. i. 2, 3 al. m Acts vii. 42 (from Amos v. 25). xxi. 26. ch. viii. 3. ix. 9. x. 1, &c. Gen. iv. 3 al. n 1 Cor. xv. 3. ch. vii. 27. x. 12. Ezek. xlv. 22. o here only †. Philo, de Abr. § 44, vol. ii. p. 67. p = 1 Tim. i. 13. Num. xii. 11. Gen. xx. 4.

Chap. V. 1. om τε B D²(appy) [vss(exc syr)].

the dignity upon himself, but have been appointed by God. 1.] **For** (takes up again ch. iv. 15 with a view to substantiate it: see remarks below) **every high priest** (in the sense, Levitical high priest, the only class here in question. Delitzsch is however right in maintaining, that it is not right to limit the words to this sense, or to see in them this condition, which indeed is not brought forward, but only exists in the nature of the case, no other high priests being in view), **being taken from among men** (this participial clause belongs to the predicative portion of the sentence, and indeed carries the chief weight of it, having a slight causal force; 'inasmuch as he is taken from among men.' And thus the clause is understood by Chrys., Thl., Primas., and Calv., Schlicht., Grot., Beng., Bl., De W., Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. Others, as Luth., Seb. Schm., Wetst., Storr, Kuinoel, al., take it as belonging to the *subject*, as does the E. V., "Every high priest taken from among men," and see in it a contrast, as in ch. vii. 28, between human high priests, and the Son of God. But such contrast here is not only not in, but inconsistent with, the context: which does not bring out as yet any difference between Christ and the Jewish high priests, but rather (see below) treats of the attributes of a high priest from their example. λαμβανόμενος is no technical word, as '*capi*' in Latin: "Eximie virgines Vestales, sed flamines quoque Diales, item pontifices et augures *capi* dicebantur," Aul. Gell. i. 12: for the question here is not of electing or appointing, which comes below in καθίσταται, but simply of *taking from among*, as in reff.), **is appointed** (the ordinary classical word: ἰατροὺς κατέστησαν ὀκτώ, Xen. Anab. iii. 4. 30: and the pass., ἔδει βασιλέα καθίστασθαι, id. Ages. iii. 1, see also reff., and numerous examples in Bleek) **for** (*on behalf of*, for the benefit of: vicariousness must not be introduced where the context, as here, does not require it: see note on ch. ii. 9) **men** (the stress is both times on this genitive and its preposition, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται: the former justifying the latter. This is a powerful additional reason for taking ἐξ ἀνθρ. λαμβ. predicatively: for if it be taken as attached to the subject, "every high priest taken from among *men*," with a necessary stress in such case on '*men*,' the same stress must be laid on '*men*' in the ὑπὲρ ἀνθρ., with an implication that Christ, with whom on this hypothesis the human high priest is contrasted, was *not* appointed for *men*) **in matters relating to God** (see note on ch. ii. 17. It is extraordinary how Calvin and Kypke could, in the face of usage and of ch. ii. 17 and vii. 28; viii. 3, have supposed καθίσταται to be active, and τὰ πρ. τ. θ. accus. after it: "*Curat* Pontifex, vel *ordinat, quæ ad Deum pertinent:* . . . constructio melius fluit, et sententia est plenior," Calv.: "Cultum divinum instituit," Kypke. So also Stuart in his summary, "that he may superintend or direct the concerns which men have with God;" but not in his commentary. All the instances of an active (dynamic) sense of the middle of καθίστημι adduced by Kypke are in the *aorists*, which stand on different ground from the *present*), **that he may offer** (the technical word: see reff.) **both gifts and sacrifices for sins** (δῶρα and θυσίας are both to be taken with ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, as the τε shews: not, as Grot., Bengel, al., δῶρα alone, and θυσ. ὑπὲρ ἁμ. together; nor, as Delitzsch, is ὑπέρ to be taken with προςφέρῃ. And the sentence ἵνα προςφ. κ.τ.λ. is not, as Thl., a mere epexegesis of τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, but is intimately connected by the word ἁμαρτιῶν with what follows: see below. ὑπέρ, i. e. *to atone for*, = εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, ch. ii. 17: see also reff. No satisfactory distinction can be set up between δῶρα and θυσίας: properly speaking, the former would be *any manner of offerings*, the latter *slain beasts* only: but this usage is not observed in Scripture: see reff. Thl. says, κατὰ μὲν τὸν ἀκριβῆ λόγον διαφέρουσι, παρὰ δὲ τῇ γραφῇ ἀδιαφόρως κεῖνται). 2.] **being** (one who is) **able** (this clause is closely bound to the last, and belongs to it, not to the whole sentence. It is in fact a conditioning participial clause to ἵνα προςφέρῃ, and at the same time a retrospective epexegesis of ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος) **to be compas-**

σιν καὶ ᵠ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ʳ περίκειται ˢ ἀσθένειαν· ³ καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ᵗ ὀφείλει καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ οὕτως καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ᵘ προσφέρειν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν. ⁴ καὶ οὐχ

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

q Matt. xxii. 29 ||. 1 Cor. vi. 9. 2 Tim. iii. 13. James v. 19. Isa. xliv. 8. r constr., Acts xxviii. 20. (ch. xii. 1 reff.) only. s Rom. vi. 19. 2 Cor. xii. 9. ch. iv. 15. t = 1 Cor. vii. 36. ch. ii. 17. ver. 12 ‡. u ver. 1 reff.

2. for επει και, και γαρ D[1]; *quoniam* D-lat.

3. rec δια ταυτην, with C[3]D[3]KL rel syr-mg Chr[-montf Antch$_1$] Thdrt$_1$: *propterea* vulg copt: *propter illam* D-lat: txt ABC[1] D[1][-gr P]ℵ 17 syrr Chr-2-mss [Euthal-ms] Cyr$_1$ Thdrt$_1$. for εαυτου, αυτου BD[1] [Thdrt$_1$]. rec (for 3rd περι) υπερ, with C[3]D[3]KL rel Chr[-montf] Thdrt$_1$ [Antch$_1$ Damasc]: txt ABC[1]D[1][P]ℵ 17 [47] Chr-mss Thdrt$_1$ [Euthal-ms Cyr$_1$].

sionate (μετριοπαθέω is a word apparently invented to serve the view of the Peripatetic school, as opposed to the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics. They held that we ought to rule our passions by reason, and denominated such moderation μετριοπάθεια. The word is not found,—except in a Pythagorean fragment of Archytas in Stobæus, of doubtful authenticity,—before the time of Alexander: Diog. Laert. v. 31 says, ἔφη δὲ (Aristotle) τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ, μετριοπαθῆ δέ. See numerous other examples in Bleek. Hence we have the verb and its cognates frequently used of moderating the passion of anger: Plut. de Ira Cohib. p. 453, ἀναστῆσαι κ. σῶσαι κ. φείσασθαι κ. καρτερῆσαι πρᾳότητός ἐστι κ. συγγνώμης καὶ μετριοπαθείας: Appian, Bell. Hisp. p. 529, εἰ μετριοπαθῶς σφίσι χρήσεται, παραδοῦσιν ἑαυτούς: Jos. Antt. xii. 3. 2, Οὐεσπασιάνου δ' ἄν τις καὶ Τίτου τὴν μεγαλοφροσύνην εἰκότως ἐκπλαγείη, μετὰ πολέμους κ. τηλικούτους ἀγῶνας, οὓς ἔσχον πρὸς ἡμᾶς, μετριοπαθησάντων. So the Etym. Mag., μετριοπαθεῖν ἐκ μέρους τὰ πάθη καταδέχεσθαι, συγγινώσκειν: Hesych. μετριοπαθής· μικρὰ πάσχων, ἢ συγγινώσκων ἐπιεικῶς. The meaning here therefore must be given according to this analogy, and the dative following explained as one of *direction*, or perhaps *commodi*) **towards the ignorant and erring** (the former mild word, though frequently used of sinners elsewhere without (e. g. Hosea iv. 15: Sir. v. 15; xxiii. 2 al.: Judith v. 20: Esdr. viii. 75 (72): cf. 2 Chron. xvi. 9: and so Thl. here, ὅρα δέ, ὅτι πᾶν ἁμάρτημα ἄγνοια κ. πλάνη γεννᾷ) as well as with the implication of ignorance (see Eccles. v. 5: Levit. iv. 13; v. 18), seems to be here placed, as well as **πλανωμένοις**, itself at all events a milder term than ἁμαρτάνουσιν, as suitable to the tone of the sentence, in which the feeling of a sinner towards his fellow-sinners is expressed. The sense might be filled up, 'towards those who (possibly after all) are ignorant and deluded.' And thus the propriety of the next clause is rendered still greater; both these, ἄγνοια and πλάνη, being the results of ἀσθένεια, with which he himself is encompassed. On the exclusion on the one side from these designations of 'sinners with a high hand,' and the inclusion in them, as above, of much more than sins, strictly speaking, of ignorance, see Delitzsch's note), **seeing that he himself also is compassed about with infirmity** (on this construction of an acc. with **περίκειμαι**, compare ref. Acts: so τεῖχος περιβαλέσθαι τὴν πόλιν, Herod. i. 163: Eustath. on Il. τ. p. 1229: ὅρα δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ περικεῖσθαι δοτικῇ συνέταξε, λαβὼν αὐτὸ ἀντὶ τοῦ συγκεῖσθαι κ. περιπεπλέχθαι· ἡ μέντοι συνήθεια ἐπὶ τοῦ βαστάζειν κ. φορεῖν τὴν λέξιν τίθησι κ. αἰτιατικῇ συντάσσει, ὡς ἐν τῷ περίκειται τῦφον ἢ πλοῦτον ἢ δυνάστειαν. **ἀσθένεια**, as in ch. vii. 28, that moral weakness which makes men capable of sin. It is never predicated of Christ in this sense: nay, by the terms of vii. 28, He is excluded from it. That ἀσθένεια of the flesh, which He bore on Him, and thereby was capable of suffering and of death, was entirely distinct from this. Some have gone even further here, as Œc.—τὸ "περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν" εἰπών, σαφῶς ἐδήλωσεν ὅτι ἀσθένειαν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκάλεσεν). 3.] **And on account of it** (the infirmity wherewith he himself is encompassed; not fem. for neut., as Bengel, altern.: nor is αὕτη, Matt. xxi. 42, which he alleges, the slightest justification for such a notion) **he must** (not meaning, it is his appointed duty according to the law: but, it is necessary for him, a priori, on higher ground than, and before, the ordinance of the law. See on ch. ii. 17) **even as for the people, so also for himself, offer** (here only used absolutely in N. T., see Num. vii. 18) **for** (see on ch. x. 6) **sins** (and accordingly, such was the ordinance of the law: cf. Levit. iv. 3; ix. 7; xvi. 6 al. Much has been said as to the applicability or otherwise of these considerations to Christ. Some have considered all that has hitherto been said as spoken of human high priests in contradistinction to Him: but it is better to understand it all as spoken of high priests

[v] ἑαυτῷ τὶς [v] λαμβάνει τὴν [w] τιμήν, ἀλλὰ [x] καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, [y] καθώσπερ καὶ Ἀαρών. [5] οὕτως καὶ ὁ χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν [z] ἐδόξασεν [a] γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτὸν [b] Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε·

v constr., Luke xix. 12. Rom. xiii. 2.
w = Jos. Antt. xii. 9. 7, τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς τιμῆς, & al. fr.
x = ch. xi. 8. Isa. xlii. 6. xlviii. 12. see ch. ix. 15. Rom. viii. 30.
y here only. see ch. iv. 2.
z = John viii. 54 al. fr. Esth. iii. 1. Isa. iv. 2 al. see Acts iii. 13. Rom. viii. 30.
a inf., Mark vii. 4. Acts xv. 10. Col. iv. 6. Rev. xvi. 9. Winer, § 44. 1.
b Acts xiii. 33. ch. i. 5. Psa. ii. 7.

4. λαμβανει bef τις D m: τις is insd above the line B[1][2.3(Tischdf)]. rec aft αλλα ins ο, with C[3]L[P] rel Cyr[-p Phot$_1$] Thdrt Thl: om ABC[1]DKℵ b d h k l m o [Chr$_1$ Procop$_1$ Damasc]. rec καθαπερ, with C[2]D[3]KL[P]ℵ[3] rel [Euthal-ms] Thdrt$_2$ Phot$_1$: καθως C[1](appy) Chr Procop$_1$: txt AB(C[1]?)D[1]ℵ[1] 17 [Cyr$_1$ Chron$_1$] Damasc. om και (C[1]?)D[1] [vulg Syr Cyr$_1$ Chron$_1$]. rec ins ο bef ααρων, with Thdrt$_1$: om ABCDKL[P]ℵ rel [Chr Euthal-ms Cyr$_1$ Chron$_1$ Damasc].
5. γενεσθαι A 71 [arm(-ed Rieu)] Cyr-jer[-ed$_1$ Cyr$_1$ Chron$_1$ Phot$_1$].

in general: and then, as Ebrard well says, leave it to the Writer himself, ver. 5 ff., to determine how far these requisites are satisfied in Christ. The progress of the argument itself will shew us, ver. 8 f., and further on, ch. vii. 27, in how far Christ is unlike the O. T. high priest). **4—10.**] Second requisite: *divine appointment.*

4.] **And** (couples to ver. 1, of which the subsequent verses have been epexegetical) **none taketh** (**λαμβάνει**, not altogether perhaps without an allusion to λαμβανόμενος above, ver. 1. So in Xiphilinus Galb. p. 187, νομίζων οὐκ εἰληφέναι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ δεδόσθαι αὐτῷ) **the office** (of the high priesthood: so τιμή, Herod. ii. 59, οὔτε τιμὰς τὰς ἐούσας συνταράξας (Πεισίστρατος), οὔτε θέσμια μεταλλάξας: see other examples in Bleek. Josephus uses it frequently of the high-priestly office: e. g Antt. iii. 8. 1, αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς Ἀαρῶνα τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης ἄξιον ἔκρινε) **to himself** (dat. commodi: and carrying the stress of the sentence, although the construction of λαμβάνει with both clauses must be somewhat zeugmatic: it must have rather a more active sense in the case where he takes it to himself, than in that where he only receives it, being called by God. This is denied by Delitzsch, but I see not how we can altogether escape it. The construction with ἑαυτῷ in the one case necessarily throws a different tinge over the verb than when it is understood with καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) **but** (only **when**) **called by God** (with the ὁ of the rec. text, it would be, '*but only he who is called by God*'), **as indeed was Aaron** (see Exod. xxviii. 1; xxix. 4: Levit. viii. 1: Num. iii. 10; but especially Num. xvi.—xviii. Schöttgen quotes from the Rabbinical Bammidbar Rabba, § 18, fol. 234, "Moses ad Corachum ejusque socios dixit: Si Aaron frater meus sibimetipsi sacerdotium sumsit (נטל לעצמו = λαμβάνειν ἑαυτῷ) recte egistis, quod contra ipsum insurrexistis: jam vero Deus id ipsi dedit," &c. This divine ordinance of Aaron and his sons to be high priests endured long in the Jewish polity: but long before this time the rule had been disturbed: Jos. Antt. xx. 10. 5, relates, τὴν δὲ βασιλείαν Ἡρώδης παρὰ Ῥωμαίων ἐγχειρισθείς, οὐκέτι τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσαμωναίου γένους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς, ἀλλὰ τισὶν ἀσήμοις, καὶ μόνον ἐξ ἱερέων οὖσι, πλὴν ἑνὸς Ἀριστοβούλου, τὴν τιμὴν ἀπένεμε. Some of the early Commentators, e. g. Œc., Thl., Primas., imagine that an allusion to this irregularity is here intended: αἰνίττεται δὲ ἐνταῦθα τοὺς τότε ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οἳ ἐπεπήδων τῇ τιμῇ, ὠνητὴν ταύτην κτώμενοι, καὶ τὸν νόμον διαφθείροντες, Œc. But, though even Bleek imagines such an allusion may have been in the Writer's mind, it seems I own to me very improbable).

5.] **Thus Christ also** (as well as those others) **did not glorify** HIMSELF **to be made High Priest** (i. e. did not raise *Himself* to the office of High Priest. **δοξάζειν** is here used in its most general sense, of all those steps of elevation by which the dignity might be attained: see especially ref. John, which is exceedingly useful to the right understanding here. De Wette (so also Hofmann, Schrb. ii. 1. 182. See Delitzsch's note) is certainly very far wrong, in taking ἐδόξασεν of the ultimate well-known glorification of Christ, properly so called (ch. ii. 9), for thus confusion is introduced into the members of the parallel, seeing that this sentence, οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενηθ. ἀρχ., ought to correspond to οὐχ ἑαυτῷ λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν above. In the construction, the inf. **γενηθῆναι** contains rather the result than the definite purpose: 'did not exalt himself so as to be made,' i. e. 'did not use that self-exaltation which might make him'), **but He** (i. e. the Father) **who spake to Him, Thou art my son, I have this day begotten thee** (see ch. i. 5, where this same saying is similarly adduced as spoken by the Heavenly Father to the

[6] καθὼς καὶ [c] ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν [d] τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. [7] ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς [e] σαρκὸς

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

c see ch. iv. 5. d Psa. cix. 4. Luke i. 8. 1 Cor. xiv. 40. Col. ii. 5. ver. 10. ch. vi. 20. vii. 11, &c. only. = 2 Macc. ix. 18 (see note). e = 1 Pet. iv. 2. 2 Cor. x. 3. Gal. ii. 20. Phil. i. 22, 24.

6. aft εν ετερῳ ins παλιν D¹[-gr. aft συ ins ει P 47(Mill) syr copt basm arm Chron]. μελχισεδεχ (here and vii. 1) A vulg.
7. aft ος ins ων D¹[-gr].

Son. It must be carefully observed, that the Writer does not adduce this text as containing a direct proof of Christ's divine appointment to the High Priesthood: that follows in the next verse: nor again, does it merely assert, without any close connexion (cf. **καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει**), that the same Divine Person appointed Him High Priest, who said to Him "Thou art my Son:" but it asserts, that such divine appointment was wrapped up and already involved in that eternal generation to the Sonship which was declared in these words. So Thl.: *δοκεῖ δὲ ἀνάρμοστος εἶναι ἡ ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου ψαλμοῦ προφητεία πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον· προὔκειτο μὲν γὰρ δήπουθεν ἀποδειχθῆναι ἀρχιερέα τὸν χριστόν, αὕτη δὲ ἡ μαρτυρία τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθῆναι δηλοῖ. μάλιστα μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγεννῆσθαι προκατασκευή ἐστι τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χειροτονηθῆναι.* And similarly Chrys. Then again, we must beware of imagining that **ὁ λαλήσας . . . . γεγέννηκά σε** is a mere periphrasis of *ὁ πατήρ*, as some have done. The true account seems to be this: the word **ἐδόξασεν** contains in it the whole process of exaltation (through suffering) by which the Lord Jesus has attained the heavenly High Priesthood. This whole process was not *his own work*, but the Father's, John viii. 54. And in saying this, we involve every step of it, from the very beginning. Of these, unquestionably the first was His eternal generation by the Father. He did not constitute *himself* the Son of God, in virtue ultimately of which sonship He *ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεύς*. And therefore in proving this, the sacred Writer adduces first the declaration of the Father which sets forth this His generation as Son of God, on which all His *δοξασθῆναι* depended,—and then, when He was completed by sufferings, vv. 7—10, the direct declaration of his High Priesthood, also by the Father. This class of interpretations has been much impugned, principally by the Socinian interpreters, and those who lean that way. Schlichting, Grot., Hammond, Limborch, Peirce, Storr, De Wette, and even Tholuck, refer the saying to the time of Christ's exaltation through death: and therein the more directly Socinian of them (e.g. Schlichtg.) see a disproof of the eternal generation of the Son. To take one of the arguments by which even such Commentators as Tholuck support this view; he alleges that it best agrees with the *τελείωσις* spoken of vv. 7 ff., in which Christ by obedience became perfect as our High Priest. How fallacious this is, may readily be seen from the words **καίπερ ὢν υἱός**, which according to this view He was not, in the present sense, till those sufferings were ended. Delitzsch also would understand the words entirely of His triumphant glorified state, beginning with the Resurrection: on the ground that there is no connexion in the proposition that He who designated Him as His Eternal Son, also appointed Him to the High Priesthood. But surely this is not so: see above. On the whole question of the interpretation of the words themselves, as cited from the Psalm, see on ch. i. 5, where I have fully discussed it), 6.] **even as also he saith in another (place)** (see on ref., *ἐν τούτῳ*), **Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek** (on the relation of this Psalm to Christ, see generally on ch. i. 13. I may add to what was there said, that it is thus declared, that He, in whom all the theocratic promises find their fulfilment, in whom the true Kingdom of God comes and is summed up, was to be, as in Zech. vi. 12 ff., "a priest upon His throne," and such a priest (i. e. necessarily *High* Priest, if a King; as indeed the word is given in ver. 10 and ch. vi. 20) as should be after the order of Melchisedek. In examining this last predication, we find that **κατὰ τὴν τάξιν**, according to the ordinary meaning of *τάξις*, imports, *according to the office or order*, the rank which Melchisedek held. So Jos. Antt. vii. 11. 6, David appointed Amasa commander, *καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτῷ ἐφ' ἧς Ἰωάβος ἦν, δίδωσιν*: Polyb. ii. 24. 9, *ἐφεδρείας ἔχοντες τάξιν*: Demosth. 313. 18, *οἰκέτου τάξιν, οὐκ ἐλευθέρου παιδός, ἔχων*. See many other examples in Bleek. So that **κατὰ τὴν τάξιν** will be very nearly the same as *κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα*, ch. vii. 15: and the Peschito has this latter expression both in the Psalm, and throughout our Epistle. On **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα**, as indeed on the detailed application of the several expressions to Christ, see on ch. vii. 20 ff.).

7 ff.] The *sufferings* of Christ are now adduced, as a portion of his *δοξασθῆναι* to be made High Priest. They were all in subjection to the will of the Father: they

αὐτοῦ [f g] δεήσεις τε καὶ [g h] ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον [i] σώζειν αὐτὸν [i] ἐκ θανάτου [k] μετὰ [l] κραυγῆς [m] ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ [k] δακρύων [n] προσενέγκας, καὶ [o] εἰσακουσθεὶς [p] ἀπὸ τῆς

f Heb., here only. elsw. Luke (i. 13 al3.) & Paul (Rom. x. 1 al11.), exc. James v. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 12, from Ps. xxxiii. 15. g Job xl. 22 (27). so Polyb. iii. 112. 8. h here only. Job as above. 2 Macc. ix. 18 only. i = (see note) John xii. 27. James v. 20. Jude 5. 1 Macc. ii. 59. k Acts xix. 19, 31. ch. xii. 17. l Matt. xxv. 6. Acts xxiii. 9. Eph. iv. 31. Rev. xiv. 18. xxi. 4 only. = Esth. iv. 3. m = Rev. xviii. 2. Dan. vi. 20 Theod. n John xvi. 2. (see note.) o Matt. vi. 7. Luke i. 13. Acts x. 31. 1 Cor. xiv. 21 only. Ps. xxi. 2. cxiv. 1. p = Luke xix. 3. xxiv. 41. John xxi. 6. Acts xii. 14. xx. 9. xxii. 11. Ps. cxviii. 28. ὅπως θαυμασθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱπποτροφίας, Thuc. vi. 12.

om τε K o [Did$_1$] Chr-4-mss: expressed in syr, not in latt Syr copt [basm æth arm]. for εισακ., ακουσθ. D[1].

were all parts of his τελείωσις, by virtue of which He is now, in the fullest and most glorious sense, our High Priest. So that these verses are no digression, but stand directly in the course of the argument, as proving the proposition, οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα. Part of this connexion is recognized by Bleek, but not all. He regards the verses as introduced to shew that Christ was never, not even in his deepest humiliation, severed from the Father, whose Son He was, and who subsequently, at his resurrection, appointed Him to his High Priesthood: thus missing the one link which binds this passage into the argument, viz. that this obedience and these sufferings were all *a part of His being glorified* for his High Priestly office: *a part of that office itself*, performed before He was perfected by entrance, through the veil of His flesh by death, into the most holy place. This mistake about the time of commencement of the High Priesthood of Christ has misled several of the Commentators throughout this part of the Epistle. **ὃς ἐν κ.τ.λ.**] It will be best to mark at once what I believe to be the connexion of this much-disputed sentence, and then to justify each portion in detail afterwards. **Who in the days of his flesh, in that he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard by reason of his reverent submission, though He was a son, learned, from the things which He suffered, his obedience, and being made perfect, became the cause of eternal salvation to all who obey Him, being addressed by God as High Priest after the order of Melchisedek.** That is, being paraphrased,—'who had a course of glorifying for the High Priest's office to go through, not of his own choice, but appointed for Him by the Father, as is shewn by that sharp lesson of obedience (not as contrasted with disobedience, but as indicating a glorious degree of perfect obedience, τὴν ὑπακ.), familiar to us all, which He, though God's own Son, learned during the days of his flesh: when He cried to God with tears for deliverance from death, and was heard on account of His resignation to the Father's will ("Not my will, but Thine be done"),' &c. Then as to details: **ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ** I understand as a general wide date for the incident which is about to be brought in,—as contrasted with His present days of glorification in the Spirit.

προσφέρειν δέησιν is found in Achil. Tat. vii. 1 (Bl.), ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔπειθεν . . . . δευτέραν αὐτῷ προσφέρει δέησιν, and Longin. Pastoral. ii. 23: Jos., B. J. iii. 8. 3, has προσφέρει εὐχήν. **ἱκετηρία** is properly an adjective used of κλάδος, ῥάβδος, &c. held out by the ἱκέτης. So Philo, Legat. ad Caium, § 36, vol. ii. p. 586, γραφῇ δὲ μηνύσει μου τὴν δέησιν, ἣν ἀνθ' ἱκετηρίας προτείνω. But it also was used as = ἱκεσία or ἱκετεία: so, joined as here with δέησις, by Isocr. de Pace 46, πολλὰς ἱκετηρίας καὶ δεήσεις: see reff. and more instances in Bleek. **πρὸς τὸν δυνάμ.** is to be taken with the substantives δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετ., not with the verb προσενέγκας, in which case the words would most probably be placed after μετὰ κραυγ. ἰσχ. κ. δακρ., next the verb. **σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου** is by Estius, Schulz, al. understood to mean, not as generally, *to rescue Him from death*, but "*ut celeriter eriperetur a morte quam erat passurus:* quod," Estius adds, "factum est, quando a morte ad vitam immortalem resurrexit tertia die." So also more recently Ebrard. But this is not only against the usage of σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου: cf. reff., and the examples given in Bl.: e. g. Od. δ. 755, ἢ γάρ κέν μιν ἔπειτα καὶ ἐκ θανάτοιο σαώσαι: Aristid. Plat. i. p. 90, (ὁ κυβερνήτης) σώζων ἐκ θανάτου καὶ οὗτος ἀνθρώπους κ. αὐτοὺς κ. χρήματα,—but still more decidedly against the truth of the sacred narrative: "Father, if it be possible, *let this cup pass from me:*" for we must of course assume, that in such a designation of the Father, the contents of the prayer made to Him are also indicated.

The **μετὰ δακρύων** is not distinctly asserted in the sacred narrative: but is a most obvious inference from what is there: cf. Matt. xxvi. 37 ||. Bl. has noticed that

[q] εὐλαβείας, 8 [r] καίπερ ὢν [s] υἱός, [t] ἔμαθεν [u] ἀφ᾽ [v] ὧν ἔπαθεν

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

q ch. xii. 28 only. Josh. xxii. 24. Prov. xxviii. 14. Wisd. xvii. 8 only. (-βής, Luke ii. 25. -βεῖσθαι, ch. xi. 7.) r w. particip., ch. vii. 5. xii. 17. Phil. iii. 4. 2 Pet. i. 12 only. s so ch. iii. 6. t = Phil. iv. 11. u = Matt. xxiv. 32 ‖ Mk. v constr., 1 Cor. vii. 1. ch. ii. 18 (there also w. πάσχειν) al.

from the juxtaposition of **κραυγή** and **εἰσακουσθείς**, it is probable that the Writer may have had before his mind such passages from the Psalms as xxi. 2, *ὁ θεός μου, κεκράξομαι ἡμέρας πρός σε καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσῃ*: ib. ver. 24, *καὶ ἐν τῷ κεκραγέναι με πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσήκουσέ* (*ἐπήκ.* A) *με*: Ps. cxiv. (cxvi.) 1. I may remark, that there seems no reason for understanding the *κραυγὴ ἰσχυρά* and *δάκρυα* of any other time than the agony at Gethsemane, as some have done. This is adduced as the most illustrious instance of that learning obedience from suffering. Epiphanius reports that this *weeping* of the Lord in His agony was once related in some texts of St. Luke: see note on Luke xxii. 43, 44.

εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας is rendered in three different ways. 1. "*He was heard on account of His pious resignation.*" 2. "*He was heard, and so delivered, from that which He feared.*" 3. "*He was heard by Him who was His fear.*" Of these, (3) may shortly be discussed. It is cited by Wolf, Curæ in loc., as the view of Albert Ehlers, and is justified by God being called "*the Fear of Isaac,*" Gen. xxxi. 42, 53. See also Isa. viii. 13. But as Wolf answers, "Si Deum indicare voluisset Apostolus, procul dubio scripsisset, *ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ*, vel *ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ*, cum antea *τοῦ δυναμένου σώζειν*, i. e. Dei facta fuisset mentio." And usage would be wholly against such a sense of *εὐλάβεια*. (2) has found a formidable phalanx of supporters. The old Latin versions, "exauditus a metu:" Ambrose on Ps. lxi. p. 957, "exauditus ab illo metu:" Calv., Beza, Schlichting, Grot., Gerhard, Erasm. Schmid, Jac. Cappell., Hammond, Limborch, Schöttgen, Wolf, Bengel, Wetst., Storr, Ernesti, Bretschn., Kuinoel, De Wette, Stuart, Tholuck, Ebrard, and many others. Of these, most understand **εὐλάβεια** of *His own fear* (abstr.), from which, by strengthening Him, God delivered Him: some, as Calv., Schlicht., Hamm., take it (concr.) of the *thing itself which* He feared, viz. death: "ex eo quod timebat," Calv. But neither can this be maintained. Bleek has most elaborately discussed the meanings of *εὐλάβεια*, and shewn, that however near it may seem to approach in some Greek sentences, to *fear*, yet it is always the fear of caution or modesty, not of terror: and even could it be thus taken (which Delitzsch, though interpreting the passage as I have done below, yet maintains it may be, on the strength of such examples as Sir. xli. 3, *μὴ εὐλαβοῦ κρῖμα θανάτου*), it would not be agreeable either to the propriety of the passage to express that Christ was delivered from death in such a phrase, when *σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου* has immediately preceded,—nor to its purpose, to predicate such a deliverance from death of Him at all, seeing that He did actually undergo that death which He feared. This would apply to the *concrete* acceptation of *εὐλάβεια*: and the *abstract* is precluded by the usage of the word. Besides which, the expression **εἰσηκούσθη ἀπό** would be, if not altogether unprecedented, yet so harsh as to be exceedingly improbable. None of the precedents alleged for it apply. In Ps. xxii. 22, "Thou hast heard me from among the horns of the unicorns," the LXX (xxi. 21) have *κ. ἀπὸ κεράτων μονοκερώτων τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου*, which is no example: in Job xxxv. 12, *ἐκεῖ κεκράξονται καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσῃ καὶ* (om. *καί* A) *ἀπὸ ὕβρεως πονηρῶν*, the *ἀπό* belongs to the former verb *κεκράξονται*. The only case of a pregnant construction at all similar, seems to be, Ps. cxvii. 5, *εἰσήκουσέ μου εἰς πλατυσμὸν* (*κύριος*): but as Bl. remarks, it surely is no reason, because a *translator* reproduces a Hebrew pregnancy, that a writer should have a far harsher construction of the same kind attributed to him when there is no such justifying reason. The other instances, from our Epistle, ch. x. 22, *ῥεραντισμένοι . . . ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς*, vi. 1, are to no purpose, as the verbs there carry in them the idea of being cleansed, or of turning, *from* something, and the prep. therefore naturally follows. It remains then to examine (1), against which it is urged by Beza, and even by Tholuck (but not in his last edn.), that **ἀπό** will not bear the meaning '*on account of.*' It is surprising that a scholar should ever have made such an objection, in the face of the instances in the reff., to which many more might be added out of the classics from those given by Bleek. The objection which Tholuck still brings, that such an interpretation would require *αὐτοῦ* after *τῆς εὐλαβ.*, is equally futile, the unusual expression of the art. after a preposition carrying the full force of a possessive. On the other hand it must be urged, that this meaning, '*He was heard on account of His pious resignation,*' as it is that given by all the Greek expositors, so is the only one which will satisfy the usage of *εὐλάβεια*. The account of the word, which I take mainly from Bleek, is this: it is derived from *εὐλαβής*, and that from *εὖ* and *λαμ-*

τὴν [w] ὑπακοήν, [9] καὶ [x] τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο πᾶσιν τοῖς [y] ὑπ-

w Heb., here only. elsw., 1 Pet. i. 2, 14, 22, and Paul (Rom. i. 5 al10.). x ch. ii. 10 reff. 2 Kings xxii. 36 only. y ch. xi. 8 reff.

9. rec τοις υπακ. αυτω bef πασιν, with KL rel Thdrt$_1$ Damasc$_1$ Œc: txt ABCD[P]ℵ m 17 [47] latt syrr copt [æth arm] Chr$_1$ Cyr$_1$ Thdrt$_2$ [Euthal-ms Antch$_1$ Damasc$_1$ Thl].

βάνειν, denoting one who lays hold of any thing well, i.e. carefully, so as not to break or injure it; and is used of a man proceeding cautiously in his design, so as to avoid injury to himself or another. As such, it is opposed to θράσος by Demosth. 517. 21, κ. γὰρ ἐκ τούτου φανερὰ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ἥ τε τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων ὑμῶν εὐλάβεια γενήσεται κ. τὸ τούτου θράσος. Thus again in Plut. Marc. 9, p. 252, τὸ θαῤῥαλέον αὐτοῦ κ. δραστήριον πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνου κεραννύντες κ. ἁρμόττοντες εὐλάβειαν κ. πρόνοιαν. And Polyb. iii. 105. 8, διὰ μὲν τὴν Μάρκου τόλμαν ἀπόλωλε τὰ ὅλα, διὰ δὲ τὴν εὐλάβειαν τοῦ Φαβίου σέσωσται καὶ πρὸ τοῦ καὶ νῦν. And hence the meaning sometimes approaches very near to *fear*: but, as above observed, always the fear of great caution or great modesty, not that of terror in any case. So Liban. iv. 265 a, μεστός ἐστιν εὐλαβείας κ. δέδοικεν: Jos. Antt. vi. 9. 2, μὴ ταπεινὸν ἔστω φρόνημα μηδ' εὐλαβές, ὦ βασιλεῦ. And in Antt. xi. 6. 9, Esther is said to have come in to the king μετὰ δέους, but he laid the sceptre on her neck, εὐλαβείας αὐτὴν ἀπολύων. So far is the word from representing the fear of terror, that it is expressly opposed to it: as e. g. by Demosth. 405. 19, τίνα δὲ οὗτοι μὲν ἄτολμον κ. δειλὸν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους φασὶν εἶναι, ἐγὼ δὲ εὐλαβῆ; ἐμέ. Diog. Laert. says of Zeno, τὴν δ' εὐλάβειαν (ἐναντίαν φησὶν εἶναι τῷ φόβῳ) οὖσαν εὔλογον ἔκκλισιν· φοβηθήσεσθαι μὲν γὰρ τὸν σοφὸν οὐδαμῶς, εὐλαβηθήσεσθαι δέ. See also in Bleek a remarkable extract from Plutarch, where he mentions εὐλάβεια being used by the Stoics as an euphemism for φόβος. From these meanings the transition was very easy to that cautious reverence with which the pious man approaches a Divine Being. So Plut. Camill., τὴν τοῦ Ἀλβίνου πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐλάβειαν κ. τιμήν: Plato, Legg. vi. p. 879, εὐλαβεῖσθαι θεόν: Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 6, vol. i. p. 476, εὐλαβείᾳ τὸ θαῤῥοῦν ἀνακέκραται. τὸ μὲν γὰρ "τί μοι δώσεις (Gen. xv. 2);" θάρσος ἐμφαίνει· τὸ δὲ "ὦ δέσποτα," εὐλάβειαν: cf. also reff., especially ch. xii. 28, the only other place where it is found in the N. T. And this religious sense certainly suits remarkably well in our passage. No term could more exactly express the reverent submission to His Heavenly Father's will which is shewn in those words, "Not my will, but thine be done:" none the constant humbling of himself in comparison with the Father, and exalting Him in word and deed, of which our Saviour's life is full. I have no hesitation therefore in adopting this rendering, and feeling entirely satisfied with it. Besides fulfilling the requisites of philology and of fact, it admirably suits the context here, where the appointment of Christ by the Father to his High Priesthood and the various steps by which that High Priesthood was perfected, are in question. As the ancient schol. says, εἰ καὶ χάριτι, φησί, πατρικῇ ὡς υἱὸς εἰσηκούσθη, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας εὐλαβείας, εὐλαβείας γὰρ ἦν τὸ λέγειν Πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σύ. The matter of fact represented by **εἰσακουσθείς** may require some explanation. He *was heard*, not in the sense of the cup passing away from Him, which indeed was not the prayer of his εὐλάβεια,—but in strength being ministered to Him to do and to suffer that will of his Father, to fulfil which *was* the prayer of his εὐλάβεια—"Not my will, but thine be done." And I have little doubt that the word immediately refers to the "angel from heaven, strengthening Him," of Luke xxii. 43. Calvin's remarks ("Ita sæpe fit, ut hoc vel illud petamus, sed in alium finem: ipse vero Deus quod petieramus, eo modo quo petieramus, non concedens, interea modum invenit, quo nobis succurrat"), however true in the Christian life, do not apply here, because the real prayer of our Lord, as εὐλαβὴς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, was granted in the very form in which it was expressed, not in another. **καίπερ ὢν υἱός**] This clause, according to all analogy of the use of καίπερ with a participle, is to be taken by itself, not with what follows. So καίπερ πολλὰ παθόντα, Od. η. 224; καίπερ οὐ στέργων ὅμως, Æsch. Sept. c. Theb. 714: &c. Bleek, who adduces many more examples, doubts whether any authentic instance of the use of καίπερ with a finite verb can be produced (not Rev. xvii. 8: see text there): see also reff. Thus much being certain, the next question is, to what these words are to be applied. A threefold connexion is mentioned by Photius (in Œc.). The first alternative involves an inversion which would be unnatural in the last degree: ὃς ἐν τ. ἡμ. τῆς σαρκ. αὐτ., καίπερ ὢν υἱός, δεήσεις κ. ἱκ. . . . . προσενέγκας. The second is to take the words with the clause immediately pre-

ακούουσιν αὐτῷ [a] αἴτιος [a] σωτηρίας [a] αἰωνίου, 10 [b] προςαγο-

a here only. 1 Kings xxii. 22. a here only. Isa. xlv. 17. see ch. vi. 2. ix. 12. b here only. Deut. xxiii. 6. = 2 Macc. iv. 7. x. 9. xiv. 37.

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

ceding: εἰσηκούσθη, φησί, καίπερ ὢν υἱός, κ. μὴ δεόμενος εἰσακουσθῆναι. And so Thl. (Chrys. in one place, but see also below; Phot. prefers it among the three), al. And this doubtless is possible, both grammatically and contextually. For the **καίπερ ὢν υἱός** would thus come in as an exceptional clause, not to εἰσακουσθείς, in which light Bleek, Lünem., al. object to it, seeing that his being a Son would be rather the reason why He should than why He should not be heard,—but to the whole clause εἰσακ. ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας,—though He was a Son, yet not this, but his εὐλάβεια, was the ground of his being heard: which gives an undoubted good sense. Not much dissimilar will be the sense given by the other and more general way: viz. to take the words with the following clause, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν: although He was a Son, He learned his obedience, not from this relation, but from his sufferings. So Chrys. (τί λέγεις; ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ εὐλαβείας ἠκούετο; καὶ τί περὶ τῶν προφητῶν πλέον ἂν εἴποι τις; ποία δὲ καὶ ἀκολουθία εἰπεῖν εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, καὶ ἐπαγαγεῖν, καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν; but see also above), Ambrose (Ep. lxiii. vol. iii. p. 1033: "et ex iis quæ passus est, quamvis esset filius Dei, discere videretur obedientiam:" and alibi), and almost all the moderns. And there can be little doubt that this yields the better sense, and points to the deeper truth. Christ was a Son: as a Son, He was ever obedient, and ever in union with his Father's will; but ἡ ὑπακοή, *His special* obedience, that course of submission by which He became perfected as our High Priest, was gone through *in Time*, and matter of *acquirement* for Him, and *practice*, by suffering. The expression, **ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν**, brings to mind a number of Greek sayings founded on the proverb, παθήματα, μαθήματα. So Herod. i. 207, of Crœsus, τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα, ἐόντα ἀχάριστα, μαθήματα γέγονεν: Æschyl. Agam. 177, τὸν πάθει μάθος θέντα, and a very long list of examples in Wetstein and Bleek. The ancients found this assertion startling, attributing too narrow a sense to our Lord's παθήματα: so Thdrt., τὸ δὲ ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν, ὑπερβολικῶς ὁ ἀπόστολος τέθεικε· τὴν γὰρ ὑπακοὴν οὐ μετὰ τὸ πάθος, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους ἀπεδείξατο. And Chrys., ὁ μέχρι θανάτου πρὸ τούτου ὑπακούσας ὡς πατρὶ υἱός, πῶς δὲ καὶ ὕστερον ἔμαθεν; This indeed would be a difficulty, were the Writer speaking of the Passion only, in its stricter sense; but he is speaking, I take it, of that continuous course of new obedience entered on by new suffering, of which the prayer in Gethsemane furnishes indeed the most notable instance, but of which also almost every act of His life on earth was an example. Thl. is so scandalized by the whole passage as applied to Christ that he says, εἶδες πῶς διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀκροατῶν ὠφέλειαν οὕτω συγκατέβη Παῦλος, ὥστε καὶ ἄτοπά τινα λέγων φαίνεσθαι. Two mistakes must be avoided: 1. though He was *the* Son, which I find in Craik's new translation of the Epistle: cf. ch. iii. 5, 6, Μωυσῆς, ὡς θεράπων . . . χριστός, ὡς υἱός: and consider besides, that if we take from the simple predicative force of **υἱός**, as a well-known relative, we take from the **καίπερ ὤν** at the same time, by diminishing the general appreciation of the exceptional **καίπερ**: and, 2. that of Whitby, that ἔμαθεν here means "*taught* (*us*)." If such a meaning ever could be admitted, least of all could it, from the context, here, where the subject treated is entirely Christ Himself, in his completion as our High Priest, and not till this is finished does that which He became to others come into question. **τελειωθείς**, see note on ch. ii. 10, *perfected*, completed, brought to his goal of learning and suffering, through death: the time to which the word would apply is that of the Resurrection, when his triumph began: so our Lord Himself on the way to Emmaus, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστόν, καὶ (τελειωθεὶς would come in here) εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; Thdrt., τελείωσιν δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν κ. τὴν ἀθανασίαν ἐκάλεσε· τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ πέρας. **ἐγένετο**, by means of that course which ended in His τελείωσις. In **πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ** there is probably an allusion to the ὑπακοή above. As He obeyed the Father, so must we obey Him, if we would be brought to that σωτηρία αἰώνιος into which He has led the way. The expression is strictly parallel with οἱ πιστεύσαντες, ch. iv. 3, and τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ, ch. vii. 25. Some have thought that in **πᾶσιν**, the Writer hints to his Jewish readers, that such salvation was not confined to them alone. But it hardly seems likely that such a by-purpose should lie in the word. This unlikelihood is increased if πᾶσιν (as it must do) begins, instead of closing the clause as in rec. **αὐτῷ** is of course Christ.

αἴτιος εἶναι τινί τινος is good Greek, and often found: see examples in Bleek, e. g. Xen. Cyr. viii. 5. 2, πολλῶν κ. ἀγαθῶν

ρευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν [c] τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.

[11] Περὶ οὗ πολὺς [d] ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ [e] δυσερμήνευτος

c ver. 6.
d plur., so ch. ii. 5. vi. 9, 11.
e here only †. Philo de Somn. i. § 32, vol. i. p. 649.

11. ins και bef περι D[1][-gr: add δε Syr]. om ο D[1][P arm].

αἴτιοι ἀλλήλοις ἔσεσθε: Diod. Sic. iv. 82, τοῖς ἄλλοις αἴτιος ἐγένετο τῆς σωτηρίας: and the same expression in Jos. Antt. iii. 3. 1; vii. 1. 1: Philo de Agric. § 22, vol. i. p. 315: De Vita Contempl. § 11, vol. ii. p. 485. See reff. also on σωτηρία αἰώνιος.

The next clause, **προσαγορευθεὶς κ.τ.λ.**, depends closely upon τελειωθεὶς κ.τ.λ. above, and belongs to the time of Christ's exaltation, indicated by τελειωθείς: and therefore must not be divided by a colon, as done by Griesbach, Bengel, Matthäi, al., from the foregoing, nor supposed to refer to the whole from ver. 7. As to the word itself, it refers to the passage of the Psalm above, and carries with it a slight causal force, '*being*,' or '*inasmuch as He is*, named.' προσαγορεύω in this connexion has a force of solemnity and formal appellation: so, Xen. Cyr. vii. 2. 4, Crœsus says to Cyrus, χαῖρε ὦ δέσποτα· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τύχη καὶ ἔχειν . . . . δίδωσί σοι, καὶ ἐμοὶ προσαγορεύειν: Diod. Sic. i. 4, Γάϊος Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ, ὁ διὰ τὰς πράξεις προσαγορευθεὶς θεός. See reff. 2 Macc., and many more examples in Bleek. So that it here implies, not '*appointed*' or '*inaugurated*,' but '*addressed as*,' '*named*,' it being of course implied that He was both appointed and inaugurated.

11—VI. 20.] *Digression*, before entering on the comparison of Christ with Melchisedek, *complaining of the low state of spiritual attainment of the readers* (11—14): *warning them of the necessity of progress and the peril of falling back* (vi. 1—8): *but at the same time encouraging them by God's faithfulness in bearing in mind their previous labour of love, and in His promises generally, to persevere in faith and patience to the end* (vi. 9—20).

11.] **Concerning whom** (i. e. *Melchisedek*, as Syr. (which expresses Melchisedek after the relative), Calv., a-Lap., al., Bleek, De W., Tholuck, al.: not as Œc., Prim., al., and Lünem., *Christ*, of whom such an expression as this would hardly here be used, seeing that the whole Epistle hitherto has been concerning Him: nor is οὗ neuter, as Schlichting, Grot., Storr, Kuinoel, al.: and more recently, Delitzsch (περὶ τοῦ εἶναι χριστὸν ἀρχ. κατὰ τ. ταξ. M.): for the Writer *returns to Melchisedek*, ch. vii. 1) **our discourse** (that which we have to say. The plural pronoun, not with any definite reference to Timothy or other companions of the Writer, nor intended to include the readers, which is here impossible: but as in some other places of the Epistle, see reff., merely indicating the Writer himself, as so frequently in the Epistles of St. Paul) **is** (not, as Erasm., Luther, a-Lap., al., "*would be*:" for we may safely say that in that case εἴη or ἂν εἴη would be supplied, as in the passage of Lysias cited below, and Dion. Hal. i. 23, περὶ ὧν πολὺς ἂν εἴη λόγος, εἰ βουλοίμην τὴν ἀκρίβειαν γράφειν) **much, and difficult of interpretation to speak** (the connexion of **δυσερμήνευτος** with λέγειν is somewhat dubious. Who is the ἑρμηνευτής? the *Writer*, so that it should be difficult *for him* to explain what he has to say to his readers, or the *readers*, so that it should be difficult *for them* to understand it for themselves? This latter alternative is taken by Grot. ("quem si eloquerer, ægre intelligeretis"), Jac. Cappel., Peirce, Valcknaer, al. But surely this would be inadmissible as matter of construction, and would require ἐν τῷ λέγειν or ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. And in consequence, some who take this view connect λέγειν with λόγος, πολ. ἡμ. ὁ λ. κ. δυσερμ. λέγειν, referring, as Wetst., to Lysias adv. Pancleon. p. 167. 25, ὅσα μὲν οὖν αὐτόθι ἐῤῥήθη, πολὺς ἂν εἴη μοι λόγος διηγεῖσθαι. But, as Bleek has noticed, there is this difference between the passages: that in ours, the adjectives are almost necessarily predicates, whereas in Lysias they are epithets: and, in consequence, here the verb must depend on δυσερμήνευτος. We are driven then to the other alternative, of making the *Writer* the subject to be supplied: so Chrys. (ὅταν γάρ τις πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔχῃ μὴ παρακολουθοῦντας, μηδὲ τὰ λεγόμενα νεοῦντας, ἑρμηνεῦσαι καλῶς αὐτοῖς οὐ δύναται), and Thl. (διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν οὖν νωθρείαν, φησί, δυσερμήνευτός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, καὶ διότι οὐ συνίετε ὑμεῖς, διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ καλῶς ἑρμηνεῦσαι οὐ δύναμαι), Erasm. ("sed omnia perdifficile fuerit enarrare vobis, eo quod" &c.), Schlichting ("sermo difficilis ad eloquendum sic ut facile ab audientibus percipi et intelligi queat"), al.: Bleek, De W., Lünem., al. Then the infin. follows, as ὅπως ἂν ὦσιν (οἱ λόγοι) ὡς πιθανώτατοι λέγειν, Plato, Gorg. p. 479 C: σῆμα ταυρόπουν ὁρᾶν,

[f] λέγειν, ἐπεὶ [g] νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς [h] ἀκοαῖς. [12] καὶ γὰρ [i] ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι [j] διὰ τὸν χρόνον, πάλιν [k] χρείαν [k] ἔχετε τοῦ [k] διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ τὰ [l] στοιχεῖα τῆς

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

f constr., see note. g ch. vi. 12 only. Prov. xxii. 29. Sir. iv. 29. xi. 12 only. see Prov. xii. 8. h = Mark vii. 35. Luke vii. 1. Acts xvii. 20 al. 2 Macc. xv. 39. οἷς ὦτα μέν ἐστιν, ἀκοαὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔνεισιν. Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hæres, § 3, vol. i. p. 474. i ver. 3. j = here only. see note. k constr., see note and Matt. iii. 14. xiv. 16. John xiii. 10. 1 Thess. i. 8. Dan. iii. 16. l Gal. iv. 3, 9. Col. ii. 8, 20. 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12 only †. Wisd. vii. 17. xix. 18 only.

12. om *τινα* 67[2].—*τίνα* (*interrog.*) CL[P](putting a stop bef it) [also B[2]]D[3] latt syr

Eur. Iph. Aul. 275: Γαλάτεια . . . λευκοτέρα πακτᾶς ποτιδεῖν, Theocr. xi. 20: and as in our phrase 'beautiful to look upon,' 'hard to work upon,' &c. Bleek (after Storr) and Lünemann have supposed that a kind of zeugma is necessary to connect λόγος with both predicates, πολύς regarding more the discourse itself and the explanation of the subject given by the Writer,—δυσερμήνευτος, the contents of the λόγος, as thus explained. But it does not seem to me that such a supposition is needed: our λόγος, that which we have to say, is both πολύς, abundant in quantity, and δυσερμήνευτος, difficult to state perspicuously to *you*, in quality. And so also Delitzsch), **since** (probably renders a reason only for the δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, not belonging also to πολύς) **ye are become** (not, "*are*," as E. V., Luther (not De W.), al. Chrys. says well, δηλοῦντος ἦν, ὅτι πάλαι ὑγίαινον καὶ ἦσαν ἰσχυροί, τῇ προθυμίᾳ ζέοντες, καὶ ὕστερον αὐτοὺς τοῦτο παθεῖν μαρτυρεῖ) **dull** (**νωθρός**, a lengthened and later form of νωθής. It is found as early as Plato, Theætet. p. 144 B, but more commonly in the later writers, Aristid., Plut., Polyb., al. See Elsn. and Wetst. Bleek thinks the most probable formation of it is from the negative νη and ὠθέω, as νωδός toothless, νώδυνος painless, νώνυμος nameless, νήπιος from ἔπω, = 'in-fans.' Thus the two words mean, '*difficult to move*:' so ὄνος νωθής, Il. β. 559: ὄνων νωθρὸν δέμας, Oppian, Halieut. iii. 140. And so likewise as applied to the soul, Plut. Lycurg. 51 e: νωθρᾶς . . . . κ. πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἀφιλοτίμου ψυχῆς σημεῖον: and to the senses, Heliodor. v. 10, ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ᾐσθόμην . . . . τάχα μέν που καὶ δι' ἡλικίαν νωθρότερος ὢν τὴν ἀκοήν· νόσος γὰρ ἄλλων τε καὶ ὤτων τὸ γῆρας. See many more examples in Bleek and Wetst.) **in your hearing** (more usually the accus., as in the last citation: but frequently in the (local or referential) dative, as e. g. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε. See examples in Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 6. ἀκοή is used in good Greek writers of the *ear*, with however this distinction, that it is of the ear with reference to the act of hearing, not merely as a member of the body. Philo draws the distinction, in ref. It is related to οὖς as ὄψις to ὀφθαλμός: cf. Xen. Mem. i. 4. 11, καὶ ὄψιν κ. ἀκοὴν κ. στόμα ἐνεποίησαν: Herod. i. 38, διεφθαρμένος τὴν ἀκοήν: and other examples in Bleek. The plur. here denotes not only the plurality of persons addressed, but also, as in ref. Mark, the double organ of hearing in each person). **12.] For though** (or, '*when*:' but in the presence of διὰ τὸν χρόνον, which gives the temporal reference, it is perhaps better not to repeat it) **ye ought** (see on ver. 3, and ch. ii. 17) **on account of the time** (i. e. the length of time during which you have been believers: οὕτω δὲ δείκνυσιν ἐκ πολλοῦ πεπιστευκότας αὐτούς, Œc. Cf. Polyb. ii. 21. 2, οἱ μὲν αὐτόπται γεγονότες τῶν δεινῶν ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν ἐξεχώρησαν διὰ τὸν χρόνον, ἐπεγένοντο δὲ νέοι: Diod. Sic. i. 12, βραχὺ μετατιθείσης διὰ τὸν χρόνον τῆς λέξεως: ib. c. 27, κατέφθαρται διὰ τὸν χρόνον: and other examples in Bleek. So that it is not "*jamdudum*," as Luther, al., nor "*after so long a time* (διὰ χρόνου)," as Schulz: nor "*on account of the present time* (διὰ τὸν καιρόν)," as proposed (not preferred, as Bl.) by Owen, and given by Braun: nor can we understand it, with a-Lapide, "pro longitudine temporis, quo tum in lege Mosi, quum in Christianismo estis eruditi." On the evidence given by expressions of this kind as to the time of writing the Epistle, and the persons to whom it is addressed, see Prolegg.) **to be teachers, ye again have need that some one teach you** (it is doubtful whether τινα represent the accus. sing. masc. (τινά) or the accus. plur. neut. (τίνα). The latter has been taken by our E. V., after considerable authorities: e. g. the Syr.; the Latin attached to D, "iterum necesse est doceri nos, quæ sint," &c.; vulg.; Aug. Tract. 98 in Joann. (vol. iii. pt. ii.): and indeed most Commentators, including Grot., Wolf, Bengel, Kuin., De Wette, Tholuck, Delitzsch. But the other rendering has also ancient authority for it: Œc. says, πάλιν χρ. ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινα. τί δὲ διδάσκειν; τὰ στοιχεῖά φησι. And so Luth., Calv. ("ut quis vos doceat elementa"), al., and Lachmann, Bleek, Ebrard, Lünem. And indeed it is the only one which will fit either the context, or the construction strictly considered. The context: for it

[m] ἀρχῆς τῶν [n] λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ [o] γεγόνατε [p] χρείαν [o] ἔχοντες [q] γάλακτος, καὶ οὐ [r] στερεᾶς [s] τροφῆς. 13 πᾶς

m ch. vi. 1. n Acts vii. 38 Rom. iii. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 11 only. Num. xxiv. 4, 16. = Ps. cvi. 11. cxviii. 67, 172. Isa. v. 24. o constr., Mark i. 4. ix. 3, 7. 2 Cor. vi. 14. Col. i. 18. Rev. iii. 2. xvi. 10. p w. gen., Matt. vi. 8. ix. 12. 1 Cor. xii. 21. 1 Thess. iv. 12. ch. x. 36. Rev. xxi. 23. Isa. xiii. 17. q 1 Cor. iii. 2. ix. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 2 only. Gen. xviii. 8. r = here bis (2 Tim. ii. 19. 1 Pet. v. 9) only. (Deut. xxxii. 13 al.) Diod. Sic. ii. 4 al. in Bl. = τέλειος or κραταιότερος in Philo. s Matt. iii. 4. Acts ii. 46. xxvii. 33 al. Ps. cxlv. 7.

copt [æth] Jer$_1$ Aug$_1$, διδασκεσθαι τινα Orig$_1$ syr-mg. λογων D[1] 3. 10-1. 108, *verborum* D-lat, *sermonum* vulg [Jer$_1$: simly copt æth arm]. om last και B[2]C‎א[1] 17 vulg copt Orig$_3$[int$_2$ Euthal-ms] Chr-2-mss$_1$ Cyr$_1$ Aug$_1$: ins AB[1]DKL[P]א[3] rel.

was not loss of power in them to distinguish between first elements and other portions of Christian doctrine, of which he complains, but ignorance altogether, and slowness of ear to receive divine knowledge: and they wanted *some one* to begin again with them and teach them the very first elements. And so far from *τινά*, '*some one*,' being, as Delitzsch most absurdly says, matt und nichtssagend, it carries with it the fine keen edge of reproach; q. d. 'to teach you what all know, and any can teach.' Then again, had *τινα* been interrogative, we should have expected *διδάσκεσθαι*, or some personal pronoun before *διδάσκειν*. This is perhaps not altogether certain, in the face of *οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφειν*, 1 Thess. iv. 9, where I have retained the rec. (as against the correction *ἔχομεν*, admitted by Lachmann) and defended it as a mixture of two constructions. Still we have no right to assume such an irregularity where the context manifestly admits the common construction. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 1, *οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι*: and reff. The acceptation of *τοῦ διδάσκειν* as a substantival infinitive (*of the teaching*) is precluded by *ὑμᾶς* following) **the rudiments** (or 'elements:' see Gal. iv. 3 and note, and Ellicott there: the simple parts, out of which a body is compounded: Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 1, *βούλει σκοπῶμεν, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς τροφῆς ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων*: Galen, adv. Lycum, *δῆλός ἐστι μηδὲ τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς Ἱπποκράτους τέχνης ἐπιστάμενος*: which are afterwards called *αἱ συλλαβαὶ τῆς τέχνης*, and *τὰ πρῶτα τῆς τέχνης*) **of the beginning** (so "prima elementa," Quintil. Instit. i. 1: Hor. Sat. i. 1. 26: "prima pueritiæ elementa," Justin. Hist. vii. 5. The genitive specifies the elements, that they are not only such, but also belong to the *very beginning* of divine knowledge) **of the oracles** (**λόγιον**, properly a diminutive from *λόγος*, is used both in classical and Hellenistic Greek for an *oracle*, or a *divine utterance*. Very numerous instances are given in Bleek from both sources: and such will occur at once to every scholar. See Herod. iv. 178: Thucyd. ii. 8: and reff. Here it betokens that Christian doctrine (cf. ch. vi. 1), which rests entirely on revelations from God: as Schlichting: "doctrinæ Christianæ, quæ nil nisi Dei eloquia et oracula continet") **of God: and ye have become** (*καὶ οὐκ εἶπε· χρείαν ἔχετε, ἀλλὰ γεγόνατε χρ. ἔχοντες· τουτέστιν ὑμεῖς ἠθελήσατε, ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τοῦτο κατεστήσατε, εἰς ταύτην τὴν χρείαν.* Chrys.: and Œc., *γεγόνατε ἐκ ῥαθυμίας, οὐκ ὄντες τοιοῦτοι*: and Thl. even stronger, *ἐκ προαιρέσεως τοιοῦτοι γεγονότες*) **(persons) having need of milk, and not of solid food** (see 1 Cor. iii. 2. The similitude is very common with Philo: see extracts in Wetst. and Bleek. Arrian, Epictet. ii. 17, has the contrast as here, *οὐ θέλεις ἤδη ὡς τὰ παιδία ἀπογαλακτισθῆναι, κ. ἅπτεσθαι τροφῆς στερεωτέρας*. What is the milk in the Writer's meaning, is plain from ch. vi. 1, where he enumerates several portions of Christian doctrine as parts of *ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ λόγος*. The Fathers for the most part take the *στοιχεῖα* and the *γάλα* to mean the doctrine of the incarnation: so Chrys., *στοιχεῖα ἀρχῆς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα φησίν. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν γραμμάτων πρῶτον τὰ στοιχεῖα δεῖ μαθεῖν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θείων λόγων πρῶτον περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος δεῖ διδάσκεσθαι*: and similarly Thl. and Œc. Primasius more explicitly: "Lac ergo simplicis doctrinæ est incarnatio filii Dei, passio, resurrectio illius, ascensio ad cœlos; solidus vero cibus perfecti sermonis est mysterium Trinitatis, quomodo tres sint in personis et unum in substantia Deitatis." But nothing of this is found in the context: add to which, that the Writer has actually treated of the præ-existent state of Christ and of His incarnation, ch. i. ii. Thl. reckons the explanation about Melchisedek among the *στοιχεῖα*, not even to understanding which were they equal: and certainly this *might* be so: but from the form of the contrast drawn, and from ch. vi. 1, it is much more probable that the Writer regards that explanation as one of the more recondite things, and those enumerated ch. vi. 1, as the first principles. But it does not thence follow that these *στοιχεῖα* are of less importance than those deeper mysteries: these are the founda-

γὰρ ὁ [t] μετέχων [q] γάλακτος [u] ἄπειρος [v] λόγου [w] δικαιοσύνης, [x] νήπιος γάρ ἐστιν. 14 [y] τελείων δέ ἐστιν ἡ [r] στερεὰ

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

t ch. ii. 14 reff. u here only. 1 Kings xvii. 39 Ald. compl. Zech. xi. 15 (Jer. ii. 6 passive). Wisd. xiii. 18 only. ἀπ. τῆς ναυτικῆς, Herod. viii. 1, and passim in classics, see Bl. v = ch. vi. 1. w = (see note) ch. vii. 2. xi. 7. x = Matt. xi. 25 || L. Rom. ii. 20. 1 Cor. iii. 1. Eph. iv. 14. Ps. cxviii. 129. Pind. Pyth. iii. 148. y = 1 Cor. ii. 6. xiv. 20. Eph. iv. 13 al. gen., Acts i. 7. Rom. ix. 16.

13. aft *δικαιοσυνης* ins *εστιν* D[1] latt [Orig-int$_3$(om Orig$_2$) Aug$_1$]. aft *γαρ* ins *ακμην* D[1], *adhuc* D-lat.

tions, without which no building whatever can be raised. This is well expressed by Limborch, as cited by Bleek: "Hæc itaque sublimior doctrina non vocatur solidior cibus quia ad fidem Christianam magis est necessaria quam principia illa religionis: nihil minus: illis enim ignoratis, modo principia religionis Christianæ quis solida fide amplectatur, potest esse Christianus: non autem est Christianus, nisi illa firma fide amplexus fuerit: sed eo solum respectu, quod faciant ad solidiorem doctrinæ Christi confirmationem: sicuti solidus cibus non præcise est necessarius ad vitæ conservationem, sed ad virium majorum quæ ad labores sustinendos requiruntur, acquisitionem. Idque potissimum locum habet in Hebræis, qui multum addicti allegoricis interpretationibus, et de legis suæ divinitate persuasi, valde in fide Christiana confirmari poterant dilucida et distincta applicatione typorum V. T. ad Christum ejusque pontificatum"). Ver. **13** renders a reason for vv. 11, 12, and especially for *δυσερμήνευτος*. Having before stated that what he had to say would be hard for him to explain to them, and then that they were become persons needing milk and not solid food, he now proceeds to join these two positions together: **For every one who partakes of** (in the sense of *has for his share*, in ordinary feeding: not, partakes of in common with other things, for that adults do: see 1 Cor. x. 21) **milk, is unskilled in** (**ἄπειρος**, from *πεῖρα*, trial: opposed to *ἔμπειρος*, experienced: not to be confounded with another *ἄπειρος*, from *πέρας*: Etym. Mag., *ἄπειρος, ὁ μὲν ἀμαθής, παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν πεῖραν· ὁ δέ, μέγας, παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν πέρας*. It is of frequent use in the classics in this sense of unskilled: see numerous examples in Bleek: e. g. Plato, Rep. ix. p. 737, *ἄπειροι ἀληθείας*, and a passage not unlike this in its cast, Herodian v. 5. 1, *αὐτὸς γὰρ ἦν νέος τε τὴν ἡλικίαν, πραγμάτων τε κ. παιδείας ἄπειρος*) **the word of righteousness: for he is an infant** (that is, 'for every partaker of milk, in the metaphorical sense in which I just now used the word, i. e. every one who requires yet to be taught the first principles &c., is devoid of understanding in the word of righteousness, in, that is, the positions and arguments which treat of God's salvation by Christ: for he is an infant: takes the same rank in spiritual understanding, that an infant does in worldly.' Thus taken, I can see no difficulty such as Bleek represents in the contextual connexion. There is of course a mingling of the figure and the thing represented, which however is easy enough to any reader to whom both figure and thing are already familiar. But it is necessary to fix more satisfactorily the meaning of the somewhat obscure expression **λόγος δικαιοσύνης**. Chrys. says, *ἐνταῦθά μοι δοκεῖ καὶ βίον αἰνίττεσθαι· ὅπερ καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἔλεγεν, Ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν πλέον κ.τ.λ., τοῦτο καὶ αὐτός φησιν· ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης, τουτέστι, τῆς ἄνω φιλοσοφίας ἄπειρος, οὐ δύναται παραδέξασθαι βίον ἄκρον κ. ἠκριβωμένον*. Similarly Thl., giving however the alternative that *δικαιοσύνη* may mean *χριστὸς αὐτός*. Œc. says, *λόγον δὲ δικαιοσύνης λέγει τὸν περὶ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ κυρίου*. Thdrt., generally, *τὰ τελειότερα δόγματα*. Primasius, "Alienus est a discretione perfectæ justitiæ, quia nondum potest penetrare arcana mysteriorum, nec scit, ut expedit, discretionem facere inter bonum et malum." And so a-Lapide, Bretschn., al. Others, as Beza, Pyle, Storr, Tholuck, al., take *δικαιοσύνη* of the doctrine of justification before God by faith in Christ: or, as Bengel and Cramer, justification and sanctification as well: uprightness of doctrine and practice. Calvin says, "justitiæ nomine perfectionem intelligens, de qua paulo post loquitur" (ch. vi. 1). Many others take *λόγον δικαιοσύνης* as = *λόγου δικαίου*: so Schlichting, Grot., Wahl, Kuinoel, al. Others again have appealed to the Heb. usage of צְדָקָה for '*truth*,' and understood it "*verbum veritatis*:" so, with minor differences, Michaelis, Zachariä, Dindorf. Bleek half adopts a hint given by Carpzov, who interprets it of the "doctrina de sacerdotio Jesu Christi Melchisedeciano, quæ dicitur λόγος δικαιοσύνης propterea quod Melchisedecus, vi nominis, *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης* vertitur, vii. 2, eaque appellatio ad Christum sacerdotem applicatur, cujus *πρέπον* fuit *πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην*, Matt. iii. 15:" Bleek, however, not accepting the reference in this shape, supposes that *δικαιοσύνη* is here used as belonging to the whole subject

[s] τροφή, τῶν διὰ τὴν [z] ἕξιν τὰ [a] αἰσθητήρια [b] γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων [c] πρὸς [d] διάκρισιν [e] καλοῦ τε καὶ [e] κακοῦ. VI. [1] Διὸ

z here only ‡. (Judg. xiv. 9 A. Ald. compl. 1 Kings xvi. 7. Sir. xxx. 14 only. Dan. vii. 15 Theod.) a here only. Jer. iv. 19 only. b 1 Tim. iv. 7. ch. xii. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 14 only †. 2 Macc. x. 15 only. ὃς μὲν γὰρ τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει γεγυμνασμένον ἱκανῶς . . . οὗτος ἄριστος ἂν εἴη γνώμων, Galen. de Dign. Puls. iii. (-νασία, 1 Tim. iv. 8.) c = Acts iii. 10. ch. vi. 11. ix. 13. d Rom. xiv. 1. 1 Cor. xii. 10 only. Job xxxvii. 16 only. e so (πονηροῦ) 1 Thess. v. 22. (ἀγαθ.) Deut. i. 39. Isa. vii. 16.

to which Melchisedek, as the *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης*, also belongs: and that the *δικαιοσύνη* is that righteousness of which the fulness dwells in Christ, but of which Melchisedek, by his very name, was a type. But to this De Wette justly answers, that it would be very unnatural, to find a reference to an expression which, where it occurs, is not, any more than its cognate *βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης*, followed up,—and, so far from clearing this passage, itself needs explication. I incline more to Lünemann's view of the meaning, based as it is on the requirements of the passage, in which the stress is not on *λόγον δικαιοσύνης*, but on *ἄπειρος*, and *λόγ. δικ.* follows as something of course and generally understood. Feeling this, he interprets it of the gospel in general: that *λόγος* of which the central point is, the righteousness which is of God. And he refers to 2 Cor. iii. 9, *ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, and xi. 15, *διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης*. This acceptation would not altogether preclude *βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης* falling under the same general head, and thus would bring the two expressions into union, though without any distinct reference from one to another.

Delitzsch, whose commentary I have seen since writing the above, explains *λόγ. δικ.* "the capability to speak agreeably to righteousness" (die Fähigkeit, gerechtigkeitsgemäß zu sprechen), and takes the genitive as one of attribute. But I cannot see how the general context justifies this. It is not speaking, but apprehending, which is here surely required of the readers):

14.] **but** (continuation of and contrast to ver. 13) **solid food belongs to** (is the portion of) **the grown up** (so *τέλειος* often: e. g. Xen. Cyr. viii. 7. 3, *ἐγὼ γὰρ παῖς τε ὢν τὰ ἐν παισὶ νομιζόμενα καλὰ δοκῶ κεκαρπῶσθαι· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἥβησα, τὰ ἐν νεανίσκοις· τέλειός τε ἀνὴρ γενόμενος, τὰ ἐν ἀνδράσι*: Polyb. v. 29. 2, *ἐλπίσαντες ὡς παιδίῳ νηπίῳ χρήσασθαι τῷ Φιλίππῳ, εὗρον αὐτὸν τέλειον ἄνδρα*. The spiritual sense is found in reff.: Thl. says, *ὁρᾷς νηπιότητα ἑτέραν, ἣν καὶ γέροντες ἔχουσι, τὴν τῶν φρενῶν, καὶ τελειότητα, ἣν καὶ νέους ἔχειν οὐδὲν ἐμποδίζει.* Then the qualification of **τελείων** follows), **to those who by virtue of their (long) habit** (**ἕξις** from *ἔχω*, as 'habitus' from 'habeo.' Quintil. Inst. x. 1 init., "Sed hæc eloquendi præcepta, sicut cognitioni sunt necessaria, ita non satis ad vim dicendi valent, nisi illis firma quædam facilitas, quae apud Græcos *ἕξις* vocatur, acceperit: quam scribendo plus, an legendo, an dicendo, consequamur, solere quæri scio." Aristot. Rhet. i. 1, *οἱ μὲν εἰκῇ ταῦτα δρῶσιν, οἱ δὲ διὰ συνήθειαν ἀπὸ ἕξεως.* Observe, on account of this meaning of the word as well as the accus. after **διά**, it is not, "*by means of skill acquired in practice*," as Œc. (*τὴν ἕξιν λέγει τὴν τελειότητα*, so also Thl., adding, *καὶ τὴν παγιότητα τῶν ἐθῶν*), Bengel ("**ἕξις** notat h. l. robur facultatis cognoscentis ex maturitate ætatis spiritualis existens"): but, '*on account of* (their) *long usage*,' so that *ἕξις* stands in a causal, not in an instrumental relation to the result. Notice also that *διὰ τὴν ἕξιν* is not = *δι' ἕξιν*, '*by virtue of habit*' (abstract),—and that, on account of its position, it belongs not to *γεγυμνασμένα*, but to the whole sentence) **have their organs of sense** (not, *their senses* themselves. Wetst. quotes a definition ascribed to Galen, *τὸ αἰσθητήριον, τὸ αἴσθησίν τινα ἐμπεπιστευμένον ὄργανον . . . . ἤτοι ὀφθαλμός, ἢ ῥίς, ἢ γλῶττα, ἃ καὶ ὄργανα αἰσθητικὰ προσαγορεύεται.* Here again there manifestly is a mixture of the figure and the thing signified: on account of what follows, we must necessarily understand these *αἰσθητήρια* of the inner organs of the soul: as Œc., *τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰσθητήρια λέγει*) **exercised** (reff.) **with a view to** (so in ref. 1 Tim., *γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν*:) see also reff. here. **πρός** most likely belongs to *γεγυμνασμένα*, not to the whole *τῶν . . . . ἐχόντων*, because of the art. *τά*, which makes *γεγυμνασμένα* a predicate, not an epithet. See the very similar passage of Galen in reff.) **distinction of good and evil** (this puts us in mind, as Bleek remarks, of the common O. T. expression in describing childhood: e. g. Deut. i. 39, *πᾶν παιδίον νέον, ὅστις οὐκ οἶδεν σήμερον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν*: Isa. vii. 16, *πρὶν γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν.* Cf. Sext. Empir. Hyp. Pyrrh. iii. 19, *λείπεται δὲ τὸ ἠθικόν, ὅπερ δοκεῖ περὶ τὴν διάκρισιν τῶν τε καλῶν καὶ κακῶν καὶ ἀδιαφόρων καταγίγνεσθαι.* The reference here of good and evil is manifestly not to *moral* qualities, but to excellence and inferiority, wholesomeness and corruptness in doctrine. Chrys. explains it well: *νῦν οὐ περὶ βίου*

[f] ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς [g] ἀρχῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ [h] λόγον [i] ἐπὶ τὴν [k] τελειότητα [l] φερώμεθα, μὴ πάλιν [lm] θεμέλιον [mn] κατα-

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

f Matt. iv. 20, 22. xviii. 12. Mark vii. 8. Judg. ix. 9. τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφεὶς πρὸς τὴν τελευτήν, ὕστερον οὖσαν, φέρῃ. Eurip. Androm. 393, al. in Bleek. g = ch. v. 12. h = ch. v. 13. i = here only. ἥξει δ' ἴσως ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν λόγον φερόμενος, Lycurg. adv. Leocr. p. 138, al. in Bleek. k Col. iii. 14 only. Judg. ix. 16, 19. l 1 Cor. iii. 11. 2 Tim. ii. 19. m here only. see note. (τιθέναι θ., Luke vi. 48, 49 al. διδόναι, Ezra v. 16. ἐμβάλλεσθαι, Esdr. vi. 20.) n = here (2 Cor. iv. 9) only ‡. (-βολή, ch. iv. 3.)

Chap. VI. 1. φερομεθα D[1](but βαπτισμον below) K[P] o(but τελειωτητα) syr.

ὁ λόγος, ὅταν λέγῃ· πρὸς διάκρ. καλοῦ κ. κακοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ δυνατὸν εἰδέναι κ. εὔκολον· ἀλλὰ περὶ δογμάτων ὑγιῶν κ. ὑψηλῶν διεφθαρμένων τε καὶ ταπεινῶν. τὸ παιδίον οὐκ οἶδε τὴν φαύλην κ. τὴν δόκιμον τροφὴν διαιρεῖν· πολλάκις γοῦν καὶ χοῦν ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὸ βλαβερὸν ἐδέξατο, καὶ πάντα ἀδιακρίτως ποιεῖ· ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ τέλειον τοιοῦτον. τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν οἱ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς προσέχοντες, κ. ἀδιακρίτως τὰς ἀκοὰς ἐκδιδόντες ἀδοκίμοις. καὶ τούτους αἰτιᾶται ὡς ἁπλῶς περιφερομένους, κ. νῦν μὲν τούτοις νῦν δὲ ἐκείνοις διδόντας ἑαυτούς· ὃ καὶ πρὸς τῷ τέλει ᾐνίξατο λέγων· διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις κ. ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε. τοῦτό ἐστι πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ· λάρυγξ μὲν γὰρ σῖτα γεύεται, ψυχὴ δὲ δοκιμάζει λόγους. But we must beware of the mistake to which Chrys. gives some countenance, and which Œc. and Thl. repeat, that the καλόν represents δόγματα ὑψηλά, and κακόν, δόγματα ταπεινά).

Chap. VI. 1.] **Therefore** (on the connexion, see below) **leaving** (as behind, and done with; in order to go on to another thing. "Jubet omitti ejusmodi elementa, non quod eorum oblivisci unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est hærendum. Quod melius patet ex fundamenti similitudine quæ mox sequitur. Nam in exstruenda domo, nunquam a fundamento discodere oportet: in eo tamen jaciendo semper laborare ridiculum." Calvin) **the word of the beginning of Christ** (= ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ above, ch. v. 12: that word, or discourse, which has respect to the fundamental and elementary things mentioned below), **let us press on to maturity** (φέρομαι in this sense is not uncommon: see Lycurg. in reff.: Xen. Venat. 3. 10, ἄν ποθεν ἀκούσωσι κραυγῆς, καταλείπουσαι τὰ αὐτῶν ἔργα ἀπρονοήτως ἐπὶ τοῦτο φέρονται: Polyb. v. 26. 6, πᾶσιν ἄδηλος ἦν, ἐπὶ τί φέρεται, καὶ ἐπὶ ποίας ὑπάρχει γνώμης. Bleek cites on Valcknaer's authority φέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν: and in the Pythagorean school our very expression, φέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα, was current. A question of some difficulty has divided the Commentators here: whether this sentence be meant as expressing the resolution of the Writer, as we say, 'let us now proceed' to this or that,—or as conveying an exhortation to the readers. Each view has a formidable array of supporters. On the side of the former are Primasius, Erasmus, Luther, a-Lapide, Grot., Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, al., and Storr, Heinrichs, Abresch, Wahl, Bretschn., Kuinoel, Baumg. Crus., De Wette, Tholuck, Conybeare, al. The latter is adopted by Chrys., Thdrt., Phot., and Gennadius (in Œc.), Thl. (not decidedly), Calvin, Justiniani, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Lünemann, Hofm. (Schrb. i. 553). Owen tries (and so also Delitzsch) to comprehend both meanings: giving, however, the alternative very lucidly: "The Apostle either assumes the Hebrews unto himself, as to his work, or joins himself with them as to their duty. For if the words be taken the first way, they declare his resolution in teaching: if in the latter, their duty in learning." Between these two, both equally legitimate, the context must decide. And in seeking for elements of decision, I own that the alternative seems to me to have been put too exclusively. What I mean will be plain, when we consider on the one hand that θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι can hardly be properly said of any but a *teacher*: and on the other, that vv. 4 ff., ἀδύνατον γὰρ κ.τ.λ., must necessarily have a general reference of warning to the hearers. It seems to me that the fact may be best stated thus: The whole is a συγκατάβασις of the Writer to his readers: he with his work of teaching comes down to their level of learning, and regards that teaching and learning as all one work, going on together: himself and them as bound up in one progress. Thus best may we explain the expressions, which seem to oscillate alternately between writer and readers. And thus will διό retain all its proper meaning, which on the first hypothesis was obliged to be wrested: so Schlichting, its advocate, confesses, and joins διό to ch. v. 11. But now it will mean, 'Wherefore, seeing that we (you and I, by communication) are in so low a state, babes, instead of grown men, let us,' &c.): **not again laying the foundation** (θεμ. καταβάλλεσθαι is a phrase of common occurrence in later writers. Dion. Hal. iii.

βαλλόμενοι [o] μετανοίας [o] ἀπὸ [pq] νεκρῶν [q] ἔργων καὶ [r] πίστεως [rs] ἐπὶ θεόν, 2 [t] βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς [u] ἐπιθέσεώς τε

o here only. see Acts viii. 22. Jer. viii. 6.
p Rom. vii. 8. James ii. 17, 26.
q ch. ix. 14.
r here only. (ἐν, Gal. iii. 26. εἰς, Acts xx. 21. πρός, 1 Thess. i. 8. gen. obj., Mark xi. 22.)
s Acts xi. 17. xxi. 31. xvii. 19. Rom. iv. 5, 24.
t Mark vii. 4. [8.] ch. ix. 10. Col. ii. 12 only †.
u (N. T. always w. χειρῶν) Acts viii. 18. 1 Tim. iv. 14. 2 Tim. i. 6 only ‡. 2 Chron. xxv. 27.

2. διδαχην B, *doctrinam* D-lat.

69, Ταρκύνιος . . . . τούς τε θεμελίους (τοῦ νεῶ) κατεβάλετο: Porphyr. de Abstin. viii. 10, οἰκίας θεμέλια καταβάλλεσθαι: Galen, Rat. Medendi ix., χρὴ γὰρ οἶμαι τὰ θεμέλια τοῖς οἰκοδομήμασιν ἰσχυρὰ προκαταβεβλῆσθαι: Jos. Antt. xi. 4. 4, εὐθὺς τοὺς θεμελίους κατεβάλετο: ib. xv. 11. 3, ἀνελὼν δὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους θεμελίους, καὶ καταβαλόμενος ἑτέρους. Cf. 2 Macc. ii. 29, ἀρχιτέκτονι τῆς ὅλης καταβολῆς, and see examples also of βάλλεσθαι, in Bleek. It is a curious instance of the occasional singularity and perversity of Ebrard's exposition, that he insists here on καταβαλλόμενοι meaning "*pulling down*:" (which however, as Delitzsch remarks, partakes of the infirmity of all would-be original interpretations, falling under the proverb, "There is nothing new under the sun:" for the old Latin has "non iterum fundamenta *diruentes*.") Not to dwell on the entire inconsistency with the context, how can one be said καταβάλλεσθαι θεμέλιον, which is in the ground already?

The *subjects* to be supplied to καταβαλλόμενοι are the readers, with whom the Writer unites himself, as above explained) **of** (the genitives here indicate the materials of which the foundation consists. They are all matters belonging to the λόγος τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ: extending indeed in their influence over the whole Christian life, just as the shape of the foundation is that of the building: but to be laid down once for all and not afterwards repeated) **repentance from dead works, and faith on God** (so in the opening of the Gospel, Mark i. 15, μετανοεῖτε κ. πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: and in its progress, Acts xx. 21, διαμαρτυρόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν. These were the common conditions on which all mankind were invited to embrace the Gospel. And as the readers here were Jews, so would these words especially remind them of the form in which they were first invited by Christ's messengers. But we have to notice the qualifications which here follow each term—μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων—πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν. The νεκρὰ ἔργα are taken by all the patristic expositors to mean *sinful* works: so Chrys., τὰ ἡμαρτημένα: Thdrt., τὴν πονηρίαν: Thl., τουτέστι, τὴν ἀποταγὴν τῶν ἔργων τοῦ σατανᾶ: Primas., "Pœnitentiam ab operibus mortuis agere, est ipsa opera mala per pœnitentiam delere, quæ animum mortificabant: opera namque mortis sunt peccata." And so the great majority of modern Commentators also. And the justification of such an expression as νεκρὰ ἔργα for *sins* is variously given: as *causing death eternal*, Schlichting, J. Cappell., Limb., Peirce, Stuart, al.: as *polluting, like the touch of a dead body*, Chrys. (on ch. ix. 14, καλῶς εἶπεν, ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. εἴ τις γὰρ ἥψατο τότε νεκροῦ, ἐμιαίνετο· καὶ ἐνταῦθα εἴ τις ἅψαιτο νεκροῦ ἔργου, μολύνεται διὰ τῆς συνειδήσεως), Œc. (ibid.), Storr, al. But neither of these meanings is borne out: the former being contrary to usage, the latter far-fetched and unlikely. It is much better to take **νεκρός** in its common and obvious meaning; *dead, devoid of life* and power: cf. νεκρὰ πίστις, and νεκρὰ ἁμαρτία in the reff. St. Paul speaks, Eph. v. 11, in nearly the same sense: cf. τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἄκαρπα τοῦ σκότους. And Tholuck cites from Epict. Dissert. iii. 23, 29, νεκρὸς λόγος, in the sense of discourse without convincing power. But such dead or lifeless works again may be variously understood: either of the works of the flesh in the unconverted man, or of the Jewish works of the law which could not give life. Considering the readers and object of the Epistle, it is much more likely that the latter are here meant: those works by which they sought to set up a righteousness of their own, before they submitted themselves to God's righteousness. And so, nearly, Delitzsch, and Hofm. Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 166. The best explanation of **πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν** is found in St. Paul's language, Rom. iv. 5, τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. And by this, our expression is defined to mean, *full trust, rested on God, that He has fulfilled his promises in Christ*: so Wittich, cited in Bleek: "Fides evangelio adhibita, hæc fides dicitur ἐπὶ θεόν, quia dum evangelio creditur, creditur præstitisse Deum promissa facta patribus eaque in Christo implevisse." We may observe, that the genitives arrange themselves in groups of pairs, of which this is the first), 2.] **of the**

χειρῶν [vw] ἀναστάσεώς τε [w] νεκρῶν καὶ [x] κρίματος [y] αἰωνίου.

ABCDK LPא abcd fghkl mno 17. 47

v Heb., ch. xi. 35 bis only. w Matt. xxii. 31. Acts xvii. 32. xxiii. 6 al. x = Acts xxiv. 25. 1 Pet. iv. 17. Rev. xx. 4. y Mark iii. 29. ch. v. 9 reff.

om 2nd τε B D¹[-gr P]. for νεκρων, χειρων D¹[-gr].

doctrine of washings (not *baptisms*: *βάπτισμα* is generally the N. T. word for both Christian baptism and that of John. In reff., the word is used as here of washing, or lustration with water. On the meaning, see below. Our first question is, respecting the construction. The words are taken in two other ways besides that given above. 1. Some have taken *βαπτισμῶν* and *διδαχῆς* as two distinct genitives: so Chrys. (apparently, for he says, *εἰ γὰρ πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐβάπτισε καὶ ἄνωθεν κατήχησε, καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς βαπτισθέντες ἐδιδάσκοντο τὰ πρακτέα κ.τ.λ.*), an interp. given in Œc., . . . *λόγον· ποῖον δὴ τοῦτον; τὸν τῶν βαπτισμῶν καὶ διδαχῆς καὶ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν κ.τ.λ.*: and so Cajetan, Luther, Semler, Michaelis, al., and De Wette. But this seems very improbable. The rhythm of the sentence, which in all the other cases has *two* substantives in a clause, seems to forbid insulating the two words and forming a clause out of each: besides which, a double objection arises from the words themselves; that thus the plural *βαπτισμῶν* would not be accounted for, and that thus also *διδαχή* would have to bear a meaning which it is very doubtful if it can bear. 2. The two substantives being taken together, **διδαχῆς** is made the genitive dependent on **βαπτισμῶν**,—those baptisms which were accompanied with *διδαχή*, in distinction from those other washings, which were not so accompanied. This view is taken by Bengel ("*β. δ.* erant baptismi quos qui suscipiebant, doctrinæ sacræ Judæorum sese addicebant; itaque adjecto *διδαχῆς* distinguuntur a lotionibus cæteris leviticis"), Winer (making however the distinction between Christian and Jewish baptism, § 30. 3, Rem. 4, edn. 6), Michaelis, al. Still it cannot be denied that this would be a very strange expression, and that thus the plur. *βαπτισμῶν* would be more unaccountable than ever, seeing that it would apply to one kind of baptism only, viz. the Christian. As regards the plur. *βαπτισμῶν*, it has been very variously taken: by some as put for the singular, in which number the Syr. translates it: by Chrys. (to whom Calv. assents), as implying the repetition of baptism involved in the **πάλιν**,—*τί αὐτὸ πληθυντικῶς εἶπε; διὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν, μὴ πάλιν θεμ. καταβ. μετανοίας. εἰ γὰρ πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐβάπτισε, καὶ ἄνωθεν κατήχησε, καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς βαπτισθέντες ἐδιδάσκοντο τὰ πρακτέα, καὶ τὰ μὴ πρακτέα, διηνεκῶς ἔμελλον ἀδιόρθωτοι μένειν*: by Thl. and Œc. as pointing to a practice among the Hebrews of frequently repeating baptism (*ἴσως δὲ οὗτοι ὡς ἔτι τοῦ νόμου ἀντεχόμενοι πολλοὺς βαπτισμοὺς Ἰουδαϊκῶς καὶ ἐν τῇ χάριτι ἐπρέσβευον*, Thl.): by others, as referring to the threefold immersion in baptism: by Grot., al., "de duplice baptismo, interiore et exteriore:" by Thdrt. of the plurality of the recipients, *ἐπειδὴ πολλοὶ τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀπολαύουσι χάριτος*: so Primas., Beza, Erasm. Schmid. But none of these seem to reach the point so well as that given above, which includes in the idea those various washings which were under the law, the baptism of John and even Christian baptism also perhaps included, the nature of which, and their distinctions from one another, would naturally be one of the fundamental and primary objects of teaching to Hebrew converts. This meaning, which is that of Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Schöttg., Wolf, al., and Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, Tholuck, al., is strongly combated by Lünemann, and the insecurity of the consideration arising from the different form of *βαπτισμός* and *-μα* is urged on the ground that the Writer never uses *βάπτισμα*: but against this we may fairly allege that he *does use βαπτισμός* again (ch. ix. 10), and in the ordinary sense of Jewish washings, not in that of Christian baptism. When it is objected to the view (as e. g. by Stuart) that the doctrine of Jewish washings would have had nothing to do with the elements of Christian teaching, we may fairly say that such objection is brought in mere thoughtlessness. The converts being Jews, their first and most obviously elementary instruction would be, the teaching them the typical significance of their own ceremonial law in its Christian fulfilment. It is obvious from what has been above said, that we must not, as Erasm., Calv., Beza, Schlichting, al., understand "the teaching given as *introductory to baptism*:" Calvin identifying it with the other genitive terms of the sentence: "Quæ enim baptismatis est doctrina, nisi quam hic recenset de fide in Deum, de pœnitentia et de judicio, ac similibus?") **and of laying on of hands** (first, it is almost necessary, on account of the transposed place of *βαπτισμῶν*, and the coupling by *τε*, to understand *ἐπιθέσεώς τε* as gen. after *διδαχῆς*, and not after *θεμέλιον* (of the succeeding genitives, see

[3] *καὶ τοῦτο * ποιήσομεν* [a] *ἐάνπερ* [a] *ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ θεός.* [4] [b] *ἀδύ-*

a = 1 Cor. xvi. 7. Xen. Cyr. i. 1. 2. v. 5. 9. — z ch. iii. (6 v. r.) 14 only. — b ver. 18. ch. x. 4. xi. 6.

3. * *ποιήσωμεν* ACD[P 47] arm Chr-ms [Euthal-ms] Thdrt$_2$ Damasc: *ποιησομεν* BKLℵ rel latt Chr-montf$_1$ [Thl] Ambr$_1$.

below). And thus the doctrine of laying on of hands, like that of washings, not being confined to any one special rite, will mean, the reference and import of all that imposition of hands which was practised under the law, and found in some cases its continuance under the gospel. By laying on of hands, the sick were healed, Mark xvi. 18: Acts ix. 12, 17; xxviii. 8: cf. 2 Kings v. 11: Matt. ix. 18 al.; officers and teachers of the Church were admitted to their calling, Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22: Num. viii. 10; xxvii. 18, 23: Deut. xxxiv. 9; converts were fully admitted into the Christian Church after baptism, Acts viii. 17; xix. 6: 2 Tim. i. 6. And there can be little doubt that it is mainly to this last that the attention of the readers is here called, as the Writer is speaking of the beginning of Christian teaching: so Chrys., *οὕτω γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάμβανον*: and Thdrt., *διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς χειρὸς ὑποδέχονται τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος*. Some have thought that the principal reference is to the laying of hands on the scapegoat as a type of our Lord's taking our sins upon Him: but this is unlikely) **and of resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment** (these words, as well as the foregoing clause, depend on *διδαχῆς*. This would be evident, were it merely for the sense, seeing that it is not the facts themselves of the resurrection and the judgment which would be laid as the foundation of the *τοῦ χριστοῦ λόγος*, but the *doctrine* of these, that apprehension and recognition of them consequent on their being *taught*, as *διδαχή* implies. And then notice, that these also were points of Jewish doctrine, confirmed and brought into clearer light by the Gospel. Some, as Est., Schlicht., Schöttg., Michaelis, Storr, al., have supposed *ἀναστ. νεκρῶν* to refer only to the righteous, as in John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54,—*κρίματος αἰωνίου* only to the wicked. But it is more probable, in a passage of such very general reference, that the Writer speaks generally, without any such distinction here in view, of the two doctrines: of the *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς* and the *ἀνάστασις κρίσεως* of John v. 29. And it is probable that he uses *κρίματος* in the same indefinite meaning. Cf. ref. Acts. *κρῖμα*, properly the *result* of *κρίσις*, gradually became in later Greek, as other substantives in *-μα*, confounded with the *process* in *-σις*, and the two used convertibly. Our Writer has both: cf. ch. x. 27. *αἰωνίου*, probably as part of the proceedings of eternity, and thus bearing the character and stamp of eternal: or perhaps as Thl., *τουτέστι, τῆς κρίσεως τῆς αἰώνια διδούσης ἢ ἀγαθὰ ἢ κολάσεις*. So Erasm. (par.) and many others). **3.] And this** (viz. *ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φέρεσθαι*, see below) **we will do** (on the reading, see digest. *ποιήσομεν* has been variously interpreted. Schlichting, Grot., Wetst., and several others, who suppose (see above) that *φερώμεθα* expresses the determination of the Writer, take it as referring to the participial clause *μὴ πάλ. θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι*, and as meaning, "*even* (*καί*) *this* (*τὸ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβάλλεσθαι*) *we will do*." But surely this is impossible: first, we have to refer *τοῦτο* to a dependent clause, not to the whole sentence going before: and even if this could be got over, the *μή* attached to *καταβαλλόμενοι* is put aside, and the clause taken as if it were a positive one. Besides which, no convenient sense would be yielded by such a reference. For having asserted on this hypothesis that even the relaying of the foundation should be done, if God will, he goes on to say *ἀδύνατον γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*, which would in no way (see below) fit in to the context. This being so, others, still regarding *φερώμεθα* as the first, refer the future *ποιήσομεν* to the *φερώμεθα*. So Primasius, "Et hoc faciemus, i. e. et ad majora nos ducemus, et de his omnibus quæ enumeravimus plenissime docebimus nos, ut non sit iterum necesse ex toto et a capite ponere fundamentum:" and Thl., *τοῦτο ποιήσομεν. ποῖον; τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φέρεσθαι*. And doubtless so a very good sense is given. In favour of *ποιήσωμεν*, it may be said, that it corresponds better with the hortatory tone of *φερώμεθα*, and though the less obvious reading, is more in accordance with the style of the Epistle) **if, that is** (the force of *περ* in composition is to give thoroughness and universal reference to the particle to which it is attached: *ἐάν*, &c.: *ἐάνπερ*, 'si omnino:' so Hom. Il. ψ. 97, *μίνυνθά περ ἀμφιβαλόντε ἀλλήλους*, "brevi omnino amplexu fruentes." See this well worked out, and its relation to *περί*, *πέρας*, &c. established, in Hartung's chapter on the particle, Partikellehre i. 327—344. The effect of this meaning in hypothetical sentences like the present, is to assume the hypothesis as altogether requisite to the previous position: so Soph. Œd. C. 999, *εἴπερ ζῆν*

c ch. ix. 7, 26, 27, 28. x. 2. xii. 26, 27. νατον γὰρ τοὺς [c] ἅπαξ [d] φωτισθέντας [e] γευσαμένους τε τῆς ABCDK LPℵ abcd fghkl mno 17. 47

2 Cor. xi. 25. Phil. iv. 16. 1 Thess. ii. 18. 1 Pet. iii. 18, 20. Jude 3, 5 only. Ps. lxxxviii. 35. d = John i. 9. Eph. i. 18. iii. 9. ch. x. 32. Judg. xiii. 8, and 23 A. Ald. compl. 4 Kings xii. 2 al. e ch. ii. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 3. Ps. xxxiii. 8. ἐγεύσατο ἀρχῆς, Herod. iv. 147. ἐλευθερίης γευσάμενοι, ib. vi. 5.

φιλεῖς, "if, that is, thou lovest life:" Æsch. Ag. 28, εἴπερ Ἰλίου πόλις ἑάλωκεν, ὡς ὁ φρυκτὸς ἀγγέλων πρέπει), God permit (Œc., τὸ ἐάνπερ οὐ πρὸς τοῦτο εἶπεν, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ πάντως ἐπιτρέποντος—ἐπιτρέπει γὰρ ἀεὶ ὁ θεὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ τέλεια—ἀλλ' ὡς ἔθος ἡμῖν λέγειν·—θεοῦ θέλοντος τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν. And Thl., better, ἅμα δὲ καὶ διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ἐντεῦθεν, τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἐκείνου ἐξαρτᾶν θελήσεως, καὶ μηδὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμολογουμένως καλῶν τῇ οἰκείᾳ θαρρεῖν κ. κρίσει κ. δυνάμει. It may here again be said, that the addition after the hortatory ποιήσωμεν is as delicate and beautiful, as it is frigid in the common acceptation after the indicative ποιήσομεν. For it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure, Phil. ii. 13. And it leads the way beautifully to what follows: 'If,' I say, 'God permit: for when men have once fallen away, it is a thing impossible,' &c.). 4.] **For** (depends on the whole foregoing sentence, including the reference to the divine permission: not as Whitby and De Wette, on μὴ πάλιν θεμ. καταβαλλόμενοι. The connexion is: we *must* go on, for if we go back, it will be to perdition—a thing which (ver. 9) we do not think of you, and therefore expect your advance) **it is impossible, in the case of** (these words I insert, not as belonging to the Greek construction, but as necessary in English, to prevent the entire inversion of the Greek order of the sentence) **those who have been** (or, *were:* but the English perfect here represents idiomatically the Greek aorist, ἅπαξ in this clause referring pointedly enough to the time when the event took place. And indeed where there is no such plain reference as in the subsequent clauses, *we* are in the habit of expressing priority more by the perfect, the Greeks by the aorist. And here it is quite necessary to take our English perfect: for our indefinite past, 'who were enlightened and tasted . . . and were made . . . and tasted . . .' would convey to the mere English reader the idea that all this took place at one and the same time, viz. baptism,—whereas the participles clearly indicate progressive steps of the spiritual life. These remarks do not apply to cases like that of Acts xix. 2 f., but only to those where an aorist participle indicates priority to some present action) **once** (for all: indicating that the process needs not, or admits not, repetition: cf. reff. **ἅπαξ** occurs eight times in our Epistle, which is oftener than in all the rest of the N. T.) **enlightened** (Bleek gives a good résumé of the usage and meanings of **φωτίζειν**. It is a word of later Greek, principally found in the N. T. and LXX (reff.). It occurs in Polyb. xxx. 8. 1, τῶν γραμμάτων ἑαλωκότων κ. πεφωτισμένων, "taken and brought to light:" xxiii. 3. 10, ἐφώτισε τὴν ἑκατέρων αἵρεσιν: Arrian, Epict. i. 4, τῷ . . τὴν ἀλήθειαν . . . φωτίσαντι καὶ εἰς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους ἐξενέγκαντι: Diog. Laert. i. 57, μᾶλλον οὖν Σόλων Ὅμηρον ἐφώτισεν ἢ Πεισίστρατος. In all these places the sense is to *bring to light*, or *cast light upon*. The other meaning, to *enlighten*, applied to a person, is purely Hellenistic. So in ref. Judg., φωτισάτω ἡμᾶς, τί ποιήσωμεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ τῷ τικτομένῳ. And the LXX usage is generally simply *to teach*, *to instruct:* so in ref. 4 Kings, and ib. xvii. 27, φωτιοῦσιν αὐτοὺς τὸ κρῖμα τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς γῆς. Here it implies, *taught, by the preaching of the word of God.* An historic interest belongs to the occurrence of this word here, as having in all probability given rise to a meaning of φωτίζειν and φωτισμός, as denoting *baptism*, which was current throughout the Church down to the Reformation. Justin Mart. Apol. i. 61, p. 80 says, καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λοῦτρον **φωτισμός**, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. Chrys. has two κατηχήσεις πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι, in the first of which (vol. ii. p. 228) he justifies the name **φώτισμα** for baptism by reference to the two places in this Epistle. Suicer (sub voce) gives a full account of this usage, from which it appears that the word never came simply and purely to signify outward baptism, but always included that illumination of the new birth which is the thing signified in the sacrament. So Ps.-Chrys., Hom. on John i. 1, vol. xii. p. 418, (οἱ αἱρετικοὶ) βάπτισμα ἔχουσιν, οὐ φώτισμα. καὶ βαπτίζονται μὲν σώματι, ψυχῇ δὲ οὐ φωτίζονται· ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ Σίμων ἐβαπτίσθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη· οὕτω καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀκολούθως εὑρίσκονται. The Syr. here translates, "qui semel ad baptismum descenderunt." And so all the ancient Commentators here, and some of the moderns, as Justiniani, Estius, a-Lapide, Calmet, Hammond, Pyle, Ernesti. Erasmus seems the first who interpreted the word aright ("qui semel reliquerint tenebras vitæ prioris, illuminati per doctrinam evangelicam"), and

[f] δωρεᾶς τῆς [g] ἐπουρανίου καὶ [h] μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου [5] καὶ [i] καλὸν [j] γευσαμένους θεοῦ [ik] ῥῆμα [l] δυ-

f John iv. 10. Acts viii. 20. 2 Cor. ix. 15 al. Wisd. xvi. 25.
g ch. iii. 1 reff. h ch. iii. 14 reff. i Josh. xxi. 43. (xxiii. 15.) Zech. i. 13. j w. acc., John ii. 9. Job xii. 11. 1 Kings xiv. 29 al. k Rom. x. 17. Eph. v. 26. vi. 17. ch. xi. 3. l = ch. ii. 4 reff.

4. γεννηθεντας A f k m o. (simly elsw.)

almost all since have followed him), **and** (on the coupling by τε see below) **have tasted** (personally and consciously partaken of: see reff. 1 Pet. and Ps.: and on the general expression γεύεσθαί τινος, note on ch. ii. 9) **of the heavenly gift** (what is more especially meant? It is very variously given: Chrys. (τουτέστι, τῆς ἀφέσεως), Œc. (τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῆς ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι), *remission of sins:* and so Thl., Faber Stap., Erasm. (par.) ("jamque per baptismum condonatis peccatis"), Hammond, De Wette, al.: Schlichting ("animi cum pax et tranquillitas quæ oritur ex notitia plenissimæ remissionis omnium peccatorum, tum liquidissimum illud gaudium et spes immortalis vitæ"), Grot. ("id est, pacem conscientiæ"), Justiniani, *joy and peace in believing:* Primas., Estius (only as "probabilitatem habens"), Michaelis, *the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper:* Owen, Calmet, Ernesti, *the Holy Spirit and His gifts:* Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, and many more, *Christ Himself:* Kuinoel, Heinrichs, al., *the religion of Christ,—the gospel:* Pareus, *faith:* Klee, *regeneration* in general as distinguished from the special gifts of the Spirit in Baptism: Bleek and Tholuck, on account of the close coupling by τε to what has preceded, the φῶς itself conveyed in the φωτισμός. But I would rather, considering the emphatic position of γευσαμένους, take, as indeed do Lünemann and Ebrard virtually (and Delitzsch, referring to 2 Cor. ix. 15), **δωρεά** to have a perfectly general reference, q. d. 'that which was bestowed on them thereby.' This heavenly gift the persons supposed have *tasted for themselves.* The τε, in the style of this Epistle and St. Luke in the Acts, cannot be pressed so securely as in ordinary Greek and in the rest of the N. T.: and indeed on this last rendering is fully justified) **and have been made** (see note on ch. iv. 3, for a discussion of the passive sense of ἐγενήθην: which, however true here, must not be too much pressed, so as to emphasize the participle: see below) **partakers** (see on ref.) **of the Holy Spirit** (outwardly, the agency would be the laying on of hands after baptism: but obviously the emphatic word is **μετόχους**—have become *real sharers*—εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ποτισθέντες: so that the proper agent is He who only can bestow this participation, viz. God), 5.] **and have tasted** (see above: **γευσ.** is not emphatic here, as before, but having once borne its emphatic *meaning,* carries it again, in its repetition. On the government, see below) **the good word of God and the powers of the world to come** (Bengel, al. wish to establish a distinction here between the senses of the accus. and gen. government by γεύεσθαι. "Alter partem denotat: nam gustum Christi, doni cœlestis, non exhaurimus in hac vita: alter plus dicit, quatenus verbi Dei prædicati gustus totus ad hanc vitam pertinet, quanquam eidem verbo futuri virtutes sæculi annectuntur." But thus even Bengel's own account of the distinction halts on one foot; and moreover the distinction itself is untenable, witness ὡς δὲ ἐγεύσατο τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγενημένον, ref. John: this being merely as it would appear a Hellenistic impropriety, not found in good Greek. (Another distinction is made by Delitzsch, h. l., from Kühner, § 526, Anm. 3, al.; that words of bodily partaking take a gen. in a partitive sense, but an acc. where the object partaken is either considered as a whole, or is designated materially, or as an accustomed means of nourishment. But this also fails in the above instance, however true in general.) Here, as Bleek, after Böhme, suggests, the acc. perhaps was adopted to avoid the ambiguity which would have arisen, in καλοῦ γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥήματος, as to whether καλοῦ agreed with θεοῦ or with ῥήματος. But now, *what are the things spoken of?* What is **καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα**? The epithet is frequently applied to the word of God: see reff.: and usually with reference to its quickening, comforting, strengthening power, as sent or spoken by God to men. And in consequence it has been taken here to signify the comforting portion of the gospel, its promises: so Thdrt., τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν: Est., Schlicht., Grot., Kuinoel, Thol., and many others. Others understand it more generally, as Chrys. (τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐνταῦθα λέγει), Thl. (περὶ πάσης πνευματικῆς διδασκαλίας τοῦτό φησι), Œc. (τὴν περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ διδασκαλίαν), Primas., Faber Stapul., Corn. a-Lap., Bengel, al. This latter, or that modification of it which understands by ῥῆμα θεοῦ the wholesome and soul-preserving utterance of God in the gospel,

m Matt. xii. 32. Eph. i. 21 only. Isa. ix. 6 Aℵ[3a]. see ch. ii. 5. n here only. = Ezek. xiv. 13. xv. 8. xviii. 24. xx. 27, all with παράπτωμα; constr., ib. xxii. 4. Wisd. vi. 9. xii. 2.

νάμεις τε [m] μέλλοντος [m] αἰῶνος, [6] καὶ [n] παραπεσόντας, ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

5. for δυναμ. τε μ. αιωνος, *occidente jam ævo* Tert(readg as some conjecture δύναι ἔτι μέλλοντος αἰῶνος or δύναντος αἰῶνος).
6. παραπεσοντος (*mechanical repetn*) D[1][-gr].

seems to me better than the meaning taken by Bleek, who thinks ῥῆμα to be a personified attribute of God, as λόγος τοῦ θ. ch. iv. 12, and the gospel, with its comforting message, an emanation from it, on which the soul feeds. Certainly the passage which he cites from Philo is much to the point: ζητήσαντες καὶ τί τὸ τρέφον ἐστὶ τὴν ψυχὴν . . . εὗρον μαθόντες ῥῆμα θεοῦ καὶ λόγον θεοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ πᾶσαι παιδεῖαι καὶ σοφίαι ῥέουσιν ἀέννασι, De Profug. § 25, vol. i. p. 566, said of the Israelites in the wilderness. See also Allegor. iii. § 60 f. p. 121 f., where the manna is said to be designated by the ῥῆμα θεοῦ and λόγος θεοῦ, with reference to Exod. xvi. 16, and to Deut. viii. 3. It certainly is not improbable that in using the expression **τὸ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα**, the Writer may have had in view this latter text, ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος: but the supposed personification does not seem to suit the context.

Then it is a far more debated question, what is meant by **δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος**. Some have said, those *powerful foretastes of glory* which belong indeed to the future state in their fulness, but are vouchsafed to believers here: so Schlichting, interpreting γεύσασθαι of this foretaste; so Primas., Seb. Schmidt, al. But most Commentators, and rightly, take αἰὼν μέλλων as equivalent to οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα ch. ii. 5 (where see note), and as designating the Christian times, agreeably to that name of Christ in ref. Isa., πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Then the δυνάμεις of this 'world to come' will be as in ch. ii. 4, where we have ποικίλαι δυνάμεις enumerated with σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν and πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς, as God's testimonies to the gospel. Thus they would mean the χαρίσματα, given by the Spirit in measure to all who believed, "distributing severally to every man as He will." We need not necessarily limit these to external miraculous powers, or even προφητεία and the like: but surely may include in them spiritual powers bestowed in virtue of the indwelling Spirit to arm the Christian for his conflict with sin, the world, and the devil.

The ancients were very uncertain in their exegesis of the words: Chrys., τίνας λέγει δυνάμεις; ἢ τὸ θαύματα ἐπιτελεῖν, ἢ τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος. And some way on, he says, εἰπὼν δὲ Καλ. γευσ. θεοῦ ῥ. δυνάμ. τε αἰῶνος μέλλ., οὐκ ἀποκαλύπτει αὐτό, ἀλλ' αἰνίττεται, καὶ μονονουχὶ ταῦτα λέγει· ὅτι τὸ ζῆν ὡς ἀγγέλους, τὸ μηδενὸς δεῖσθαι τῶν ἐνταῦθα, τὸ εἰδέναι ὅτι τῆς τῶν μελλόντων αἰώνων ἀπολαύσεως πρόξενος ἡμῖν ἡ υἱοθεσία γίνεται, τὸ εἰς τὰ ἄδυτα ἐκεῖνα εἰσελθεῖν προσδοκᾶν, διὰ τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστι ταῦτα μαθεῖν. τί ἐστι, δυνάμεις τε τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος; ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος, ἡ ἀγγελικὴ διαγωγή. τούτων ἤδη τὸν ἀρραβῶνα ἐλάβομεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. Thdrt., δυνάμεις δὲ μ. αἰ. τὸ βάπτισμα προσηγόρευσε κ. τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος· διὰ τούτων γὰρ δυνατὸν τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων τυχεῖν ἀγαθῶν. Photius, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἃ δύναται ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν ἐκμαθόντας, by catechesis, for so he interprets γευσαμένους),

6.] **and have fallen away** (the classical usage of παραπίπτω is very different, as will be seen from the following examples: Herod. viii. 87, κατὰ τύχην παραπεσοῦσα νηῦς, i. e. impinging, coming into collision: Plato, Phileb. p. 14 c, τὸν νῦν δὲ παραπεσόντα (λόγον), "eum sermonem qui nobis se obtulit:" Legg. iii. p. 686, ἔδοξέ μοι θαυμαστὸν κτῆμα παραπεσεῖν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, "Græcis accidisse." We first find trace of our present meaning in Xenophon, Hell. i. 6. 4, διαθροούντων . . . ὅτι Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέγιστα παραπίπτοιεν ἐν τῷ διαλλάττειν τοὺς ναυάρχους κ.τ.λ. Polyb. uses it frequently in this sense, but commonly with a gen. of that from which: so iii. 54. 5, πᾶν τὸ παραπεσὸν τῆς ὁδοῦ: xii. 7. 2, παραπίπτειν τῆς ἀληθείας: viii. 13. 8, τοῦ καθήκοντος: and xviii. 19. 6 absolutely, τοῖς ὅλοις πράγμασιν ἀγνοεῖν ἔφη καὶ παραπίπτειν αὐτόν. In the LXX it occurs often (reff.) in the ethical sense, and the cognate noun παράπτωμα often in the N. T. It is used here, as ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν, ch. x. 26, and ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, ch. iii. 12,—see also ch. x. 29, and παραρυῶμεν ch. ii. 1,—as pointing out the sin of apostasy from Christ: and the case supposed is very similar to that of the Galatians, to whom St. Paul says, κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ [τοῦ] χριστοῦ οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε, Gal. v. 4; and ib. iii. 3, ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε; The fear was (see Prolegg. § iv. 1) lest these Hebrew converts should cast away their

πάλιν [o] ἀνακαινίζειν [p] εἰς μετάνοιαν, [q] ἀνασταυροῦντας

o here only. Ps. cii. 5. ciii. 30 al. τῆς ἔχθρας . . . . πάλιν ἀνακεκαινισμένης, Isocr. Areop. 3, al. in Bleek. (Paul, ἀνακαινόω, 2 Cor. iv. 16. Col. iii. 10. -νωσις, Rom. xii. 2. Tit. iii. 5.) p = Eph. ii. 22. q here only †. = (see note).

confidence in Christ, and take up again that system of types and shadows which He came to fulfil and abrogate: and nearly connected with this peril was their small progress in the doctrine of Christ. While speaking therefore of that, and exhorting them to be advancing towards maturity, he puts in this solemn caution against the fearful result to which their backwardness might lead), **again** (**πάλιν** does not belong to *παραπεσόντας*, but to *ἀνακαινίζειν*: the usual place of *πάλιν*, and the unvarying place in this Epistle, being before the verb to which it belongs) **to renew** (them) **to repentance** (there is no pleonasm, as Grotius thought, in *πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν*. For the **ἀνακαινίζειν** would be the regenerating in any case, and the **πάλιν** *ἀνακ.*, the renewal of it. Even in the first case, man *ἀνακαινίζεται*: in the second case, **πάλιν** *ἀνακαινίζεται*. As to the word, it is found, after Isocr. as in reff., in Appian, Lucian, Josephus (Antt. ix. 8. 2, *βασιλέα Ἰώασον ὁρμή τις ἔλαβε τὸν ναὸν ἀνακαινίσαι τοῦ θεοῦ*), Philo (Legat. ad Cai. § 11, vol. ii. p. 558, *ἀνισότητα, τὴν ἀδικίας ἀρχήν, ἀνεκαίνισεν ἰσότητι, ἥτις ἐστὶ πηγὴ δικαιοσύνης*), and freq. in LXX. Observe St. Paul's usage in reff. The usage of the word, as Bleek remarks, is without reference to any previous existence of the state into which the renewal takes place: e. g. we cannot say here that the perfect state of man before the fall was in the Writer's mind. The verb is active, and implies a subject. This by some is made to be the foregoing accusatives, and *ἑαυτούς* is supplied after *ἀνακαινίζειν*: so Origen cites it (in Joann. tom. xx. 12, vol. iv. p. 322, *ἀνακαινίζειν ἑαυτόν* in some mss., *ἀνακαινισμὸν ποιεῖν ἑαυτῶν* in others): so vulg. ("*renovari*"), and Erasmus, Vatabl., al. But it is far better, as in the translation, and usually, to make the subject indefinite: "it is impossible to" &c. "Instead of **εἰς μετάνοιαν**, one would expect *ἐν μετανοίᾳ* or *διὰ μετανοίας*, inasmuch as *ἀνακαινίζεσθαι* in full measure can only be brought about by *μετάνοια*, and must therefore be preceded by it. But on the other side, *μετάνοια* itself, the change of disposition, may be considered as the result of the renewal of the man having taken place: and so it is here: to renew to *μετάνοια*, i. e. so to form anew, that entire change of disposition precedes." Bleek. On the very general ancient reference of this to renewal of baptism, see below. It is really marvellous, that such a note as this of Dr. Burton's could have been written in England in the present century: "*ἀνακαινίζειν, once more to make them new creatures by baptism, εἰς μετάνοιαν, upon their repentance.* Even if they repent, there is no power to readmit them by baptism"), **crucifying as they do** ("*seeing they crucify*" as E. V. well. The ratiocinative force is given by the omission of the article before the participle, as the demonstrative would be by its insertion. Some ancient Commentators, especially those who refer the foregoing clause to the repetition of baptism, join these participles closely to the verb *ἀνακαινίζειν*, as epexegetical of it; as indicating, that is, what such a *πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετ.* would be: that it would amount to a new crucifying and putting to shame the Son of God: and they refer to St. Paul's declaration, that in baptism is symbolized the crucifixion of the old man with Christ (Rom. vi. 3 ff.), and understand it thus, that if baptism be repeated, Christ also would appear to be crucified anew. So Chrys., Thdrt., Eulogius (Phot. Bibl. 280, ed. Bekk. p. 538 a), Phot. (in Œc.), Œc. (*ὁ τοίνυν, φησίν, οἰόμενος εἶναι δεύτερον βάπτισμα, ὅσον τὸ κατ' αὐτόν, ἄνωθεν σταυροῖ τὸν κύριον. τί γὰρ ἕτερον ποιεῖ ὁ δεύτερον αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος συσταυροῦσθαι νομίζων, ἢ ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸν ἡγεῖται δεύτερον ἐσταυρῶσθαι, δι' ὧν ποιεῖ; τὸ δὲ δεύτερον σταυροῦν, φησί, τὸν χριστόν, τὸ ὅσον ἧκεν εἰς αὐτόν, οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν ἢ παραδειγματίσαι αὐτὸν καὶ καταισχῦναι. ἅπαξ γὰρ σταυρωθείς, ἀθάνατός ἐστι λοιπόν. ὁ δὲ ἀνασταυρῶν, ψεῦδος τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ὅπερ αἰσχύνην αὐτῷ φέρει ὡς ψευσαμένῳ τὸ ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν μόνον*), Schol. Matthiæ, Thl., and similarly Faber Stapulensis, Erasm. (par.), Clarius. And so Calvin takes the connexion, even though he does not understand the foregoing of the repetition of baptism: that it is impossible that they should again be renewed to repentance, and their fall from Christ be forgiven them, for that thus God would be again crucifying His Son and putting Him to shame. This Beza also mentions as an alternative (giving it indeed his approval, "quam sententiam si amplectamur, uti sane probabilis et commoda mihi videtur, tum pro 'ut qui rursum crucifigant,' scribendum erit, 'rursum crucifigendo, et ad ignominiam exponendo'"). "But besides that which Seb. Schmidt adduces against the Greek Commentators, that they

r dat., = Gal. vi. 14. [r] ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [s] παραδειγματίζοντας. ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

s here and Matt. i. 19 v. r. only. Num. xxv. 4. Jer. xiii. 22. Ezek. xxviii. 17 only.

παραδειγματίζοντες D.

wrongly assume *Christ* to be crucified in baptism, whereas it is only our old man that is crucified,—the whole construction is, grammatically speaking, very unnatural; and only tolerable, if the men spoken of, whose renewal is said to be impossible, were not the object but the subject, if, that is, instead of ἀνακαινίζειν we had a passive, or it could be taken intransitively. And since this cannot be done, it is only possible, grammatically, to take the participles as a close specification of the foregoing object, an emphatic setting forth of the grievous offence of which they have become guilty by their apostasy, and on account of which it has become impossible to renew them again to repentance." Bleek) **afresh** (it has been questioned by Lambert Bos, Exercitt., whether **ἀνασταυροῦν** can bear this meaning. He, and others who have taken his view, adduce multitudes of instances of the use of the word in the simple sense of 'to crucify,' the ἀνά being merely '*up*,' as in ἀνακρεμάω, ἀναρτάω, ἀνασκολοπίζω, &c. So in Herod. vi. 30, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ σῶμα . . . . ἀνεσταύρωσαν, and thus in Thucyd., Xen., Polyb., also in Plato, Plut., Diod. Sic., Ælian, Herodian, Galen, Lucian, Josephus. But it has been well answered by Bleek, and others, 1. that ἀνά in composition is not unfrequently found with the double meaning of *again*, or *back*, and also *up*: as e. g. in ἀναβλέπω, which signifies both *to look up*, and to *recover sight*; so of ἀναβαίνω, ἀνάγω, ἀναδύομαι, ἀναθέω, ἀνατρέχω, ἀνακαθίζω, ἀνακομίζω, ἀναπέμπω, ἀναπλέω, &c.: 2. considering, α. that the classical writers never had any occasion for the idea of re-crucifying, and, β. that our Writer could have used the word, however to be rendered, with no other idea here, it is very probable that the reiterative force of ἀνά is the right one to be adopted: 3. the consensus of the Greek interpreters is of great weight, in a question simply affecting the meaning of a Greek compound. Chrys., ἄνωθεν πάλιν σταυροῦντας: Thdrt., Œc., ἄνωθεν, φησί, σταυροῦντας: Phot., ἐπὶ δευτέραν σταύρωσιν κ. δεύτερον πάθος καλοῦντας αὐτόν: Thl. and Schol. Matth., ἄνωθεν σταυροῦντας· ἅπαξ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη κ.τ.λ.: Syr., "denuo crucifigunt:" vulg., "*rursum crucifigentes*:" D-lat., "*recrucientes*:" Tert., "*refigentes cruci*." Jerome's testimony also is remarkable: "Pro *rursus crucifigentes* melius unum verbum compositum in Græco est ἀνασταυροῦντες, quod nos interpretari possumus *recrucifigentes*") **to themselves** (**ἑαυτοῖς** is not, as some of the Fathers, e. g. Œc., Thl., ὅσον τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς,—nor *by their means*, as Schulz: but is that kind of 'dativus commodi' which approaches very nearly to mere reference, though there never is, properly speaking, a dative of mere reference. So in ref. Gal., δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται κἀγὼ κόσμῳ. Christ was their possession by faith: this their possession they took, and recrucified to themselves: deprived themselves of all benefit from Him, just as did the unbelieving Jews who nailed Him to the tree. Vatablus's "*in suorum perniciem*," approved by Lünemann, is too strong. The 'dativus incommodi' is only in fact a fine irony on the 'dativus commodi,' and its edge must not be turned by too rough use. Bengel's characteristic antithesis, "ἑαυτοῖς, *sibi*, facit antitheton ad παραδειγματίζοντας, ostentantes," is in this case more fanciful than real) **the Son of God** (for solemnity, to shew the magnitude of the offence), **and putting (Him) to open shame** (so in ref. Matt.: in ref. Num., the word is used of the actual hanging up on a tree: "Take all the heads of the people, καὶ παραδειγμάτισον αὐτοὺς τῷ κυρίῳ κατέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου." See other examples in Bleek. Here the word continues the action of the former participle: they crucify Him anew, and as at his former crucifixion, put Him to shame before all: as Bleek strikingly says, they tear Him out of the recesses of their hearts where He had fixed his abode, and exhibit Him to the open scoffs and reproach of the world, as something powerless and common: cf. ch. x. 29, τὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας). It would be quite beyond the limits of mere annotation, to give any satisfactory analysis of the history of interpretation of this passage, and of the conflicts which have sprung up around it. Such accounts will be found admirably given in several of the Commentators, among whom I would especially mention Bleek and Tholuck; and for the English reader, Owen, who treats it at great length and very perspicuously. I will only mention the most notable points, and set down a few landmarks of the exegesis. 1. The passage was used by the Montanists and the Novatians, in ancient times, to justify the irrevocable exclusion from the Church, of those who had lapsed.

7 [t] γῆ γὰρ ἡ [t] πιοῦσα τὸν [u] ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλάκις

t Deut. xi. 11. ἡ γῆ πίνουσα τὸ ὕδωρ, Herod. iii. 117. so iv. 198. u gen., Mark iv. 26. Rev. iii. 10 al. fr.

7. αυτην B^2 213-9^2. rec πολλ. bef ερχομ. with ACKL rel vulg [arm] $Epiph_1$ [Chr_1 Euthal-ms Cyr_1 Thdrt Damasc $Orig\text{-}int_1$]: bef τον b: txt BD[P]ℵ m (syrr copt) Chr_1.

Tertullian, de Pudicitia, § 20, vol. ii. p. 1021, cites it as the testimony of Barnabas, and adds, "Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam mœcho et fornicatori secundam pœnitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat." See other testimonies in Bleek i. § 53, and h. l. But, 2. in the Catholic Church this view was ever resisted, and the Fathers found in the passage simply a prohibition against the repetition of baptism. So Athanasius expressly, Ep. 4, ad Serap. § 13, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 563, οὐκ ἐκκλεῖόν ἐστι τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων τὴν μετάνοιαν, ἀλλὰ δεικνύον, ἓν εἶναι τὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας βάπτισμα καὶ μὴ δεύτερον. And so all the ancients who have noticed the passage, and some of the moderns: see above on φωτίζω. 3. In later times, the great combat over our passage has been between the Calvinistic and the Arminian expositors. To favour their peculiar views of indefectibility, the former have endeavoured to weaken the force of the participial clauses as implying any real participation in the spiritual life. So Calvin himself ("Hoc (the elect only being truly regenerate) obstare nego quominus reprobos etiam gustu gratiæ suæ adspergat, irradiet eorum mentes aliquibus lucis suæ scintillis, afficiat eos bonitatis suæ sensu, verbumque suum utrumque animis eorum insculpat"), Beza ("Aliud est vere credere . . . aliud vero gustum aliquem habere . . ."): so Owen ("The persons here intended are not true and sincere believers: . . . . for, 1) in their full and large description there is no mention of faith or believing," &c.), and recently Tait, Exposition of Epistle to the Hebrews. But all this is clearly wrong, and contrary to the plainest sense of the terms here used. The Writer even heaps clause upon clause, to shew that no such shallow tasting, no "primoribus tantum labris gustasse" is intended: and the whole contextual argument is against the view, for it is the very fact of these persons having veritably entered the spiritual life, which makes it impossible to renew them afresh if they fall away. If they have never entered it, if they are unregenerate, what possible logic is it, or even common sense at all, to say, that their shallow taste and partial apprehension makes it impossible to renew them: what again to say, that it is impossible πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν persons in whose case no ἀνακαινισμός has ever taken place? If they have never believed, never been regenerated, how can it be more difficult to renew them to repentance, than the heathen, or any unconverted persons? One landmark of exegesis then must be, to hold fast the simple plain sense of the passage, and recognize the fact that the persons are truly the partakers of the spiritual life—regenerate by the Holy Spirit. *Elect* of course they are not, or they could not fall away, by the very force of the term: but this is one among many passages where in the Scripture, as ever from the teaching of the Church, we learn that '*elect*' and '*regenerate*' are not convertible terms. All elect are regenerate: but all regenerate are not elect. The regenerate may fall away, the elect never can. 4. Again, the word ἀδύνατον has been weakened down to "*difficile*" by the ancient Latin version in D, and thus explained by a-Lapide, Le Clerc, Limborch, Pyle, and many others. The readers of this commentary will not need reminding, that no such sense can be for a moment tolerated. And this is our second landmark of exegesis: *ἀδύνατον stands immoveable.* But let us see where, and how, it stands. It is the strongest possible case, which the Writer is putting. First there is *considerable advance in the spiritual life,* carefully and specifically indicated. Then there is *deliberate apostasy*: an enmity to Him whom they before loved, a going over to the ranks of His bitter enemies and revilers, and an exposing Him to shame in the sight of the world. Of such persons, such apostates from being such saints, the Writer simply says that it is impossible to bestow on them a fresh renewal to repentance. There remaineth *no more* sacrifice for sin than that one which they have gone through and rejected: they are in the state of crucifying the Son of God: the putting Him to shame is their enduring condition. How is it possible then to renew them to repentance? It is simply impossible, from the very nature of the case. The question is not, it seems to me, whether man's ministry or God's power is to be supplied as the agent, nor even whether the verb is active or passive: the impossibility lies merely within the limits of the hypothesis itself. Whether God, of His infinite mercy and almighty power, will ever, by judgments or the strong workings of His Spirit, reclaim the obdurate sinner, so that even

[v] ὑετόν, καὶ [w] τίκτουσα [x] βοτάνην [y] εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς — ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

v Acts xiv. 17. xxviii. 2. James v. 18. Rev. xi. 6 only. Job v. 10. w = here only. γῆς τῆς πάντα τικτούσης, Philo, Opif. Mund. § 45, vol. i. p. 31. ἡ γῆ . . . τίκτουσα ποίαν, Eur. Cyclop. 332. x here only. Exod. ix. 22, 25. x. 12, 15. y Luke ix. 62. xiv. 35 only. Ps. xxxi. 6. Sus. 15 [Theod.] only.

he may look on Him whom he has pierced, is, thank Him, a question which neither this, nor any other passage of Scripture, precludes us from entertaining. There is no barring here of God's grace, but just as I have observed above, an axiomatic preclusion by the very hypothesis itself, of a renewal to repentance of those who have passed through, and rejected for themselves, God's appointed means of renewal. 5. Another dispute over our passage has been, whether the *sin against the Holy Ghost* is in any way brought in here. Certainly we may say that the fall here spoken of cannot be identical with that sin: for as Bleek has well remarked, that sin may be predicated of persons altogether outside the Christian Church, as were those with reference to whom our Lord uttered His awful saying on it. It is true, the language used in the parallel place, ch. x. 29, does approach that sin, where he says, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας: but it is also clear that the impossibility here spoken of cannot depend on the fact of such sin having been committed, by the very construction of the participles, ἀνασταυροῦντας and παραδειγματίζοντας, which themselves render the reason for that impossibility. 7, 8.] *Illustration of the last position*, by a contrast between profitable and unprofitable land. For land which has drunk in ("γῆ, indefinite: ἡ πιοῦσα, defined as to the kind of γῆ meant. So Gal. ii. 20; iii. 21; iv. 27: Xen. Hell. i. 10. 1, ἀποτέμνεται χεὶρ ἡ δεξιά, 'a hand, namely, the right.'" Delitzsch) the rain frequently coming on it (so far, is the *subject* of both sides of the hypothesis: and not the word γῆ only. This is necessitated by the omission of the article at ἐκφέρουσα. The E. V., "But that which beareth thorns" &c., would require ἡ δὲ ἐκφέρουσα. Besides which, the E. V. has neglected the aorist part. here, in rendering, "*the earth which drinketh in*." The drinking in the rain is an act prior to both the hypotheses: the participles which convey the hypothesis itself being present.

The verb πίνειν is not uncommonly used of land receiving rain, both in LXX (ref.), and classical writers: as, besides Herod. in reff., Anacreon xix. 1, ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει: Virg. Ecl. iii. 111, "sat prata biberunt:" Georg. iv. 32. Here it implies not only that the earth has *received* the rain, but that it has *taken it in*, sucked it in, "being no impenetrable rocky soil, from which the rain runs off without sinking in. And thus it is an appropriate figure for men who have really taken into themselves the word of God, and experienced its power" (Bl.), and so furnishes an explanation of vv. 4, 5, as well as being explained by them. In the interpretation, ὑετός must not be too strictly confined to "teaching," as Chrys., Thl., Œc., but taken as widely as the participial clauses before extend, as importing all spiritual influences whatever. Notice ἐπ' αὐτῆς, not ἐπ' αὐτήν, as we should expect of the falling rain: the gen. being used to indicate that the rain lies and abides over it, not running off, nor merely falling towards, but covering, ready to be sucked in) and (καί serves, after the general clause, γῆ . . . ὑετόν, common to both alternatives, to introduce the first of them. We should more naturally expect τίκτουσα μέν to answer to ἐκφέρουσα δέ) brings forth (see reff. and Wetst.) plants (βοτάνη, from βόσκω, properly fodder, provender, for man or beast: generally used for grass, or corn, or any kind of green herb: so in reff. Bl. quotes from an Hexaplar transl. of Hab. iii. 17 (LXX, τὰ πεδία οὐ ποιήσει βρῶσιν), ἡ δὲ γῆ μὴ ἐκθάλῃ βοτάνην) fit (εὔθετος, a word peculiar to St. Luke elsewhere in N. T., is found in the later classics in this sense of 'aptus,' *convenient*. So Diod. Sic. ii. 57, πηγὰς . . . . εἰς λουτρὰ κ. κόπων ἀφαίρεσιν εὐθέτους: Dion. Hal. i. p. 10, χώρα εἰς νομὰς εὔθετος: Polyb. xxvi. 5. 6, πρὸς πᾶσαν σωματικὴν χρείαν . . . . . εὔθετος) for those (it is a question whether ἐκείνοις depends on εὔθετος or on τίκτουσα. It will be seen that in the instances above quoted εὔθετος is followed by εἰς or πρός and *not by a dative*. But the construction with a dative is not altogether unprecedented: e. g. besides Luke ix. 62, Nicolaus in Stob. Florileg. xiv. 7, οἶμαι δ' ἐμαυτὸν εὔθετον τῷ πράγματι, παῖδες, γεγονέναι: and the dative, whether after one or the other, is a dativus commodi, not equivalent, if taken after εὔθετον, to πρὸς ἐκείνους, but to πρὸς βρῶσιν ἐκείνοις. To the sense, it is quite indifferent which connexion we take. The sentence is perhaps better balanced by joining ἐκείνοις with τίκτουσα, τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον | ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται flowing more evenly than τίκτουσα βοτάνην | εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται. The absolute use of εὔθετον need make no difficulty: cf. ref. Ps., προσεύξεται πρός σε πᾶς ὅσιος ἐν καιρῷ

[z] *καὶ* [a] *γεωργεῖται,* [b] *μεταλαμβάνει* [c] *εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ·* 8 [d] *ἐκφέρουσα δὲ* [ef] *ἀκάνθας καὶ* [eg] *τριβόλους,* [h] *ἀδόκιμος καὶ* [i] *κατάρας* [j] *ἐγγύς, ἧς τὸ* [k] *τέλος* [l] *εἰς* [lm] *καῦσιν.* 9 [n] *Πεπείσ-*

z = ch. vii. 26. a here only. 1 Chron. xxvii. 26. Esdr. iv. 6. 1 Macc. xiv. 8 only. b ch. xii. 10. Acts ii. 46. xxiv. 25. xxvii. 33, 34. 2 Tim. ii. 6 only. LXX only in Apocr., Wisd. xviii. 9 & 2 Macc. iv. 21 al6. (-λημψις, 1 Tim. iv. 3.) c = ch. xii. 17. 1 Pet. iii. 9. Gen. xlix. 25. d = here (Mark viii. 23. Luke xv. 22. Acts v. 6, &c. 1 Tim. vi. 7) only. Gen. i. 12. Cant. ii. 13. Hagg. i. 11. e Matt. vii. 16 al. Gen. iii. 18. Hos. x. 8. f as above (e). Matt. xiii. 7 &c. ‖. xxvii. 29. Luke vi. 44. John xix. 2 only. g as above (e) and Prov. xxii. 5 (2 Kings xii. 31) only. h Rom. i. 28. 1 Cor. ix. 27. 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6, 7. 2 Tim. iii. 8. Tit. i. 16 only. Prov. xxv. 4. Isa. i. 22 only. i Gal. iii. 10, 13 bis. James iii. 10. 2 Pet. ii. 14 only. Gen. xxvii. 12, 13. j ch. viii. 13. *ἀμήχανον καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς,* Aristid. Orat. in Rom. 212 (Bleek). k = Rom. vi. 21. 2 Cor. xi. 15. Phil. iii. 19. 1 Pet. iv. 17. Wisd. iii. 9. see James v. 11. l Isa. xl. 16. xliv. 15. m here only. n Rom. xv. 14. plur., ch. v. 11 reff.

om *και* (bef *γεωργ.*) D¹ c d latt [Syr copt æth arm Orig-int₂]. om *του* D¹ d Damasc Thl.

εὐθέτῳ: Diod. Sic. v. 37, *κατασκευάζουσιν εὔθετον τὴν πρὸς τὰς ἐργασίας πραγματείαν*: also ref. Susan.), **on whose account** (the E. V. following the vulg. ("a quibus"), and Luther, Beza ("per quos"), Calv. ("quorum opera"), Erasm. (par.), al., render ungrammatically, "*by whom,*" *δι' ὧν* or *ὑφ' ὧν*. It is a curious sign of the scholarship of Owen's days, that he says, "*διά* with an accusative case is not unfrequently put for the genitive . . . . unquestionable instances of this may be given, and amongst them that of Demosth. Olynth. i. is eminent: *καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν τρόπον δι' ὃν μέγας γέγονεν ἀσθενὴς ὢν τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς Φίλιππος*:" as if this were not a strictly normal use of *διά* with the accusative. Tert. and the old Latin version in D, have it right, "*propter quos*:" and Œc. says, *γεωργεῖται δὲ δηλονότι εἰς σωτηρίαν κ. κέρδος αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν καρποφορούντων*. On the sense, see below) **also** (this *καί* is common in cases where some special reference of an already patent fact is adduced: so in ref., *τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεύς*: q. d. 'another consideration is' &c. Schlichting, al. have mistaken its sense, and regarded it as introducing *γεωργεῖται* as an additional particular over and above the *πιεῖν τὸν ὑετόν*: "Ait autem *et* colitur, ut ad imbrium irrigationem etiam terræ istius diligentem accedere culturam ostendat") **it is tilled** (*who are ἐκεῖνοι δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται,* in the interpretation? Thl. mentions two references: 1. to the men themselves: *καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἐκεῖνοι οἱ καρποφοροῦντες τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀπολαύσουσι ταύτης*: 2. to their teachers: *καὶ γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτοὺς γεωργεῖται ἡ ἀρίστη πολιτεία, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν μετεχόντων τῆς τῶν μαθητῶν ἀρετῆς*. But both these fall short of the mark: and there can be no doubt that if, as is probable, the features of the parable are to be traced in the interpretation, we must understand God as the owner of the land which is tilled, and the tillers are the teachers and preachers of the gospel. So 1 Cor. iii. 9, *θεοῦ γεώργιον . . . . ἐστε*), **partakes of** (the verb is often used without any necessary reference to *others also* being sharers: see reff.) **blessing** (Schlichting's remark is good: that the Writer has not so much the figure in mind, as the thing figured, viz. the men to whom, already having, more is given: and he refers to John xv. 2, *πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρον, καθαίρει αὐτὸ ἵνα καρπὸν πλείονα φέρῃ*) **from God** (*ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ* may be joined either with *εὐλογίας* or with *μεταλαμβάνει*. It is no objection to the former construction that it is not *τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*: the insertion of the art. would in fact encumber the sentence. And this is the connexion which seems to me the more probable; it has a share in *εὐλογία ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*. So also Delitzsch: Bleek and Lünemann support the other): **but if it bear** (Chrys., Œc., Thl., and some of the moderns, a-Lapide, Grot., al., have drawn a distinction between *ἐκφέρουσα* and *τίκτουσα*: *ὅρα πῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκανθῶν οὐκ εἶπε τίκτουσα ἀκάνθας, οὐδὲ χρησίμῳ τούτῳ ὀνόματι ἐχρήσατο, ἀλλὰ τί; ἐκφέρουσα ἀκάνθας, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις ἐκβράσσουσα, ἐκβάλλουσα*. But it has been observed by Elsner, Raphel, Wetst., al. that *ἐκφέρειν* is a general word for to bring forth fruit: e. g. Herod. i. 193, *ἔστι δὲ χωρέων αὕτη ἁπασέων μακρῷ ἀρίστη . . . . Δήμητρος καρπὸν ἐκφέρειν*. And see reff. LXX and other examples in Bleek and Wetst.) **thorns and thistles** (see reff.), **is accounted worthless** ('*reproba,*' '*rejectanea,*' tried and found wanting. It occurs in the N. T. elsewhere only in St. Paul, 7 times: see reff. Being thus rejected, it gets no share of God's blessing) **and nigh unto cursing** (see reff.: and compare Acts ix. 38; xxvii. 8, for the dative usage of *ἐγγύς*. There appears here to be an allusion to Gen. iii. 17, 18,—*ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου . . . . ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀνατελεῖ σοι*. Chrys. has noticed that in *ἐγγύς* there is a softening of the severity of the declaration: *βαβαί, πόσην ἔχει παραμυθίαν ὁ λόγος. κατάρας μὲν εἶπεν ἐγγύς, οὐ*

o Heb., here only. Paul, Rom. xii. 19, & fr. James (w. ἀδελφ.) i. 16, 19. ii. 5. 1 Pet. ii. 11 al7. 1 John ii. 7 al9. Jude 3, 17, 20.
p = ch. i. 4 reff.
q = here only. Ezek. i. 15, 19. ἀσεβείας ἐχόμενα, Ælian. Frag.(Elsner.) ἀρετῆς ἐχόμενα Philo de Agric. § 22, vol. i. p. 316. see Luke xiii. 33. Acts xiii. 44 al.

μεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, [o] ἀγαπητοί, τὰ [p] κρείσσονα καὶ [q] ἐχό-

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

9. for αγαπ., αδελφοι ℵ[1] [syrr]. rec κρειττονα, with D[1]K [rel]: txt ABCD[3]L [P]ℵ b f l n o 17 [47].

κατάρα· ὁ δὲ μηδέπω εἰς κατάραν ἐμπεσὼν ἀλλ᾽ ἐγγὺς γενόμενος καὶ μακρὰν γενέσθαι δυνήσεται), of which the end is unto burning. There is considerable doubt both as to the connexion, and as to the interpretation of the sense when obtained. To what does ἧς belong? to γῆς, or to κατάρας? The latter is taken by (not Erasm. (par.), as so cited by Bleek: for it runs, "exsecrationi divinæ: cujus exitus huc tendit, non ut demetatur, sed ut exuratur:" where the passives make it almost necessary to apply "cujus" not to the curse, but to the land), Camerarius, Bleek, al.: the end, result, of which curse is that it tends to burning. But it does not seem to me that this would have been thus expressed. κατάρας holds a very subordinate predicatory place: and it is hardly likely that it should be taken up again and made the subject of a relative: especially in the presence of such phrases as reff. 2 Cor., Phil., and 1 Pet., in all of which the gen. aft. τέλος is of the finished, not of the finishing. I would therefore, with Chrys. (δηλῶν ὅτι ἐὰν μέχρι τέλους οὕτως ἐπιμείνῃ, τούτῳ (τοῦτο?) πείσεται), Thl. (οὐκ εἶπεν ἣ κατακαυθήσεται, ἀλλ᾽ ἧς τὸ τέλ. εἰς κ., τουτέστιν, ἐὰν κ.τ.λ. as Chrys.), Luth., Bengel, and most Commentators (including Delitzsch), refer ἧς to γῆς. But then, with what view will this ultimate burning take place? Some have said, with a salutary end, as in Virg. Georg. i. 84—93 ("Sæpe etiam steriles incendere profuit agros, Atque levem stipulam crepitantibus urere flammis: Sive inde occultas vires et pabula terræ Pinguia concipiunt, sive illis omne per ignem Excoquitur vitium atque exsudat inutilis humor." See also Plin. H.N. xviii. 39 (72)). Strange to say, this meaning is adopted, not by Roman-Catholic Commentators, but by such as Schlichting, Stuart (apparently: "to have all its worthless productions consumed"), Dr. Bloomfield, al.: not seeing, except Schlichting, who attempts to repudiate it ("nam quod terra sterilis per incendium non corrumpatur sed corrigatur, hoc in similitudine hac non attenditur"), that the inevitable conclusion from such an acceptation would be, the existence of purgatorial fire. The reference clearly is, as the whole context and the words ἧς τέλος εἰς shew, not to purifying, but to consuming fire: as in ch. x. 26, 27, where the same ultimate fear is described as issuing in πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. So in Deut. xxix. 22, 23, the curse of the apostate land is described as consisting in "brimstone, and salt, and burning; that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth therein, like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah," &c. And this destruction by burning is quite according to N. T. analogy: e. g. John xv. 6: Matt. iii. 10, 12; vii. 19; xiii. 30, 40 ff.

εἰς καῦσιν is said by Kuin., Ebrard, al. to be a Hebraism for καῦσις. But this has been satisfactorily disproved by Winer, Gramm. § 29. 3 Remark. Chrys., continuing the same strain as above on κατάρας ἐγγύς, beautifully concludes, ὥστε, ἐὰν ἐκτέμωμεν κ. κατακαύσωμεν τὰς ἀκάνθας, δυνησόμεθα τῶν μυρίων ἀπολαῦσαι ἀγαθῶν, κ. γενέσθαι δόκιμοι, κ. εὐλογίας μετασχεῖν. And so Œc., Thl., Primas. The stronger Calvinistic interpreters regard ἐγγύς as betokening the *near approach* of the judgment; as in ἤγγικεν ἡ βασ. τῶν οὐρ.; and some refer the whole to the destruction of Jerusalem: so Bengel: "Strictura prophetica, per paucis annis ante *combustam* urbem Hierosolymorum. Perditissimi Judæorum erant, qui in urbe, et circum eam, fidei repugnabant."

9—20.] *Encouragement to perseverance: and first (9—12), from God's faithfulness:* see summary at ch. v. 11. καθαψάμενος τοίνυν αὐτῶν ἱκανῶς κ. φοβήσας κ. πλήξας, θεραπεύει πάλιν, ὥστε μὴ πλέον καταβαλεῖν, κ. ὑπτίους ἐργάσασθαι· τὸν γὰρ νωθρὸν ὁ πλήττων νωθρότερον ἐργάζεται. οὔτε οὖν πάντῃ κολακεύει ὥστε μὴ ἐπᾶραι, οὔτε πάντῃ πλήττει, ὥστε μὴ ὑπτιωτέρους ποιῆσαι· ἀλλ᾽ ὀλίγον ἐμβαλὼν τὸ πληκτικόν, πολὺ τὸ θεραπευτικὸν προσφέρει διὰ τῶν ἐπαγομένων, ὥστε ὃ βούλεται κατορθῶσαι. Chrys.

9.] But we are persuaded (stronger than πεποίθαμεν, which would express only a subjective confidence, whereas πεπείσμεθα gives the result of actual conviction by proof. Notice the almost verbal correspondence of ref. Rom.) concerning you, beloved ("Apposite eos sic vocat (see reff.) ne putarent eum aliquo ipsorum odio laborare, sed ut scirent eum amore Christiano erga ipsos flagrare: qui amor facit ut semper meliora ominemur iis quos amamus, et si quid severius dicimus, animo corrigendi, non nocendi cupido, dicamus." Schlichting), the things which

μενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτως λαλοῦμεν. [10] *οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς* [r] *ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ* [s] *ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης* [t] *ἧς* [u] *ἐνεδείξασθε* [v] *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,* [w] *διακονήσαντες*

r = Luke xii. 6. Ps. ix. 12, 18 al. fr. w. gen., ch. xiii. 2, 6 only. elsw., Matt. xvi. 5 || Mk. Phil. iii. 14. James i. 24 only. inf., as ch. v. 5 reff. s = 1 Thess. v. 13. 1 Pet. i. 17. Rev. xxii. 12. t attr., Matt. xxiv. 50. Mark vii. 13. Acts i. 1. ch. x. 1 al. fr. Gen. xxii. 2. Winer, § 24. 1. u = Rom. ix. 22 al. Heb. here (bis) only. elsw. Paul[9] only. Gen. l. 15, 17. v (see note.) Rom. v. 8. 2 Cor. ii. 4, 8 al. fr. w || Rom. xv. 25 al.†

10. rec ins *του κοπου* bef *της αγ.* (*gloss from* 1 *Thess* i. 3), with D[3]K[L] rel copt Chr$_2$ [Thdrt Damasc Œc] : om ABCD[1][P]ℵ 17(appy) [47 m[1]-marg] latt syrr [basm] æth arm Chr$_1$ [Euthal-ms] Antch$_1$ Thl Jer$_1$. for *ης*, *ην* B[2].

are better (the better course as regards your moral state: or, the better fate, as regards your ultimate end. So Chrys., drawing the same distinction, *ἤτοι περὶ πολιτείας* (*ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς τοιοῦτοι ἀκανθώδεις*, added by Thl.) *ἢ περὶ ἀντιδόσεως* (*ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ κατάρας ἐγγύς, οὔτε πρὸς καῦσιν, ἀλλά τις ἄλλη ἀντιμισθία ὑμῖν ἀπόκειται*, added by Thl.) *ταῦτά φησιν.* The latter is most probably the reference, seeing that what follows rests on God's ultimate faithfulness and justice in the day of retribution. The former is of course involved in it, as conditioning it.

The art. is used, because it is not merely 'better things,' of some sort, that he is persuaded, but, of two opposite courses, that one which is the more excellent), and (things) akin to salvation (the formula *ἔχεσθαί τινος*, 'to be next to,' 'bordering on,' has occasioned the participle *ἐχόμενος* to be used in the sense of *akin to, partaking of the nature of.* This use is frequent in Herodotus, e. g. v. 49, *τοῖσι οὔτε χρυσοῦ ἐχόμενόν ἐστιν οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀργύρου*: i. 120, *τὰ τῶν ὀνειράτων ἐχόμενα*: cf. also ii. 77; iii. 25, 66; viii. 142. So that Augustine's, Erasmus's, and Beza's rendering, "saluti adhærentia," is better than vulg., "viciniora saluti," or D-lat., "proximiora saluti." There may certainly be a reminiscence, in the expression, of *κατάρας ἐγγύς* above, as Schlichting, "saluti non maledictioni vicina:" but it seems hardly probable, for as Bleek remarks, had this been meant, the Writer would, considering his love for *παρονομασία*, have used some more cognate expression. On *σωτηρία*, in the highest sense, *eternal salvation*, see note, ch. i. 14), **if even we do thus speak** (*εἰ καί* differs from *καὶ εἰ*, in that the force of the *εἰ* extends over the whole of the addition or climax expressed by the *καί*, '*if even:*' whereas in *καὶ εἰ*, the hypothesis itself is included in the climax, '*even if.*' See Hartung, Partikellehre i. 139 f. The *present* enlarges the speaking, so that it refers not merely to what has just been said, but to a habit of thus speaking: *βέλτιον γὰρ ὑμᾶς ῥήμασι φοβῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀλγήσητε.* Chrys.).

10.] **For God is not unjust, (so as) to forget** (first, of the construction, *ἄδικος ἐπιλαθέσθαι*. Cf. *οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα*, ch. v. 5: it is epexegetic, and designates the act whereby or wherein the quality just predicated would be shewn. The aor. *ἐπιλαθέσθαι* must not be rendered "ut oblitus sit," "so that He should have forgotten," as Seb. Schmidt: neither can we say with Kühner, § 445. 2, that there are infinitives in which all relation of time is lost, and the aor. = the pres.: but the distinction seems to be as in other cases where aorists and presents appear to be convertibly put, that whenever the act is one admitting of being treated as a momentary one, or of being grasped as a whole, the *aor.* is used: when, on the other hand, habit, or endurance is indicated, the *present*. This is strikingly shewn in one of Kühner's own examples: Xen. Cyr. v. 1. 2, *καλέσας ὁ Κῦρος Ἀράσπην Μῆδον, τοῦτον ἐκέλευσε διαφυλάξαι αὐτῷ τήν τε γυναῖκα κ. τὴν σκηνήν*—here is the whole act: as we say '*to keep safe,*' and *αὐτῷ* binds the office as one solemn duty on Araspes; but below, ib. 3, we have, *ταύτην οὖν ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Κῦρος διαφυλάσσειν τὸν Ἀράσπην, ἕως ἂν αὐτὸς λάβῃ*, where by *ἕως ἄν*, the duration of time is introduced, and the habitual present rendered necessary. Here, the *whole forgetfulness* would be one act of oblivion, which the aor. expresses. There are many places in the O. T. where forgetfulness on the part of God is thus denied: cf. Ps. ix. 12, 18; x. 12: Amos viii. 7: or deprecated, cf. 1 Sam. i. 11: Ps. xiii. 1; xlii. 9; xliv. 24; lxxiv. 19, 23: Isa. xlix. 14 ff.: Lam. v. 20 al.) **your work** (i. e. your whole Christian life of active obedience: so *ἔργον* absolutely in the passage 1 Cor. iii. 13—15; so besides reff., in Gal. vi. 4, *τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος*. See this *work* somewhat specified in ch. x. 32—34. It is a general term, including the labours of love mentioned below) **and the love** (the expressions nearly resemble those in 1 Thess. i. 3, from which the *τοῦ κόπου* of the rec. seems to have come) **which ye shewed** (*ἐνδείκνυμαι* (see reff.) is used in classical

τοῖς ˣ ἁγίοις καὶ ʷ διακονοῦντες. ¹¹ ʸ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ʷ ἐνδείκνυσθαι ᶻ σπουδὴν ᵃ πρὸς τὴν ᵇ πληροφορίαν τῆς ᶜ ἐλπίδος ᵈ ἄχρι τέλους, ¹² ἵνα μὴ

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

x = Rom. xii. 13. 2 Cor. ix. 12. y = Matt. xiii. 17. Luke xv. 16 al. Gen. xxxi. 30. z = Rom. xii. 8, 11. 2 Cor. vii. 12 al. Ezra iv. 23. 2. 1 Thess. i. 5. ch. x. 22 only †. a = Acts iii. 10. ch. v. 14. ix. 13. b Col. ii. c ver. 18. ch. iii. 6. vii. 19. x. 23. d Rev. ii. 26. see ch. iii. 14 reff.

for διακονουντες, διακουοντες D¹; *et audimus* D-lat.

Greek in this same sense, of exhibiting a quality or attribute of character: Aristoph. Plut. 785, *ἐνδεικνύμενος εὔνοιαν*: Plut. Cicero, p. 877, *πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνύμενοι φιλοφροσύνην*. See more examples in Bleek: and note on Eph. ii. 7. Here, as there, the dynamic middle gives the personal reference: but not here, as there, conscious and predetermined) **towards His name** (*ἧς ἐνεδ. φησιν οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν θεόν· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ὡσεὶ ἔλεγε· διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ πάντα πεποιήκατε. ὁ τοίνυν τοσαύτης παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπολαύων σπουδῆς κ. ἀγάπης, οὐ καταφρονήσει ποτὲ ὑμῶν οὐδὲ ἐπιλήσεται.* Chrys. and similarly Œc. and Thl., Erasm., Calv., Luther, Justiniani, Seb. Schmidt, De W., al. And this seems better than with D-lat. and the vulg. ("*in nomine ejus* or *ipsius*"), and most Commentators, to suppose *εἰς τὸ ὄν. αὐτ.* a Hebraism for *ἐν*, or *ἐπί, τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτ.*: see Matt. x. 41, 42; xviii. 20. The **ἅγιοι** were those who were called by His name, so that beneficence towards them was in fact shewn towards His name. **αὐτοῦ** refers to God, as the antecedent expressed above: not to Christ, as Ernesti, Stuart (alt.), al.) **in having ministered** (probably, see ref. and 2 Cor. viii. 4, 19, 20; ix. 1: Acts xi. 29, if not exclusively, yet principally, in eleemosynary bestowals. It may hence perhaps be surmised that these Hebrews did not live in Judæa: see Prolegg. § ii. 15) **to the saints, and still ministering** (*ὅρα δὲ πῶς θεραπεύει αὐτούς· οὐ γὰρ εἶπε διακονήσαντες καὶ ἔστη, ἀλλὰ προσέθηκε καὶ διακονοῦντες, τουτέστι, καὶ ἔτι αὐτὸ ποιοῦντες.* Thl. There is a fine touch here of that delicate compliment, which is also characteristic of St. Paul. "Necdum hæc pietas in vobis cessavit, licet forte remiserit," as Schlichting: but the Writer leaves the defect to be understood and states the excellency at its utmost. On the Christian doctrine of reward, as declared in this passage, see note in Delitzsch, p. 242). **11.] But** (the *δέ* carries a slight reproof, contrasting your need of exhortation to constancy with your past and partially remaining present practice) **we earnestly desire** (*οὐκ εἶπε· θέλω, ὅπερ ἦν διδασκαλικῆς αὐθεντίας, ἀλλ' ὃ πατρικῆς ἦν φιλοστοργίας κ. πλέον τοῦ θέλειν, ἐπιθυμοῦμεθα· μονονουχὶ λέγων· σύγγνωτε κἂν φορτικόν τι φθεγξώμεθα.* Chrys.: and Thl., *οὐ γὰρ μέχρι ῥήματος τοῦτο βούλομαι, ἀλλ' ἡ ψυχή μου καίεται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*) **that every one of you** (*πολλὴ ἡ φιλοστοργία· κ. μεγάλων κ. μικρῶν ὁμοίως κήδεται, καὶ πάντας οἶδε, κ. οὐδένα παρορᾷ, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν περὶ ἕκαστον κηδεμονίαν ἐπιδείκνυται, κ. τὴν ἰσοτιμίαν πρὸς πάντας· ὅθεν καὶ μᾶλλον ἔπειθε δέξασθαι τὸ φορτικὸν τῶν ῥημάτων.* Chrys.) **do shew** (see above) **the same diligence** (**τὴν αὐτήν**, not as Peirce and Sykes, the same which *some have already shewn*: nor, the same as *ye have already shewn*, as Chrys. (*οἷος ἦς πρότερον, τοιοῦτον εἶναι κ. νῦν κ. εἰς τὸ μέλλον*), Œc., Thdrt., Thl., Grot., Limb., al., which would imply that the Writer was satisfied with their state hitherto, and only desired its continuance: an inference at variance with the facts of the Epistle: but, the same, with a view to the *πληροφ. τῆς ἐλπ. ἄχρι τέλους*, as they had already shewn with regard to the necessities of the saints. So Bengel, Cramer, Böhme, Bleek, Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch (doubtfully), al.) **with regard to** (the employment which this diligence is to find: the object with reference to which it is to energize) **the full assurance** (so, taking **πληροφορία** subjectively as in the other places of the N. T. (reff.), Erasm., Vatabl., Calvin, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappell., Schlicht., Calov., Wolf, Tholuck, Ebrard, Lünem., Delitzsch,—and many others. And so in fact Thl.: *ἵνα πλήρη κ. τελείαν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἐνδείξησθε κ. μὴ σκυλθῆτε.* But Corn. a-Lap., Grot., Schulz, De W., Bleek, al., take the word objectively, *the full formation*, in the sense, *to be diligent, evermore to form hope more completely* within you, so that you be not moved, but stedfast, until the great object of hope appear. This latter no doubt is excellent sense, but N. T. usage must prevail) **of your hope until the end** (cf. ch. iii. 14. The words **ἄχρι τέλους** belong to the whole sentence, not to the verb nor to *πληρ. τῆς ἐλπίδος* only. 'The end' is the coming of the Lord, looked for as close at hand, see note as above): **12.] that ye become not** ("*be not*" misses the fine delicacy of the Writer: as Chrys., *ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, ἀκμὴν γένησθε. καὶ μὴν ἀνωτέρω ἔλεγεν, ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς. ἀλλ' ὅρα*

[e] νωθροὶ γένησθε, [f] μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ [g] μακροθυμίας [h] κληρονομούντων τὰς [i] ἐπαγγελίας. [13] τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ [k] ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ θεός, ἐπεὶ [l] κατ᾽ οὐδενὸς [m] εἶχεν μείζονος [n] ὀμόσαι, [n] ὤμοσεν [l] καθ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ [14] λέγων [o] Εἰ μὴν

e ch. v. 11 (reff.) only. f 1 Cor. iv. 16. xi. 1. Eph. v. 1. 1 Thess. i. 6. ii. 14. only†. g = Col. i. 11. James v. 10. 2 Tim. iii. 10. iv. 2. Isa. lvii. 15. h ch. i. 4, 14. see ver. 17. ch. xi. 9. i plur., Heb., ch. vii. 6. viii. 6. xi. 13, 17, 33. Rom. ix. 4. xv. 8. 2 Cor. i. 20. vii. 1. Gal. iii. 16. k Mark xiv. 11. Acts vii. 5 al. fr. abs., Heb. only, ch. x. 23. xi. 11. xii. 26. Sir. xx. 23. l = Matt. xxvi. 63. Gen. xxii. 16. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 13. m = Luke vii. 42. xii. 4. Acts iv. 14. (xxv. 26.) Prov. iii. 27. n w. κατά, here bis and ver. 16 only. Gen. xxxi. 53. Isa. xlv. 23. Amos vi. 8 al. Philo (see note) al. (in Bleek) later authors. o Gen. xxii. 17. Num. xiv. 23, 35. Job i. 11.

12. aft δια ins της D[1] 108. μακροθυμουντας D[1][-gr].
14. rec η μην (*see note*), with K rel [Chr$_1$ Euthal-ms Cyr$_2$ Thdrt Thl$_{h.l.}$ Œc], ἡμῖν L[1] o: ει μη CD[3]L[2], *nisi* latt Ambr$_1$ [Primas]: txt ABD[1][P]ℵ 17 [47[1]] Did$_1$ Damasc.

πῶς ἐκεῖ μέχρι τῆς ἀκοῆς τὴν νωθρότητα ἔστησεν. ἐνταῦθά τε καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο φθέγγεται, ἀλλ᾽ ἕτερόν τι αἰνίττεται· ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ εἰπεῖν, μὴ ἐναπομείνητε τῇ ῥᾳθυμίᾳ, μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, εἶπε. πάλιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα ἐξάγει καιρὸν τὸν ἀνεύθυνον, εἰπών, ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε· ἐκείνου γὰρ τοῦ μήπω παρόντος οὐκ ἂν εἴημεν ὑπεύθυνοι. ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὸ παρὸν παρακαλούμενος σπουδάζειν, ὡς ῥᾳθυμῶν, ἴσως καὶ ὀκνηρότερος ἔσται· ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸ μέλλον, οὐχ οὕτως) **sluggish** (see on ref. Lünemann observes that this μὴ νωθ. γένησθε is in no contradiction to νωθ. γεγόνατε there, the one being of sluggishness in hearing, the other in Christian practice. See Chrys. above), **but** (this again is a δέ bringing in a strong contrast —'nay, but rather:' passing to another subject altogether, as it were. See on ch. ii. 6) **imitators** (a favourite word with St. Paul, see reff.: Xen. Mem. i. 6. 3, οἱ διδάσκαλοι τοὺς μαθητὰς μιμητὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀποδεικνύουσι. Herodian vi. 8. 5, ὡς μὴ μαθητὰς εἶναι μόνον, ἀλλὰ ζηλωτὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τῆς ἐκείνου ἀνδρείας) **of them who through faith and endurance** (see ref. Col., also ver. 15: James v. 7, 8. Both the noun and the verb belong to later Greek. They form a contrast to ὀξύ-θυμος, -έω, earlier and classical words. Here, that constant and patient waiting is implied, without which faith would be made void: of which it is said, "It is good that a man should both hope and wait for the salvation of the Lord." But there is no Hendiadys: faith is one thing, endurance another, superadded upon it) **inherit the promises** (what is meant by κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, and who are indicated by the expression? The two questions are very closely connected together. First observe that the participle is not κληρονομησάντων, but present: said not of any one act by which these persons entered on the inheritance of the promises, but of either, 1. a state now going on, '*who are inheriting*,' or, 2. in mere predication, '*who are inheritors of*.' That the first cannot be meant, is clear: for in ch. xi. where he enumerates the examples of faith and patience, he says, οὗτοι πάντες . . . οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. This same consideration will prevent the reference very commonly here supposed, to Abraham and the patriarchs. Taking then (2), we may regard the participle as ὁ πειράζων and the like, used without reference to time, but as indicative of office, or standing, or privilege. Thus the reference of the words will be perfectly general: not, *who have inherited*, nor *who shall inherit*, nor *who are inheriting*, but '*who are inheritors of*,' *who inherit*, in all times and under all circumstances. Of these, Abraham is chosen as the most illustrious example). **13—20.**] The encouragement to perseverance is further confirmed by *God's express oath made to Abraham, the first inheritor of the promise*. **13.**] **For** ("His verbis non reddit rationem cur imitari debeant eos, qui per fidem et longanimitatem divinarum promissionum hæredes sunt facti, sed cur mentionem faciat talium. Poterat enim aliquis quærere, an tales aliqui sint, et quinam sint? his ergo verbis in exemplum istius rei adducit patrem omnium credentium Abrahamum, qui et in fide fuit constantissimus, et istius fidei fructum tulit maximum." Schlichting) **God when He promised** (not, as De W., Lün., al., *having promised*: for in matter of fact the oath preceded the statement of the promise, *cf.* ver. 14 below: but the aor. participle, as so often, is contemporaneous with the aor. verb, as in ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, &c. Bleek well remarks, that ἐπαγγειλάμενος is to be taken not only as "made a promise," but in the Messianic sense, "*gave the promise*," as τὰς ἐπαγγελίας above, and ἡ ἐπαγγελία vv. 15, 17 al., αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι ch. vii. 6 al.: Rom. ix. 4: Gal. iii. 16) **to Abraham, since He could** (ἔχειν with an infin., 'to have the power, or the means, or the opportunity, to . . .' is good Greek, e. g. οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, common in Herod. See reff.) **swear by** (the classical construction of ὄμνυμι is with an accus. of the person

p = Acts iii. 26. Gal. iii. 9. Eph. i. 3 al. Gen. xxiv. 1.
q repet. as in cit., Acts vii. 34 (from Exod. iii. 7) al.

[p] εὐλογῶν [q] εὐλογήσω σε καὶ [r] πληθύνων [q] πληθυνῶ σε· 15 καὶ [s] οὕτως [t] μακροθυμήσας [u] ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. 16 ἄνθρωποι [[v] μὲν] γὰρ [w] κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος [w] ὀμνύουσιν,

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

r = Acts vi. 1, 7. vii. 17 al. Exod. s = Acts vii. 8. xvii. 33. Rom. v. 12 al. t Matt. xviii. 26, 29. Luke xviii. 7. 1 Cor. xiii. 4. 1 Thess. v. 14. James v. 7 (bis), 8. 2 Pet. iii. 9 only. Prov. xix. 11. u ch. xi. 33. (there also w. ἐπαγ.) Rom. xi. 7 bis. James iv. 2 only. Gen. xxxix. 2. Prov. xii. 27 only. v Gal. iv. 24. Col. ii. 23 al. Winer, § 63. ii. 2. e. w ver. 13 reff.

16. om μεν ABD[1]ℵ[P 47 syr arm Euthal-ms] Cyr: ins CD[3]KL rel Chr Thdrt Damasc.

sworn by, ὄμνυμι τοὺς θεούς: but κατά with a gen. is found when a thing is used as binding the oath, as ὄμνυμι κατ' ἐξολείας, Demosth. p. 553. 17 al.; καθ' ἱερῶν, p. 1306. 21 al. And this construction, applied to *persons*, appears to have arisen from that other. See Bleek's note) **none (masc.) greater, swore by Himself** (a singularly coincident passage occurs, of the same promise, in Philo, Legg. Allegor. iii. 72, vol. i. p. 127: εὖ καὶ τῷ ὅρκῳ βεβαιώσας τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν, καὶ ὅρκῳ θεοπρεπεῖ. ὁρᾷς γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καθ' ἑτέρου ὀμνύει θεός, οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρεῖττον, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅς ἐστι πάντων ἄριστος), 14.] **saying, Surely** (in reff., the editions vary between εἰ μὴν and ἦ μήν, but the greater MSS. have εἰ μήν: in fact, ει and η are constantly interchanged by the copyists. The expression occurs in formulæ jurandi in several places in the LXX (as e. g. Ezek. xxxiii. 27, ζῶ ἐγώ, εἰ μὴν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἠρημωμέναις μαχαίραις πεσοῦνται: see also ib. xxxiv. 8; xxxv. 6; xxxvi. 5; xxxviii. 19), so that it could not be an unmeaning expression to the Helleuistic ear. Bleek thinks it came from the Hebraistic formula εἰ μή, which has sometimes been written and edited for it) **blessing I will bless** (thus frequently the LXX, for the Heb. idiomatic conjunction of the absolute infinitive with the finite verb: but sometimes they have it where the Heb. has no such conjunction, as in 1 Kings ii. 25: and something like it is found even iu Greek writers, as e. g. Herod. v. 95, φεύγων ἐκφεύγει: Xen. Cyr. viii. 4. 9, ὑπακούων σχολῇ ὑπήκουσα: Lucian, Parasit. 43, φεύγων . . . κατέφυγε (none of which however are quite analogous, the second verb in all being coupled with some additional predicate, as in φεύγων ἐκφεύγει—'flying, he escapes, gets clear off'). See Winer, § 45. 8, edn. 6. At first the participle seems to have had a certain emphasis: but afterwards this was lost, and the expression became a mere formula) **thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee** (the LXX has for σε, τὸ σπέρμα σου. This the Writer alters, not from a wish to abbreviate (Jac. Cappell.) nor because he quoted from memory (Abresch), nor because he was unwilling to introduce Abraham's bodily descendants, but wished to direct his readers' thoughts to his spiritual seed (Böhme, Bisping, al.), but, as Bleek, De W., Lünem., al., because his concern here was with Abraham alone, and his spiritual example: or perhaps, as Delitzsch, seeing that πληθ. σε could only be understood of *posterity*, because he wished to concentrate the promise as much as possible): 15.] **and thus** (οὕτως belongs to ἐπέτυχε, not to μακροθυμήσας, as Tholuck, and Hofm. Enst. p. 311, for then some particular instance or kind of patience would be most naturally pointed out. It then signifies, *when he had received this promise*—being in this state of dependence on the divine promise: see below, and reff.) **having endured with patience** (viz. in his waiting so long for God's promise to be fulfilled—in having, when it was partially fulfilled, again shewn noble endurance in the will of God by offering up Isaac), **he obtained the promise** (i. e. not as Bleek, he had made to him the promise above related: this would nearly stultify the sentence, which proceeds on the faithfulness of God, confirming his promise with an oath by Himself, and the faith and endurance of Abraham, waiting for that promise to be fulfilled: but as Lün., he *obtained, got fulfilled to him*, the promise, the thing promised, to wit, the birth of Isaac, as the commencement of the fulfilment—as much of it as he could see. And thus Abraham became a κληρονόμος τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν. That there is here no inconsistency with ch. xi. 39, see shewn there. ἐπιτυγχάνω is always used of the actual getting in possession: ὁλκάδος ἀναγομένης ἐπέτυχον, Thuc. iii. 3: εἰ ἀγαθοῦ ὠνητοῦ ἐπιτύχοιμι, Xen. Œc. 2. 3: ἵππου ἐπιτυχὼν ἀγαθοῦ, ib. 12. 20: al. in Bleek. And the above is the explanation, I believe, of every expositor ancient and modern, except Schulz and Bleek. Ebrard indeed varies thus far, as to understand ἐπέτυχεν of Abraham's final and heavenly enjoyment of the fulfilment of the Messianic promises: but I believe the aorist will be generally considered to preclude this). 16—20.] *Security of this promise*, as being part of God's great promise, which He has fulfilled in Christ. These verses are transitional,

καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς [x] *ἀντιλογίας* [y] *πέρας εἰς* [z] *βεβαίωσιν ὁ* [a] *ὅρκος·* 17 *ἐν ᾧ* [b] *περισσότερον* [c] *βουλόμενος ὁ θεὸς* [d] *ἐπιδεῖξαι τοῖς* [e] *κληρονόμοις τῆς* [f] *ἐπαγγελίας τὸ* [g] *ἀμετάθετον*

x = (see note) ch. vii. 7. xii. 3. Jude 11 (only). Polyb. v. 74. 9, πρὸς τὴν ἀντιλογίαν ἀνίσταντο πολλοί. y sing., here only. Nah. iii. 9. Ps. cxviii. 96. (plur. Matt. xii. 42 ‖ L. Rom. x. 18 only.) πέρας ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις ἐστὶ τοῦ βίου ὁ θάνατος, Dem. p. 258. 19. z Phil. i. 7 only. Lev. xxv. 23. Wisd. vi. 18 only. see ch. ii. 2, 3. a here bis. Matt. v. 33. xiv. 7, 9 ‖ Mk. xxvi. 72. Luke i. 73. Acts ii. 30. James v. 12 only. Gen. xxvi. 3. b adv., Mark vii. 36. 1 Cor. xv. 10. ch. vii. 15. c of God, James i. 18 reff. d = Acts xviii. 28 †. (Isa. xxxvii. 26.) e ch. i. 2 reff. f so ch. xi. 9, 39. g here (bis) only. 3 Macc. v. 1, 12. Polyb. ii. 32. 5, θεωροῦντες ἀμετάθετον οὖσαν τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων. and al. constr., Xenoph. Fragm. Ep. i. 2, τὸ ἀμετάκλαστόν σου τῆς γνώμης.

αντιλ. bef *αυτοις* D[1.3] [syrr].
17. for *ω*, *τω* D[1]. *περισσοτερως* B, *primum* D-lat, *abundantius* vulg. *ο θεος* bef *βουλομενος* D F-lat. *επιδειξασθαι* A 47. 115 Thl.

and lead us to the consideration of the Melchisedek-priesthood of our Lord in the next chapter. 16. **For** [**indeed**] (see var. readd. This *μέν* solitarium or ellipticum is common with *γάρ*, in the sense of the German zwar or freilich, and our '*of a truth*,' '*verily*:' so Eurip. Med. 698, *ξυγγνωστὰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν σε λυπεῖσθαι, γύναι*: Xen. Mem. iii. 10. 1, *εἰσελθὼν μὲν γάρ ποτε πρὸς Παῤῥάσιον*. See the elliptic *μέν* well discussed in Hartung, Partikellehre ii. 411 ff.) **men** (emphatic) **swear** (Bleek observes that it is a mistake to call the form *ὀμνύουσιν* Hellenistic (*ὀλλύασιν, ὀμνύασιν, Ἀττικῶς· ὀλλύουσιν, ὀμνύουσιν, Ἑλληνικῶς*. Moeris), for we have it in Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 16 (*πανταχοῦ ὀμνύουσι τὸν ὅρκον τοῦτον*) and Demosth. p. 622. 22) **by the greater** (**one**) (*τοῦ μείζονος* is undoubtedly masculine: it could not be predicated of any thing neuter, that it was *greater than the men* who swear. And by the expression here, generally taken, must be meant God Himself: that greater One, who is above all men. And so Primas., Grot., Bengel, al.), **and an** (*the* in the case supposed: the art. is generic: cf. Matt. xiii. 3, *ὁ σπείρων*: John xii. 24, *ὁ κόκκος*) **oath is to them an end** (see reff. and more examples in Bleek) **of all gainsaying** (E. V. with very many others, "*strife*," which is a legitimate meaning of *ἀντιλογία* (cf. Exod. xviii. 16: Deut. xix. 17; xxi. 5: 2 Kings xv. 4: Prov. xviii. 18: Xen. Hell. vi. 3. 20, *εἰρήνην τῶν ἄλλων πεποιημένων, πρὸς δὲ Θηβαίους μόνους ἀντιλογίας οὔσης*), but not borne out here by the context, seeing that there is no allusion to any instance in which God and men were at strife. And besides, in the only places where *ἀντιλογία* occurs in the N. T. (see reff.) it has the meaning '*gainsaying*:' e. g. ch. vii. 7, *χωρὶς πάσης ἀντιλογίας*, without possibility of gainsaying. So that it is best to take this meaning here, and understand that an oath puts an end to all gainsaying by confirming the matter *one way*, in which all parties consent), **for confirmation** (the E. V. with Beza, Erasm., al., ungrammatically joins these words with *ὁ ὅρκος*,—"*an oath for confirmation*." It is obvious to every one, that they can only be joined, and that closely, with *πέρας*. The only reason why in the translation I have separated them from it, is for fear of introducing, in English, the ambiguity, 'for confirmation of all gainsaying.' Calvin's remark on this verse is pertinent: "Præterea hic locus docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum. Quod observandum est contra homines fanaticos qui regulam sancte jurandi, quam Deus lege sua præscripsit, libenter abrogarent. Nam Apostolus certe hic de ratione jurandi tanquam de re pia et Deo probata disserit. Porro non dicit olim fuisse in usu, sed adhuc vigere pronuntiat"). 17.] **In which behalf** (nearly equivalent to 'wherefore.' This seems the best rendering, and not, with some, to take *ἐν ᾧ*, as agreeing with *ὅρκῳ* "*in which*," or "*by which oath*:" cf. Thl. (alt.), Primas., al. It belongs, not exclusively to *ἐμεσίτευσεν*, nor to *βουλόμενος*, but to the whole sentence, as Delitzsch) **God, willing** ("*βουλόμενος . . . βουλῆς*, conjugata. Summa hic exprimitur benignitas," Bengel) **to shew more abundantly** ("quam sine juramento factum videretur," Beng. The word can hardly mean as Thl., *ἐκ περιουσίας*,—Beza, "amplius etiam quam necesse esset." The Commentators cite a very apposite passage of Philo, de Abr. § 46, vol. ii. p. 39: *θεὸς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὃς τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν πίστεως ἀγάμενος τὸν ἄνδρα πίστιν ἀντιδίδωσιν αὐτῷ, τὴν δι' ὅρκου βεβαίωσιν ὧν ὑπέσχετο δωρεῶν, οὐκ ἔτι μόνον ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ θεός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς φίλος γνωρίμῳ διαλεγόμενος. φησὶ γάρ· "κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὤμοσα," παρ' ᾧ ὁ λόγος ὅρκος ἐστίν, ἕνεκα τοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκλινῶς κ. παγίως ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ἐρηρεῖσθαι*) **to the heirs of the promise** (from ch. xi. 9, Isaac and Jacob were *συγκληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς* with Abraham. But there is no need

τῆς [h] βουλῆς αὐτοῦ [i] ἐμεσίτευσεν [a] ὅρκῳ, [18] ἵνα διὰ [j] δύο [k] πραγμάτων [g] ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς [l] ἀδύνατον [m] ψεύσασθαι θεόν, [n] ἰσχυρὰν [o] παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν οἱ [p] καταφυγόντες

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

h Luke vii. 30. Acts ii. 23. Eph. i. 11. Isa. xlvi. 10. i here only †. intr., Jos. Antt. vii. 8. 5, ἐμεσίτευσε πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, but commonly trans., see Bleek. (-της, ch. viii. 6.) j gen., Matt. xviii. 16. xx. 24. Luke xii. 6. Phil. i. 23 al. Gen. xxxi. 33. k so ch. x. 1. xi. 1. l ver. 4 reff. m Rom. ix. 1 al. Ps. lxxxviii. 35. n see 2 Cor. x. 10 al. o = (see note) Acts xiii. 15. Rom. xii. 8. ch. xii. 5. xiii. 22. 1 Macc. x. 24. p Acts xiv. 6 only. Gen. xix. 20. Zech. ii. 11.

18. for δια, μετα D¹[-gr]. ins τον bef θεον AC[P]ℵ¹ 17 Eus, Cyr₁ Did₂ Chr₁ Thdrt₁ Chron₁ : om BDKLℵ³ rel Eus₂ Cyr-jer₁ Phot₁ [Euthal-ms Thdrt₃ Damasc Thl].

to confine the title to them: as Œc. (Chrys.), ἦλθε δὲ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς. ἡμεῖς γὰρ οἱ κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, οἱ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν σπέρμα ὄντες τῷ Ἀβραάμ· εἰ δὲ σπέρμα, καὶ κληρονόμοι) **the unchangeableness** (see reff. Beware of supposing the words equivalent to τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀμετάθετον. It was not "His unchangeable counsel" that He would shew, but the fact that His counsel was unchangeable) **of His counsel, interposed** (μεσιτεύω, like μεσίτης, belongs to later Greek: and in its usage it is generally transitive. Thus Diod. Sic. xix. 71, μεσιτεύσαντος τὰς συνθήκας Ἀμίλκου: Polyb. ix. 34. 3, μεσιτεῦσαι τὴν διάλυσιν εὐνοϊκῶς, and other examples in Bleek: and thus some have rendered it here: ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν, Œc.: scil., τὴν βουλήν, Böhme: Thdrt. Eran. Dial. i. vol. iii. p. 34, ὁ γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπαγορεύων ὀμνύναι, τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, καθά φησι καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ. But it is also found with an intransitive sense, as in ref.; and thus we may best interpret it here: God came in as a middle person between Himself and Abraham. Men swear by God, as greater than themselves. So God becomes for men, when swearing, the third and higher person concerned, the Mediator between them: cf. Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 7, ταῦτα δὲ ὀμνύοντες ἔλεγον καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην ὧν ὑπισχνοῦντο ποιούμενοι. And thus when He Himself swears, having no greater to swear by, He swears by Himself, so making Himself as it were a third person between the parties to the oath: so, in the intransitive sense, μεσιτεύων. It is strange that Bleek quotes the E. V. as having here "*interposed himself by an oath*," whereas it has "*confirmed it by an oath*," taking the transitive sense. We may note, that this word ἐμεσίτευσεν has led the Greek expositors, Chrys., Œc., Thl., to fancy that the Son was the person swearing and sworn by. Thus Œc.: καλῶς δὲ ἔχει ἡ ἔννοια τῆς ἑρμηνείας, ἵνα οὕτως ᾖ· ὁ θεὸς τουτέστιν ὁ λόγος, ἐπιδεῖξαι βουλόμενος τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῶν τῷ πατρὶ δοξάντων, ἐμεσίτευσε τῷ πατρὶ κ. τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὅρκῳ, τουτέστι μεσίτης ἐν τῷ ὅρκῳ γέγονε· δι' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ὡς λόγου ὤμνυεν ὁ θεός) **with an oath** (dat. of the instrument: it was by means of the oath that He exercised the office of μεσίτης),

18.] **that by means of two** (δύο is here undeclinable, but not, as Delitzsch states, always in N. T. We have δυσὶν in ch. x. 28: Matt. vi. 24; xxii. 40: Acts xii. 6 al.) **unchangeable things** (ποίου καὶ ποίου; τοῦ τε εἰπεῖν καὶ ὑποσχέσθαι, τοῦ τε ὅρκον προσθεῖναι τῇ ὑποσχέσει. Chrys., Thl.: δύο πράγματα τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸν ὅρκον εἴρηκε. καὶ μόνῳ γὰρ λόγῳ χρώμενος ὁ θεὸς πληροῖ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν· πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον ὅρκον συνάπτων τῷ λόγῳ, Thdrt. Similarly Œc., Schol. Matth., Primas., Erasm., Calov., Beza, Schlichting, and almost all recent expositors. Primasius mentions an idea that one is the promise accompanied by the oath, the other the completion of the promise. Stuart thinks that the *two oaths* are meant, that to Abraham, and that to Christ by which He is constituted a priest after the order of Melchisedek, and refers to Storr as agreeing in substance with him. But this cannot be the meaning. For the Writer is not *recounting* God's promises made by oath, on which our Christian hope is founded: for thus he might say not *two* but many (e.g. "The Lord hath sworn unto David and will not repent: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy seat"): but he is impressing on us the strength of that *method of assurance* which God has been pleased to give us, in that He has not only promised (in both cases in question) but also confirmed it by an oath), **in which** ("quæ quum adsint," as Böhme in Bl.: bei denen: much as ἐν ᾧ above [as the material of the lie, if it were possible]) **it is impossible for God ever** (this force is given by the aor. which distributes the proposition into separate incidents) **to lie** (in each and either of them, it is out of all question that falsehood should be suspected in Him. The stress is on ψεύσασθαι, not on θεόν) **we may have strong encouragement** (see below), **who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us** (so (except "*consolation*" for '*encouragement*') E. V. and in my opi-

[q] κρατῆσαι τῆς [r] προκειμένης [s] ἐλπίδος· [19] ἣν ὡς [t] ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς [u] ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ [uv] βεβαίαν, καὶ εἰςερχο-

q ch. iv. 14 reff. r 2 Cor. viii. 12. ch. xii. 1, 2. Jude 7 only. Num. iv. 7. see exx. in Bl. & Wetst. s = Gal. v. 5. Col. i. 5. Tit. ii. 13. t Acts xxvii. 29, 30, 40 only †. u Wisd. vii. 23. Cebet. Tab. 9. 31 al. in Bl. v ch. ii. 2 reff.

19. εχωμεν D. ασφαλην ACD¹[P]: txt BD²KLℵ rel.

nion rightly. The construction, and with it the meaning of **παράκλησις**, is much controverted. The above view is that of Primas., Erasm., Beza, Schlicht., Grot., Wolf, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, De Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Tholuck, Delitzsch, and many others. On the other hand Œc. (*οἱ καταφυγόντες· εἰς αὐτόν φησι. κρατῆσαι· ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν εἰς τὸ κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος*), Thl. (*παράκλησιν· παραίνεσιν μεγάλην κ. προτροπήν. . . . . . ποῦ δὲ ἔχομεν τὴν προτροπήν; εἰς τὸ κρατῆσαι κ.τ.λ.*), (Chrys. gives no exposition), Camerarius, Camero, Seb. Schmidt, Heinrichs, Bleek, Lünem., Conybeare, Stuart, al. make **κρατῆσαι** dependent on **παράκλησιν**, which they render "*exhortation*," "*encouragement*." This necessitates making **καταφυγόντες** absolute, "*we who have fled for refuge:*" but from what, or to what? There is nothing in the context here, which could lead to this absolute use of such an expression. But if it be joined with *εἰς τὸ κρατῆσαι*, the idea of flying to an asylum is at once given, and the figure easily and naturally introduced. Besides which, had *παράκλησις*, meaning 'exhortation' or 'encouragement,' been followed by a verb, '*to hold fast*,' this could hardly have been expressed by an aorist: being an abiding condition, it must be *present*. Whereas now, we have fled to refuge in order to lay hold of—the whole Christian state in one act, which justifies the aorist. As regards the separate words, **παράκλησις** need not mean "*consolation*," but may here also be taken in the same sense as in the other two passages of our Epistle (reff.), viz. '*encouragement*' or 'exhortation,' without an infinitive following. Of these, the former is that which best bears *absolute* use in English, and I have therefore adopted it. **καταφεύγω** (see reff. and Jer. xxvii. (l.) 5: Ps. cxlii. 9) is generally used in the sense of *flying for refuge:* so Herod. ii. 113, of Paris, when shipwrecked in Egypt, and a suppliant in the temple of Hercules: vi. 75, of the Argives who had fled for sanctuary to the temple of Argos. See especially Raphel's note here. For **κρατεῖν**, see on ref.: where observe the present, giving the sense 'hold fast.' **τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος** is not an easy expression. The verb *προκεῖσθαι* is often used of a prize proposed for a contest,—**πρό** giving the sense of *coram*, as in 'propono:' so Herod. ix. 101, *ὅς σφι καὶ αἱ νῆσοι καὶ ὁ Ἑλλήσποντος ἄεθλα προέκειτο*, and in numerous examples in Bl. from Xen., Polyb., Ælian, Jos., Philo. So in ch. xii. 2, *τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς*. Hence it seems most natural to take *ἐλπίς* here objectively, or very nearly so;—hope, as embodying the thing hoped for. And especially is this so, when we compare Col. i. 5, *τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, and Titus ii. 13, *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα*. Those who take *κρατῆσαι* for "*to hold fast*," are obliged here to regard *τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος* as equivalent to *τῆς ἐλπίδος τῶν προκειμένων*: so Bleek: which is very forced: or, as Lünem., to regard *ἐλπίς* itself as a subjective quality made objective, which, as a privilege or a possession, is ready for and proposed to us in the Christian covenant. Calvin gives a curious explanation: "In vocabulo spei est metonymia: effectus enim pro causa accipitur: nam ego promissionem intelligo cui spes nostra innititur"): **19.**] **which** (viz. the hope: in its subjective resting on objective grounds now to be set forth: not the *παράκλησις*, as Grot., Seb. Schmidt, al.) **we have** (not, "we hold fast," as Bretschn., Wahl, al., = *κατέχομεν*: this is forbidden by the unemphatic position of the word, as well as by the context) **as an anchor of our soul** (the similitude is a very common one in Greek and Roman writers; and on coins and medals, where hope is represented by an anchor. See Wetst. A saying is attributed to Socrates, *οὔτε ναῦν ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀγκυρίου οὔτε βίον ἐκ μιᾶς ἐλπίδος ὁρμιστέον*: see Kypke. Suicer gives some interesting remarks from the Fathers on the similitude) **safe and firm** (the adjectives belong to **ἄγκυραν**, not to *ἐλπίδα*. *οὐχ ἁπλῶς δὲ εἶπεν ἄγκυραν, ἀλλά, ἀσφαλῆ τε κ. βεβαίαν. ἔστι γὰρ ἄγκυρα μὴ φυλάττουσα τὸ σκάφος ἀσάλευτον, ἢ ὅταν σαθρά, ἢ ὅταν ἐλαφροτέρα.* Thl.) **and entering into the part within the veil** (first, to what is **εἰςερχομένην** to be referred? to *ἄγκυραν*, or to (*ἣν*) *ἐλπίδα*? The former is the more obvious construction: and has been accepted by Beza, Estius ("Sicut ancora navalis non in aquis hæret, sed terram intrat sub aquis latentem, eique infigitur: ita ancora animæ spes nostra non satis habet in vestibulum

μένην εἰς τὸ [wx] ἐσώτερον τοῦ [xy] καταπετάσματος, 20 [z] ὅπου [a] πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰςῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν [b] τάξιν

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

w Acts xvi. 24 only.
x Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 15. Exod. xxvi. 33.
y ch. ix. 3. x. 20. Matt. xxvii. 51 ‖ only. = Exod. xxvi. 31—35. Lev. xxi. 23 al.
z = Matt. viii. 19. Luke ix. 57. John viii [?]1. 22 al. Ruth i. 16.
a here only. Num. xiii. 21. Isa. xxviii. 4. Wisd. xii. 8 only.
b ch. v. 6 reff.

20. aft ιησ. ins χριστος D[1].

pervenisse, id est non est contenta bonis terrenis et visibilibus: sed penetrat usque ad ea, quæ sunt intra velum, videlicet in ipsa sancta sanctorum: id est, Deum ipsum et cœlestia bona apprehendit, atque in iis figitur"), Schlichting, Limborch, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. This is said by Bleek to be too artificial, and he, with Abresch, Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, al., takes *hope* as that which enters within the veil, simply, the figure being dropped. He refers for this to the Greek expositors also: but Chrys. says, *ἄγκυραν δὲ οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἶπεν, ἀλλ' ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν· ἵνα δηλώσῃ τὸ ἀψευδὲς τῶν αὐτῇ ἐπερειδομένων εἰς σωτηρίαν· διὸ ἐπάγει, εἰςερχ. εἰς τὸ ἐσώτ. τοῦ καταπετ. τί ἐστι τοῦτο; ἀντὶ τοῦ διικνουμένην εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*: by which he clearly seems to refer it to the anchor. Thl. says beautifully on the other side, *αὕτη γὰρ (ἡ ἐλπίς) εἰςελθοῦσα ἔνδον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἤδη εἶναι ἐν τοῖς ἐπηγγελμένοις, κἂν ἔτι κάτω ὦμεν, κἂν μήπω ἐλάβομεν· τοσαύτην ἔχει τὴν ἰσχὺν ἡ ἐλπίς, ὥστε τοὺς ἐπιγείους οὐρανίους ποιεῖν*. And similarly Œc. But I must say that I prefer the other, being as it seems to me the simpler view. "Two figures are here not so much mixed, as wonderfully combined. The Writer might have compared the world to a sea, the soul to a ship, the future yet hidden glory to the concealed bottom of the deep, the far off terra firma, stretching away under the water and covered by it. Or, he might have compared the present earthly life with the forecourt, and the future blessedness with the heavenly sanctuary which is concealed from us by a veil. But he has combined both these. The Soul clings, as one in fear of shipwreck, to an anchor, and sees not whither the cable of the anchor runs,—where it is fastened: but she knows that it is fastened behind the veil which hides the future glory, and that she, if she only holds on to the anchor, shall in her time be drawn in where it is, into the holiest place, by the hand of the Deliverer." Ebrard. This is very beautiful, and in the main, simple and natural: only going off into fancy at the end, which is not required for the interpretation. The word *καταπέτασμα* is, as far as Bleek knows, Alexandrine: the classical form being *παραπέτασμα*. See reff. It was the name for the second veil or curtain (ch. ix. 3), which shut in the holy of holies; the first or outer one being called *κάλυμμα*, Philo, Vita Mos. iii. 9, vol. ii. p. 150, *ἐν δὲ τῷ μεθορίῳ τῶν τεττάρων κ. πέντε κιόνων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κυρίως εἰπεῖν πρόναον, εἰργόμενον δυσὶν ὑφάσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἔνδον ὃν καλεῖται καταπέτασμα, τὸ δ' ἐκτὸς προςαγορεύεται κάλυμμα*. See further on ch. ix. 3. For the whole expression, see reff.),

20.] **where** (*ὅπου* is found in places where *ὅποι* ought rightly to stand, as in our own common phrase, '*Where* are you going?' It is in fact a constructio prægnans, become a familiar idiom. So Xen. Ages. vi. 6, *ἄδηλος γιγνόμενος, ὅπου τε εἴη καὶ ὅπου ἴοι*. See also reff.) **as forerunner** (not "*the forerunner*" as E. V.: the omission of the art. necessarily places **πρόδρομος** in the situation of predicate) **on our behalf** (it is disputed whether **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν** is to be joined with *πρόδρομος* or with *εἰςῆλθεν*. Œc. and Thl. adopt the former: Thl. explaining very fully: *οὐκ ἠρκέσθη δὲ εἰπὼν πρό***δρομος**, *ἀλλὰ προςέθηκε καὶ τὸ* **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν**, *εἰς πλείω πίστωσιν, ὡςανεὶ τοῦτο λέγων· οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐδεῖτο τοῦ ἐκεῖσε ἐλθεῖν· πῶς γάρ, θεὸς ὤν; ἀλλ' ὥςπερ σάρκα δι' ἡμᾶς ἔλαβεν, οὕτω καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς εἰςῆλθεν ἐσώτερον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀνοίξῃ τὴν ὁδόν. ὥστε ἀναγκαίως εἰςελευσόμεθα καὶ αὐτοί. ἢ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἵνα ἐντυγχάνῃ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῷ πατρί, ὡς καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰςῄει εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἐξιλασκόμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ*. And so Thdrt., referring to John xiv. 1 ff. And similarly many moderns also. But Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. prefer joining *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* with the verb, as more simple. One objection to this they do not seem to have seen: the emphatic position which it gives to *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, a position certainly uncalled for here. Besides which, the predicate *πρόδρομος* standing alone is bald and unexpected, whereas *πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* fully justifies itself. And the subsequent words, *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μ. ἀρχιερεὺς γεν. εἰς τ. αἰ.*, are no confirmation of the other view, as Del. maintains. The Lord's entrance is *sacerdotal*, whether He is *forerunner for us*, or has *entered for us*. **ὑπέρ** is not pleonastic, as Œc.: but He is forerunner on our behalf, as representing, and introducing, us, who

Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. VII. [1] Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλεὺς [c] Σαλήμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ

c Gen. xiv. 18. xxxiii. 18 (see note). John iii. 23. Judith iv. 4.

are to come after. πρόδρομος is a good classical word, signifying ordinarily the *scouts* who were *sent before* an army, Herod. i. 60; iv. 121-2; and see many examples in Bleek: but also *any others sent before*, reff.; and Herod. ix. 14, ἦλθε ἀγγελίη πρόδρομος. It is a figure analogous, in its propriety, to ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, in theirs. And it is one full of comfort to us: as Thl., ὁ γὰρ πρόδρομος, τινῶν ἐστιν ἀκολουθούντων πρόδρομος· καὶ οὐδὲ πάνυ πολὺ τὸ μέσον τοῦ προδρόμου καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ Ἰωάννου καὶ χριστοῦ. μὴ τοίνυν ἀσχάλλετε. ὅσονούπω εἰσελευσόμεθα ὅπου ὁ πρόδρομος ἡμῶν) **entered Jesus, having become** (see on ch. ii. 17) **a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek** (the stress is on the words κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, which on that account are taken out of their order (see ch. v. 10) and put first. And this is so, because it is this particular point to which the Writer wishes to return in what follows. He assumes for the present ἀρχ. γεν. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα as conceded, and takes up the mysterious point which he left at ch. v. 10, for elucidation. And thus ends the digression which began there).

CHAP. VII. 1—X. 18.] THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDEK, SET FORTH IN ITS DISTINCTION FROM THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD: — THE NEW COVENANT BROUGHT IN BY CHRIST, IN ITS DISTINCTION FROM THE OLD:—AND THE FULL PROPITIATION WROUGHT BY HIM, IN DISTINCTION FROM THE PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES FORMERLY OFFERED. And herein, VII. 1—10.] *The priesthood of Melchisedek: its nature, as eternal* (1—3); *as superior to the Levitical* (4—10). 1—3.] This forms grammatically but one sentence, μένει being the only verb, and the adjectives ἀπάτωρ &c. being only epithets, not predicates. This has been mistaken by Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, al., who supply ἐστι to βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ and the following clauses. The epithetal clauses themselves however have some distinction from one another. As far as Ἀβραάμ, they are merely axiomatic, or historical, referring to matters of fact: after that they are predicatory, introduced and taken for granted by the Writer. **For this Melchisedek, King of Salem** (מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם, Gen. xiv. 18. It is doubtful whether this *Salem* is a short form of *Jerusalem*, or some other place. Epiphan. Hær. lv. 2, vol. i. p. 469, says, περὶ ἧς ἄλλος ἄλλως ἐξέδωκε καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλως· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν αὐτὴν τὴν νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καλουμένην,—ἄλλοι δὲ ἔφασαν ἄλλην τινὰ Σαλὴμ εἶναι ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Σικίμων καταντικρὺς τῆς νυνὶ Νεαπόλεως καλουμένης. Josephus, Antt. i. 10. 2, understands it of Jerusalem: ὁ τῆς Σόλυμα πόλεως βασιλεὺς Μ. . . . . τὴν μέντοι Σόλυμα ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν Ἱεροσόλυμα. So also the Targumists and most of the Fathers, from Theophilus ad Autolicum ii. 31, p. 372, and Greek expositors (e. g. Œc., οἴεσθαι δὲ χρὴ ὅτι καὶ Σαλὴμ ἐκείνης ἐτύγχανε βασιλεύς, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἱερουσαλήμ): and most modern Commentators: among them being Grot., Drusius, Michaelis, Kuinoel, Gesenius, Hitzig on Isa. i. 1, Von Raumer, Winer (Realw.), Lünemann, Delitzsch, al. But many others, as Primasius, Jac. Cappell., Whitby, Cellarius, Reland, Rosenmüller, Bleek, Ewald, al., contend that Jerusalem cannot be meant, because Jebus, and not Salem, was its old name, and Salem for Jerusalem occurs only in Ps. lxxvi. 2, a song of late date (entitled in the LXX, who however render the word by εἰρήνῃ, ᾠδὴ πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσύριον), and there as a poetical form, for the rhythm's sake. A prose writer of the primitive date of Genesis would not be likely to use such a form. They therefore suppose that this Salem was that mentioned John iii. 23 as near to Ænon, where John baptized: probably also in Gen. xxxiii. 18, where LXX, vulg., and E. V. all recognize שָׁלֵם as the name of a place, though the Targumists, Josephus, al. regard it as an adjective. The same place seems to be mentioned in Judith iv. 4, τὸν αὐλῶνα Σαλήμ. And for this view, there is very ancient and weighty authority. Jerome, Ep. 73 (126), ad Evagr., vol. i. p. 445, says that he had learned "ex eruditissimis gentis illius, Salem non, ut Josephus et nostri omnes arbitrantur, esse Hierusalem nomen . . . sed oppidum juxta Scythopolim, quod usque hodie appellatur Salem." And he goes on to say, "et ostenditur ibi palatium Melchisedec ex magnitudine ruinarum veteris operis ostendens magnitudinem." And Bleek, from whom this notice is mainly taken, argues with some probability that the Writer of our Epistle can hardly have thought of Jerusalem as indicated by Salem, or he would have pressed, not merely the etymology of the name, but all those sacerdotal associations which belonged to the holy city. Similarly Philo, Legg.

d Mark v. 7 ||. Acts xvi. 17 only. L. c. Ps. lxxvii. 35, 56. see Acts vii. 48. Job xxxi. 28 al.
e ver. 10. Luke ix. 37. xxii. 10. Acts x. 25. xx. 22 only. Num. xxiii. 16.

[d] θεοῦ τοῦ [d] ὑψίστου, ὃς [e] συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς [f] κοπῆς τῶν βασιλέων καὶ [g] εὐλογήσας αὐτόν, [2] ᾧ καὶ [h] δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων [i] ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ, πρῶτον μὲν [k] ἑρμηνευόμενος [l] βασιλεὺς [lm] δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

f here only. Gen. xiv. 17. Deut. xxviii. 25. Josh. x. 20. Judith xv. 7 only. g = Luke ii. 34. vv. 6, 7. ch. xi. 20, 21. Gen. xiv. 19. h vv. 4, 8, 9 only. Gen. xiv. 20. Gen. xxviii. 22 al. i = 1 Cor. vii. 17. 2 Cor. x. 13. Prov. xix. 14. Sir. xlv. 20. k John i. (39 v. r.) 43. ix. 7 only. Ezra iv. 7 only. l see Zech. ix. 9. Jer. xxiii. 5. m Rom. xiv. 17.

Chap. VII. 1. elz om 2nd του: ins A B(Tischdf expr) CDKL[P]ℵ rel Clem$_1$ Eus$_1$ [ed Gaisfd]. rec (for ος) ο, with C[1]L[P] rel [Euthal-ms]: txt ABC[3]DKℵ 17. at end ins και (αβρααμ) ευλογηθεις υπ' αυτου D[1] o. (o has αβρ. below: D[1] omits it there.)
2. for ᾧ, ο D[1]. εμερ. bef απο π. ℵ [47 Chr$_1$(and ms$_1$) Thdrt(not h. l.)]. om απο D[1] latt. παντος B. om δε και D-lat: om δε c d [Thdrt]: om και K vulg-mss F-lat [copt arm].

Alleg. iii. 25, vol. i. p. 102 (βασιλέα τε τῆς εἰρήνης, Σαλήμ, τοῦτο γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται), though elsewhere (De Somn. ii. 38, p. 691) he urges the sanctity of Jerusalem, and its etymological significance as ὅρασις εἰρήνης. And this latter view seems to me the more probable. As to the further question, whether Σαλήμ is here, or by Philo, meant *as the name of a place at all*, see on ver. 2), **priest of God the most high** (so Genesis l. c., כֹּהֵן לְאֵל עֶלְיוֹן. The appellation, here and in the O. T., belongs to the true and only God: cf. Gen. xiv. 19, 22, where in this same history both Melchisedek and Abraham speak of "the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth." Philo, in explaining this same office, Legg. Alleg. iii. § 26, p. 103, says, θεοῦ γὰρ ὑψίστου ἐστὶν ἱερεύς, οὐχ ὅτι ἐστί τις ἄλλος οὐχ ὕψιστος· ὁ γὰρ θεός, εἷς ὤν, "ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς κάτω, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν αὐτοῦ." ἀλλὰ τῷ μὴ ταπεινῶς κ. χαμαιζήλως, ὑπερμεγέθως δὲ κ. ὑπεραύλως κ. ὑψηλῶς νοεῖν περὶ θεοῦ, ἔμφασιν τοῦ ὑψίστου κινεῖ. From the above passages it will appear, that the fact of the Phœnicians in their polytheism having had one god called עֶלְיוֹן, Elion, or ὕψιστος, see Bl., De Wette: Philo Byblius in Euseb. Præpar. Ev. i. 10, p. 36, cannot be any further apposite here, than in so far as that one may have been the true God, whose worship still lingered up and down in heathen countries. The union of the kingly and priestly offices in one belonged to the simplicity of patriarchal times, and is found in Abraham himself, who offers sacrifice: cf. Gen. xv. and xxii. Bleek cites Serv. ad Æn. iii. 80, "Sane majorum hæc erat consuetudo, ut rex etiam esset sacerdos vel pontifex:" and Arist. Pol. iii. 14, says of the heroic age, στρατηγὸς ἦν κ. δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς κ. τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος. Remember the prophetic announcement Zech. vi. 13, so familiar to every Christian. Our beloved Saviour, as the πατὴρ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, restores again that first blessed family relation, which sin had disturbed), **who met** (ὁ συναντ. would be by far the simpler construction, and in ὃς συν. we must assume an anacoluthon. It is curious to find, even in De Wette, such a remark as this: "ὅς, Lachm. after ADE 2 minuscc., requires no notice, as it mars the construction") **Abraham** (it was, as the narrative in Gen. literally stands, the king of Sodom, who ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν to Abraham: but Melchisedek is mentioned in the same sentence as having brought forth bread and wine, and must be included in the category of those who came out to meet him also) **returning from the defeat of the kings** (all this from the LXX, which only differs in having, κοπῆς τοῦ Χοδολλογομὸρ καὶ τῶν βασ. τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ. κοπή in this sense is Hellenistic, as also is κόπτειν used of 'defeating,' 'cutting up' in war. See Palm and Rost's Lex.) **and blessed him** (Gen. ver. 19: see the argument below, vv. 6, 7), **to whom also Abraham apportioned a tenth of all** (Gen.: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἄβραμ (om. Ἄβρ. A) δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων: "*of all*," viz. the booty which he had taken from the kings: so Jos. Antt. i. 10. 2, τὴν δεκάτην τῆς λείας: and ver. 4 below. In the narrative, the whole has the solemnity of a formal act; of sacerdotal blessing on the part of Melchisedek, and recognition of him as High Priest of God on the part of Abraham. And so the Jews: the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, as cited in Bleek, and Philo, de Abr. § 40, vol. ii. p. 34, ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ . . . τὰ ἐπινίκια ἔθυε. The custom of setting apart the tenth to divine uses, was heathen as well as Jewish: see numerous examples in Wetstein. So far (see the summary above) is purely historical: now follow the inductions from the history: as Chrys., θεὶς τὴν διήγησιν πᾶσαν ἐν συντόμῳ μυστικῶς αὐτὴν ἐθεώρηκε καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος),

-βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστιν [n] βασιλεὺς [mn] εἰρήνης, ³ [o] ἀπάτωρ

n cf. Isa. ix. 6 A.
o here only †. see note.

first indeed being interpreted (i. e. as E. V., "*being by interpretation:*" his name bearing this meaning when translated into Greek) king of righteousness (מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק. So also Josephus, Antt. i. 10. 2, Μελχισεδέκης, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο βασιλεὺς δίκαιος. And again, B. J. vi. 10, ὁ δὲ πρῶτος κτίσας (Ἱεροσόλυμα) ἦν Χαναναίων δυνάστης, ὁ τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ κληθεὶς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος· ἦν γὰρ δὴ τοιοῦτος. And Philo, Leg. Alleg. iii. 25, vol. i. p. 103. Bleek remarks, that βασιλ. δικαιοσύνης not only comes nearer to the Semitic form, but is no doubt purposely chosen, inasmuch as Melchisedek is a prophetic symbol of Him who is not only righteous, but the fount and ground of all righteousness before God. Zech. ix. 9: Isa. ix. 7: Jer. xxiii. 5, 6: Dan. ix. 24: Mal. iv. 2: 1 Cor. i. 30), and next also ('*being*,' not '*being interpreted*,' must be supplied. This is plain from the position of ἑρμηνευόμενος after πρῶτον, and from βασ. Σαλήμ representing a matter of fact, and the interpretation following) King of Salem, which is, King of peace (it has been much disputed, whether Σαλήμ is regarded by the Writer as the name of a town at all, and is not rather a portion of the personal appellation of Melchisedek. This latter has been held by Bleek, after Böhme, and Pet. Cunæus de Rep. Hebræorum, iii. 3, mainly from the consideration that no distinction here is made between the two expressions, 'King of righteousness,' and 'King of peace.' But, as Bl. himself confesses, we may well imagine that the Writer may wish to point out as a remarkable fact, that the city over which Melchisedek reigned, as well as his own name, was of typical significance; and in that case, does not ἔπειτα δὲ καί draw sufficient distinction between his personal appellation and that of his city? As regards the word itself, it appears that שָׁלֵם is the adjective, peaceful, belonging to the substantive שָׁלוֹם, peace. But Philo takes it as here, Legg. Alleg. iii. 25, vol. i. pp. 102 f., καὶ Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλέα τε τῆς εἰρήνης, Σαλήμ, τοῦτο γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται, ἱερέα ἑαυτοῦ πεποίηκεν ὁ θεὸς . . . . καλείσθω οὖν ὁ μὲν τύραννος ἄρχων πολέμου, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἡγεμὼν εἰρήνης, Σαλήμ. '*Peace*' is here used in that pregnant and blessed sense in which Christ is said to be "Prince of peace," Isa. ix. 6: see also Rom. v. 1: Eph. ii. 14, 15, 17: Col. i. 20: οὗτος γὰρ ἡμᾶς δικαίους ἐποίησε, καὶ εἰρηνοποίησε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Chrys. It is peace as the fruit of righteousness, cf. Isa. xxxii. 17: notice the order here, πρῶτον . . . . . βασ. δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ εἰρήνης. "Righteousness and peace," says Delitzsch, "form in O. T. prophecy, the characteristic of the times of the Messiah"), without father, without mother, without genealogy (it is very difficult to assign the true meaning to these predicates. The latter of them seems indeed to represent a simple matter of fact: viz. that Melchisedek *has not in Genesis any genealogy recorded*, by which his descent is shewn (see below). But as to the two former, it cannot well be denied that, while they also may bear a similar sense, viz. that no father and mother of his are recorded in the sacred narrative, it is very possible on the other hand to feel that the Writer would hardly have introduced them so solemnly, hardly have followed them up by such a clause as μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, unless he had coupled with them far higher ideas than the former supposition implies. I confess this feeling to be present in my own mind: —indeed I feel, that such solemn words as μήτε ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ. seem to me to decide against that other supposition. So far I think all is clear: but when we come to enquire, *what* high and mysterious eminence is here allotted to Melchisedek, I own I have no data whereon to decide: nor, I think, is a decision required of us. The Writer assigns to him this mysterious and insulated position, simply as a type of Christ: and this type he is merely by virtue of negations, as far as these epithets are concerned: in what he was *not*, he surpasses earthly priests, and represents Christ: what he *was*, is not in the record. I would regard the epithets then as designedly used in this mysterious way, and meant to represent to us, that Melchisedek was a person differing from common men. It remains to give, 1. an account of each word used: 2. a summary of the opinions respecting the passage. 1. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ occur in two senses: α. of those who *have lost father* or *mother*: so Pollux, Onomast. iii. 2. 4: see Herod. iv. 154: Soph. Trach. 300: Eur. Orest. 304: Herc. Fur. 114 f. This clearly has no place here. β. Of those who, with whatever meaning, can be said *not to have had father* or *mother*: whether it be meant *literally*, as where Plato, Symp. 8, calls the heavenly Aphrodite ἀμήτωρ, Οὐρανοῦ θυγάτηρ: so Διὸς ἀμάτορος Παλλάδος, Eur. Phœn. 676: and in Pollux,

° ἀμήτωρ ° ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

ὁ μὴ ἔχων μητέρα ἀμήτωρ, ὥσπερ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ, καὶ ἀπάτωρ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πατέρα, ὡς Ἥφαιστος (according to a legend that he was the son of Juno alone): see many other examples in Bleek:—or *improperly*, one whose father or mother is unknown, or ignoble—so Ion, Eur. Ion 850, is said to be ἀμήτωρ, ἀναρίθμητος, as being supposed to be the son of a humble slave: and in Horace's "viros nullis majoribus ortos," Sat. i. 6. 10: Cic. de Orat. ii. 64, "quibus nec mater nec pater, tanta confidentia estis?" (Bl. observes that neither the "patre nullo" of Livy iv. 3, nor the ὡς ἀμήτωρ ἀπάτωρ τε γεγώς of Ion 109 can be adduced here, because in the former case there was a myth according to which the word might be literally used of Servius Tullius, and in the latter the ὡς deprives the words of their true meaning. Delitzsch has quoted ἀμήτωρ as used of Sarah by Philo, de Ebriet. 14, vol. i. 365 f.: Quis Rer. Div. Hær. 12, p. 481, "quoniam ejus mater in sacris literis non memoratur" (Mangey): but this is not correct, for in both places Philo states the reason to be a mystical one, because she was related to Abraham by the father's, not by the mother's side.) ἀγενεαλόγητος occurs only here in all Greek literature. It can only mean, '*without genealogy*.' But this has been variously understood. Corn. a-Lapide says, "Per genealogiam accipe prosapiam non tam parentum quam filiorum Melchisedech: nam de patre et matre ejus jam dixerat." "Dicet aliquis," says Estius, "Quorsum addidit, 'sine genealogia,' cum jam dixisset 'sine patre, sine matre:' quæ pars genealogiam satis videbatur exclusisse. Responderi potest, ea parte removeri genus, a quo Melchisedech descendit, id est, majores, non autem genus cujus ipse princeps fuit, id est, posteros ac nepotes. Proinde hujus generis gratia additum esse: 'sine genealogia.' Nam utroque modo *genus* accipi constat, etiam apud Græcos, ut et *generationem* apud Hebræos. Unde est illud Gen. v., 'Hic est liber generationis Adam,' et cap. x., 'Hæ generationes filiorum Noë,' et cap. xi., 'Hæ generationes Tharæ,' cum posteros eorum vellet recensere. Sic quidem Hieronymus hanc partem intellexit, quando eam interpretatur, *sine nuptiis*, lib. i. contra Jovinianum. Per nuptias enim genus in posteros propagatur. Unde et Martyr Ignatius in Epistola ad Philadelphios Melchisedech recenset inter sanctos qui cœlibem vitam duxerunt." But this, which would be at the best but a doubtful deduction from the use of "generatio," is precluded by ver. 6, in which ὁ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν clearly shews that it was ancestry, and not posterity, which was in the view of the Writer. 2. In giving a summary of the exegesis of the passage, I have made free use of the abundant materials at hand in the commentary of Bleek. The circumstance that Melchisedek is here stated to be ἀφωμοιωμένος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, has led many of the older expositors to regard these epithets as belonging to Melchisedek only in so far as he is a type of the Son of God, and as properly true of Him alone, not of Melchisedek, or only in an improper sense, and a subordinate manner. So Œc., ὁ γὰρ τύπος οὐ κατὰ πάντα ἴσος ἐστὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: Schol. Matth., ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡ εἰκὼν ἀμυδροτέρα τοῦ πρωτοτύπου πρὸς ἐμφέρειαν. Accordingly, they understand ἀπάτωρ of Christ in reference to his Humanity (ἀπάτωρ . . ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐκ μόνης γὰρ ἐτέχθη μητρός, τῆς παρθένου φημί. Thdrt.), ἀμήτωρ, in reference to his Divinity (ὡς θεός, ἐκ μόνου γὰρ γεγέννηται πατρός, id.), and so also ἀγενεαλόγητος (οὐ γὰρ χρῄζει γενεαλογίας ὁ ἐξ ἀγεννήτου γεγεννημένος πατρός, id.). And so Chrys., Œc., Thl., Marcus Eremita de Melchisedec, § 4 (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxv. p. 1121), Cosmas Indicopleustes (de Mundo v. in Galland. Bibl. Patr. xi. p. 478), Lactantius, Inst. iv. 13, vol. i. p. 482: Ambros. de Fide iii. 11 (88), vol. ii. p. 513 al. And so Corn. a-Lap., Jac. Cappell., Gerhard, Bisping, al. But, however the word ἀπάτωρ might perhaps be conceded to be not unnaturally applied to Christ in virtue of his Humanity, the words ἀμήτωρ and ἀγενεαλόγητος lie so far off any obvious application to his Divinity, that we may safely say this view could not well have been in the Writer's mind. See further reasons, on the words ἀφωμ. δὲ τῷ υἱ. τ. θεοῦ below, for applying these epithets to Melchisedek, and not to Christ. But *when they are so applied*, we are met by two widely divergent streams of opinion, partly hinted at in the explanation of the rendering given above. The one of these regards Melchisedek as a superhuman being: the other finds nothing in this description which need point him out as any thing beyond a man. Jerome (see Ep. ad Evagr., vol. i. p. 440 ff.) had received from Evagrius an anonymous work (which in all probability was the "Quæstiones in V. et N. Test.," by Hilarius the deacon), in which the "quæstio famosissima super Pontifice Melchisedec" was treated, and the writer tried to prove him "divinioris naturæ fuisse, nec de hominibus æstiman-

τέλος ἔχων, [p] ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει

p here only +. Epist. Jer. 5, 63, 71 only. (-οιον, Prol. Sir.)

dum: et ad extremum ausus est dicere, *Spiritum Sanctum* occurrisse Abrahæ, et ipsum esse qui sub hominis figura visus sit." This strange opinion moved Jerome "revolvere veterum libros, ut videret quid singuli dicerent." And he found that Origen, in his 1st Hom. on Genesis (now lost), maintained him to have been *an angel*, as did Didymus the follower of Origen. Then he examined Hippolytus, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Eus. of Emesa, Apollinarius, Eustathius of Antioch, and found that all these held him to have been *a man* of Canaan, King of Jerusalem, and endeavoured to prove it in different ways. He then mentions the opinion of the Jews, that Melchisedek was *Shem*, the eldest son of Noah; and gives their calculation that this may well have been, for Shem survived Abraham forty years. On this he pronounces no opinion. The view, that Melchisedek was the Holy Ghost, was also entertained by Hieracas the Egyptian, and by a branch of the Theodotian heretics, founded by a younger Theodotus (Epiphan. Hær. lv. vol. i. pp. 468 ff.: Aug. de Hær. c. 34, vol. viii.), and called Melchisedekites: and Marcus Eremita (cir. 400), who wrote a treatise on M., mentions heretics who believed him to be ὁ θεὸς λόγος, πρὶν σαρκωθῆναι ἢ ἐκ Μαρίας γεννηθῆναι. This opinion Epiphanius, Hær. lv. 7, mentions as held by some within the Church: and Ambrose, from his remarks, De Mysteriis ch. 8 (46), vol. ii. p. 337: De Sacram. iv. 3 (12), p. 368 f.: De Abrahamo i. 3 (16), vol. i. p. 288, seems to have held this: though, De Fide as above, he expressly states him to have been merely a holy man, a type of Christ. This last view was ever the prevalent one in the Church. Cyr.-alex., Glaphyr. ii. vol. ii. pp. 46 ff., combats the two opinions that Melchisedek was a vision of the Holy Spirit, and that he was a great angel. In later times the idea that he was the Son of God was revived by Molinæus (Vates, iv. 11 f.), by Cunæus (cited above), by Hottinger (De Decimis Judæorum, p. 15), Gaillard (M. Christus Unicus Rex Pacis, Ludg. Bat. 1686), and others. The theory that he was *Shem* has found many advocates: Lyra, Cajetan, Luther (on Gen. xv.), Melanchthon, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Selden (De Decimis, § 1), al. Jurieu (Histoire Crit. i. 10) believes him to have been *Ham;* Hulse (M. una cum Parente e Tenebris emergens, Lugd. Bat. 1706) and Calmet (Dissert. ii. pp. 271 f.), to have been *Enoch* reappearing on earth. Bleek refers, besides the above, for the general subject, to Deyling, Observv. Sacræ p. ii. pp. 71—87 (edn. 3, Lips. 1733): Fabricii Cod. Pseudepig. O. T. pp. 311—314 (edn. 2, 1722): Calmet, Bibl. Biblioth. pt. iv., where many dissertations are mentioned. A theory which identified Melchisedek with *Job* is mentioned by Wolf, Curæ Phil. in loc., and has recently been revived by Mr. Galloway, in his work, Egypt's Record of Time), **having neither beginning of days nor end of life** (these words are again taken by most Commentators to mean, that of Melchisedek, neither beginning of days nor end of life are related in Scripture. Some, e. g. Beza (as a deduction from the other: "ævi ac proinde sacerdotii"), Camero, Schlicht., Wittich, al., take ἀρχήν for the beginning of his sacerdotal life: others as Camero, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Schleusner, Kuinoel, take τέλος also for the end of his priestly life: "Nullus ante eum defunctus est sacerdotio cui ipse deinde successit . . . . nullus commemoratur ei successisse in sacerdotio: qua in re typus fuit Christi," Camero. But however ζωῆς τέλος may be legitimately thus referred, seeing that his priesthood and his life would expire together, ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν can hardly be understood of any thing but his *natural life*, especially as following ἀπάτωρ, &c., and in the presence of the general biblical usage of αἱ ἡμέραι τινός as a man's lifetime. Accordingly most expositors take the words in this their natural sense and interpret them as above. So Chrys. on Ps. cx. § 8, vol. v. p. 277, οὔτε ἀρχὴν οὖν ἡμερῶν φαίνεται ἔχων οὔτε ζωῆς τέλος ὁ Μ., οὐ τῷ μὴ ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὴ γενεαλογηθῆναι· ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς . . . τῷ καθ' ὅλον μὴ εἶναι ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἀρχὴν χρονικὴν μηδὲ τέλος· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἦν σκιά, τὸ δὲ ἀλήθεια. Similarly Thdrt.: Eranistes, Dial. ii. vol. i. p. 88 f.: Cyr.-alex. Glaph. ii. p. 63: Primasius, who ends, "neque enim sub quo natus est Melchisedek legitur, neque quando mortuus est narratur, sed subito introducitur sicut et Elias." Again however no one, I think, can help feeling that such an interpretation is in fact no worthy acceptation of these solemn words of the sacred Writer. The expressions become incomparably more natural, as Bleek says, if the Writer really meant that M. had not, as mortal men, a definite beginning and end of his life. It really would seem to me almost childish, to say thus solemnly of any whose acts were related

ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ [q] διηνεκές. [4] [r] Θεωρεῖτε δὲ [s] πηλίκος [t] οὗτος,

ABCDK LP[ℵ] a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

q ch. x. 1, 12, 14 only †. Symm. Ps. xlvii. 14 = εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, LXX. Heliod. Æth. i. p. 25, φυγῇ με εἰς τὸ δ. ἐζημίωσαν. (Bl.) (-κῶς, Symm. Ps. xxxvi. 3.) r = here only. (Heb. here only. Paul, never. Histor. Books, freq.) s Gal. vi. 11 only. Zech. ii. 2. t ch. iii. 3. x. 12.

4. πηλ., ηλικος D[1]. om ουτος D[1][-gr] 67[2].

in the O. T., but whose birth and death were not related, that *they had neither beginning of days nor end of life.* Suppose e. g. such a thing were said of Hobab, father-in-law of Moses. Here again Delitzsch, who takes strongly the other view, quotes from Philo an expression respecting Cain which he supposes analogous: ὁ Καῒν οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται, τὸ κακίας σύμβολον, ἣν ἀεὶ δεῖ ζῆν ἐν τῷ θνητῷ γένει παρ' ἀνθρώπους. But surely it is hardly legitimate to conclude that, because Philo means only thus much, the Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews means no more), **but (yea, rather) likened to the Son of God (ἀφομοιόω** (reff.) is a classical word. Plato, Rep. ii. 382 D, ἀφομοιοῦντες τῇ ἀληθεῖ τὸ ψεῦδος: al. in Bl. Aristot. Polit. i., τὰ εἴδη τῶν θεῶν ἑαυτοῖς ἀφομοιοῦνται οἱ ἄνθρωποι. This clause stands alone and pendent, like the preceding, and must not be taken with μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, as Syr. ("sed in similitudinem filii Dei manet sacerdos in æternum:" "but in the likeness of the Son of Aloha standeth his priesthood for ever." Etheridge's version), Schlichting ("assimilatus filio Dei, i. e. illic ubi comparatus est cum Christo. Non enim usquam Scriptura de Melchisedeco seorsim et expresse dixit, eum manere sacerdotem in perpetuum: sed tantum in comparatione cum Christo, in illis nempe verbis de Christo positis, Tu es Sacerdos" &c.). To this there are three objections: 1. it would be extremely unnatural to say that from a text where it is said that the Son of God is a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek, Melchisedek himself derives the character of remaining a priest for ever: 2. it would be but a poor way of proving the eternal priesthood of Christ, to shew that He is a priest after the order of one who only appeared to have, but really had not, such eternal priesthood: and 3. it is clearly not in respect of *priesthood* that the ἀφομοίωσις is here meant, but in respect of the foregoing predicates: for it is as to these only that the Son of God would be an archetype for Melchisedek, seeing that, in respect of priesthood, Melchisedek was chronologically prior to our Lord. So Thdrt., τούτου χάριν (in reference to the ἀΐδιος γέννησις and the ἀθάνατος φύσις of the Son of God) οὐ τὸν δεσπότην χριστὸν τῷ Μελχισεδὲκ ἀφωμοίωσεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν Μ. τῷ χριστῷ· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τούτου τύπος, οὗτος δὲ τοῦ τύπου ἡ ἀλήθεια· ἐν μέντοι τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ, οὐ Μελχισεδὲκ μεμίμηται τὸν δεσπότην χριστόν, ἀλλ' ὁ δεσπότης χριστὸς ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, in loc.: so also Eranistes, Dial. ii. vol. i. p. 88. These very words shew that the Writer does not regard Melchisedek as an *appearance* of the Son of God: and are so adduced by Epiphan. Hær. lv. 7, p. 474: οὐ γάρ τις ἑαυτῷ ὅμοιος γενήσεταί ποτε. The sense is then that Melchisedek, in being ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, personally, not typically, resembles the Son of God—in his personal attributes, as the Son of God subsequently in His incarnation, resembled *him* in His priesthood), **remaineth priest for ever (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές** = εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα above, ch. vi. 20: and see reff. The expression is one which must be interpreted in each case by the context in which it occurs. Thus Sylla and Cæsar were chosen dictators εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, "dictatores perpetui," that is, *for life*: Appian, B. C. i. p. 682. But that is no reason why here, where an eternal priesthood is in question, it should mean *for life*: indeed such meaning would be absurd, seeing that all were priests for life. In that case too, we should not have the present μένει. All kinds of ways have been devised to escape the plain assertion of these words. Most Commentators have had recourse to the same as before, viz. that *no end of his priesthood is related to us in Scripture*: so Œc., Thl., Cyr.-alex., Epiphan., and many moderns. Schlichting takes it, that as our Lord's High Priesthood, which is said to be eternal, will endure to that time when the high-priestly office will cease, so Melchisedek's priesthood is said to endure for ever, "quod et sacerdotium per longum aliquod temporis spatium egerit, et cum ipso veri Dei cultus et notitia inter homines illos extincta fuerit, ita ut sacerdotio, quod quidem vero Deo dicatum foret, nullus inter eos relictus esset locus. In æternum enim aliquid durare dicitur, quod et per longum tempus durat, et tamdiu duret quamdiu natura ipsius rei patitur. Sic David Deum se in æternum laudaturum dixit," &c. Stier says, "He stands in Scripture as a type of an eternal priest:" but the question here is not of *type*, but of *fact*. Tholuck, "He remains, in so far as the type remains in the antitype, in so far as his priesthood remains in Christ," after Primas., Haymo, Thos. Aq.

ᾧ καὶ [u] δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν [v] ἀκροθινίων ὁ [w] πατριάρχης. [5] καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευεὶ τὴν

u ver. 2 reff.
v here only †.
w Acts ii. 29. vii. 8, 9 only. 1 Chron. xxvii. 22.

om και BD[1] fuld[1](with tol) Syr copt [Primas Quæst$_1$]: ins ACD[3]KL[P]א rel [vulg (with am F-lat &c) arm] syr Chr$_1$ Cyr$_1$ [Euthal-ms] Thdrt Damasc Aug$_1$. εδωκεν bef αβρααμ A m syr: om αβρ. c.

5. rec λευι, with AD[2.3]KL rel: txt BCD[1]א.

But thus type and antitype are hopelessly confounded. Christ is to be proved to be a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek. Can we conceive then that the Writer, in setting forth what the order and attributes of Melchisedek are, should go back to Christ to find them? Again, to shew to what shifts interpreters have been reduced here, Jac. Cappellus, Pyle, Peirce, and Storr, actually understand ὅς before μένει, and construe, "*made like to the Son of God, who abideth*" &c. Every thing shews that which has been maintained all through this difficult passage, that the assertions are made, and this chief one is above all made, simply of Melchisedek, and they are, as matters of fact, inferred and laid down by the sacred Writer from the historic notices of him. What further inference lies from such dignity being here put on Melchisedek, is not, as I before said, for us to enquire: certainly, none which can in any way interfere with Christ's eternal and sole priesthood, can be correct. It is one of those things in which we must not be wise above that which is written, but must take simply and trustingly the plain sense of our Bibles on a deep and mysterious subject, and leave it for the day when all shall be clear, to give us full revelation on the matter. See on the whole, Bleek's long and interesting note, to which I must again acknowledge my obligations, and with which in the main I agree, against most expositors, and among them De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann, Ebrard, and Delitzsch). 4—10.] See summary at ver. 1. *The Melchisedek priesthood greater than the Levitical, shewn by the fact that Melchisedek received tithes of Abraham and blessed him* (4—8), *and potentially, in Abraham, Levi* (9, 10). 4.] **But observe** (some take θεωρεῖτε indicative, but the imperative seems far better, both with regard to the sense of the verb, and the requirements of the context. The δέ also tends to sharpen up the verb. The distinction between θεωρέω and ὁράω, as *behold* and *see*, is, it is true, not always observed (see Luke xxiv. 39: John iv. 19; xii. 19: Acts xvii. 22), still less that laid down in Phavorinus, ὁρῶ μὲν ἐπὶ σώματος, θεωρῶ δὲ ἐπὶ ψυχῆς: but where the context plainly allows of the distinction, it ought to be borne in mind: so Demosth. p. 19. 23, θεωρῶν καὶ σκοπῶν εὑρίσκω: 93. 9, θεωρεῖτε γὰρ τὸ παρὸν πρῶτον ὃ γίνεται: Ceb. Tab. 38, σὺ τοίνυν οὕτω θεώρησον: and other examples in Bleek) **how great** ('quantus qualisque,' of what dignity and personal excellence) **this man** (**was**) (let it be noticed that the argument still puts forward the personal dignity of Melchisedek, in a way quite inconsistent with the commonly received interpretation of the predicates above), **to whom Abraham paid tithes also** (went so far as to pay tithes, the καί belonging to δεκάτην ἔδωκεν, and of these, rather to δεκάτην, separated as it is from its verb), **from the best** (**of the spoil**) (τὰ ἀκροθίνια, neut. plur. from ἀκροθίνιος,—literally that which comes from the top of an heap, and so the first-fruits, usually of spoils: Bl. quotes from the Schol. on Eur. Phœn. 213, ἀκροθίνια κυρίως αἱ τῶν καρπῶν ἀπαρχαί, παρὰ τὸν θῖνα, ὅ ἐστι, τὸν σῶρον τῆς ἅλω, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ λέγονται καὶ αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ τῆς λείας. So Herod. viii. 121, πρῶτα μὲν νῦν τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἐξεῖλον ἀκροθίνια ἄλλα τε καὶ τριήρεας τρεῖς Φοινίσσας, and 122, πέμψαντες δὲ ἀκροθίνια οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐς Δελφούς. See many more examples in Wetst., Elsner, and Kypke. And in consequence, some have pressed here the proper meaning, and understood, that Abraham gave to Melchisedek the tenth of that portion of the spoil which was already set apart for God. But, considering that these words merely take up δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων of ver. 2 and of Genesis, it is more natural to understand τὰ ἀκροθίνια in a wider and less proper sense, of the booty itself, as indeed all booty brought away might be considered as the primitiæ, the choice part, in contradistinction to the more worthless portion which was left behind. This general sense does not indeed appear in classic Greek, nor elsewhere in Hellenistic: and when Hesych. and Phavorinus give as alternative meanings, σκῦλα, and τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν πολέμων λάφυρα, it is probable that this passage was before them. So that Bleek, with Hammond and Grotius, would understand, after Thl., ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων τῶν κρειττόνων καὶ τιμιωτέρων. This he thinks is favoured by the ἐκ, which rather indicates that whereof the tithe consisted, than that of which (ἀπό) it was the tithe), the

x Luke i. 9 only. Exod. xxix. 9 al. (-τεύειν, Luke i. 8. -τευμα, 2 Pet. i. 5, 9.)
y Luke xix. 12. Rev. xvii. 12. see ch. v. 4.

x ἱερατείαν y λαμβάνοντες, z ἐντολὴν z ἔχουσιν a ἀποδεκατοῖν τὸν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, b τουτέστιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, c καίπερ d ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς de ὀσφύος

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

z John xiv. 21. 1 John iv 21. a Matt. xxiii. 23. Luke xi. 42. xviii. 12 only. Gen. xxviii. 22. Deut. xiv. 22. constr., 1 Kings viii. 15. 17. (δεκ., ver. 6.) b ch. ii. 14 reff. c ch. v. 8 reff. d here only. Gen. xxxv. 11. 2 Chron. vi. 9. e = Acts ii. 30. ver. 10 (Matt. iii. 4 || Mk. Luke xii. 35. Eph. vi. 14. 1 Pet. i. 13) only.

rec αποδεκατουν, with ACD[2·3]KL[P]ℵ rel : txt BD[1]. om τουτεστιν B[1](ins B[2]).

patriarch (added at the end of the sentence to emphasize the title: *'and he, the illustrious patriarch:'* οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὁ 'Αβραάμ, ὁ τοσοῦτος, ὁ πατριάρχης· οὐκ ἀλόγως γὰρ τὸ πατριάρχης προσέθηκεν, ἀλλ' ἵν' ἐξάρῃ τὸ πρόσωπον. Thl. Tholuck has noticed the full rhythm of the word itself, as forming the foot called Ionicus a minore, with which, and the Pæon tertius, orators love to end their sentences. "The word **πατριάρχης** is Hellenistic: formed from ἀρχή and πατριά, the last in the Hellenistic sense denoting single families and lines of descent, the minor subdivisions of races. It is often found in the LXX version of the Chronicles for the heads of these families. Later however it was used to signify also the head and originator of a race; in Acts vii. 8, 9, it is used of the twelve sons of Jacob, as heads of the tribes; in 4 Macc. vii. 19, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; in Acts ii. 29, of David." Bleek). 5.] *Continuation of ver. 4, setting forth the reason of the* **πηλίκος**. **And** ('et quidem:' the E. V. "and verily," is rather too strong) **they of the sons of Levi who receive the priesthood** (or, and perhaps more properly, *'they of the sons of Levi, when they receive the priesthood:'* in either case meaning the family of Aaron, not as Wolf, al., the whole tribe of Levi, which indeed was appointed by God to receive tithes, see Num. xviii. 20: the words **οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λ.** will not admit of this interpretation. The Writer speaks of the custom, whereby not all the Levites, but the priests only, received tithes. **λαμβάνοντες**, as frequently, 'capessentes,' taking as of course and right: Xen. Cyr. i. 5. 2, ὁ δὲ Κυαξάρης . . . . τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε τῶν Μήδων. **ἱερατείαν**, the office of priest: mostly a late word, Dion. Hal., al.: but also found in Aristot. Pol. vii. 8, τὴν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμέλειαν, ἣν καλοῦσιν ἱερατείαν. In vv. 11, 12, 24, ἱερωσύνη is used in the same sense. If any distinction is to be made between the two words, it would rather seem to be the opposite of that laid down by Schulz and others: ἱερατεία seems more to denote the *service* of the priest, ἱερωσύνη the *office* and *power*. So in Aristot. above: so Herod. iii. 142, ἱερωσύνην . . . αἱρεῦμαι αὐτῷ τε ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖσι ἀπ' ἐμεῦ αἰεὶ γινομένοισι, τοῦ Διὸς τ. 'Ελευθερίου,—and Demosth. p. 1313. 20, προεκρίθην ἐν τοῖς εὐγενεστάτοις κληροῦσθαι τῆς ἱερωσύνης τῷ 'Ηρακλεῖ) **have commandment to take tithes of** (**δεκατεύω** is the Greek form, **-όω** the Hellenistic. See reff.) **the people according to the law** (the words **κατὰ τὸν νόμον** have been joined by Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, al., to τὸν λαόν: "the (people according to law):" i. e. either God's people, who were under the law, or those who according to the law were the λαός, in distinction from the priests and Levites, as οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ λαός, Exod. xix. 24. But, though an article after λαόν would not be, as commonly supposed, absolutely required in such a construction (witness οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν χριστῷ, τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα, and the like), yet it is difficult to imagine the construction without it here. Bleek would refer the words to ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν, justifying it by ch. ix. 19, λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑπὸ Μωυσέως, where however it is far better to join it with λαληθείσης. If it there belonged to πάσης ἐντολῆς, we should certainly expect either τῆς, or τῶν, κατὰ τὸν νόμον. The commandment referred to, on the ordinary construction of the first words of the verse would be Num. xviii. 20—32. But it seems more natural to understand those first words as I have given them in the alternative there, and then κατὰ τὸν νόμον falls into its place easily: 'Those of the sons of Levi, when they are invested with the priesthood, receive commandment to tithe the people according to the law.' On the ways in which the right of tithe was understood at different times, and how it became at length attached to the priesthood only, see Bleek's note), **that is, their brethren, though come out of the loins of Abraham** (the formula **ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφ.** for to spring from, as an ancestor, is only Hellenistic, arising from the rendering by the LXX of the Heb. יָצָא מֵחֲלָצַיִם, as in reff. Compare ἐκ τῶν πλευρῶν σου, 3 Kings viii. 19; ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ, Gen. xlvi. 26.

The meaning is very difficult to assign. Certainly it cannot be as Bleek, after

Ἀβραάμ· [6] ὁ δὲ μὴ [f] γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν [g] δεδεκάτωκεν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τὸν [h] ἔχοντα τὰς [hi] ἐπαγγελίας [k] εὐλόγηκεν. [7] [l] χωρὶς δὲ πάσης [m] ἀντιλογίας [n] τὸ [o] ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ [p] κρείττονος [k] εὐλογεῖται. [8] καὶ ὧδε μὲν [q] δεκάτας ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι [r] λαμβάνουσιν· ἐκεῖ δέ, [s] μαρτυρού-

f here only. 1 Chron. v. 1. Herod. ii. 146. iii. 75 al. (-γία, 1 Tim. i. 4. see ver. 3.)
g here and ver. 9 only. Neh. x. 37 only. (ἀποδεκ., ver. 5.)
h 2 Cor. vii. 1. i plur., ch. vi. 12 reff. k ver. 1. l ch. iv. 15 reff. m = ch. vi. 16. n neut., 1 Cor. i. 27, 28. Gal. iii. 22 al. o John ii. 10. Rom. ix. 12 (from Gen. xxv. 23) only. adv., 1 Tim. v. 9 only. p ch. i. 4 reff. q ver. 2 reff. r = Matt. xvii. 24. xxi. 34. Exod. xxx. 16. s ver. 17. ch. xi. 2, 4, 5, 39. Rom. iii. 21. 1 Tim. v. 10 al.

6. rec ins τον bef αβρααμ, with AD[2.3]KL[P]א[3] rel Chr Thdrt Damasc: om BCD[1]א[1] 17. ευλογησεν AC[P 47 Euthal-ms] Chr$_1$.—ηυλ. AD[1].

Böhme, "Abrahamidas quidem, sed fratres tamen:" for this quite reverses the τουτέστιν and καίπερ. I take this to be intended: by the first clause, **τουτέστιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν**, that the Levitical tithe right was all within the limits of one race, a privilege 'de Abrahamide in Abrahamidem,' and therefore less to be wondered at, and involving less difference between man and man, than the tithe right of Melchisedek over Abraham, one of different race, and indeed over all his progeny with him. Then the second clause, **καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβρ.**, is inserted to shew the deep subjection of the ordinary Abrahamid to the Melchisedek priesthood, seeing that, notwithstanding his privilege of descent, he was subjected to his own priest, his brother, who in turn paid tithes in Abraham to Melchisedek).

6.] **But** (apodosis to μέν, ver. 5), **he whose pedigree is never** (see below) **reckoned from them** (contrast—*οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευεί,—ὁ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν*: also speaking for the connexion above advocated in ver. 5. The present part. gives the sense, '*who is not in the habit of having his genealogy made out*' . . ., whose descent no one thinks of deducing. This is also indicated by the subjective μή. Had it been οὐ (as *οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι*, 1 Pet. ii. 10) it would denote the mere matter of fact,—'of whom no such genealogy exists.' This is better than with Winer, edn. 6, § 55. 5, to regard the μή as only a stronger form of negation. The verb is good Greek: the Egyptian priests in Herodotus, Ἑκαταίῳ γενεηλογήσαντι ἑωϋτὸν . . . . ἀντεγενεηλόγησαν κ.τ.λ., ii. 143, see also ib. 146; and in Xen. Symp. iv. 51, we have γενεαλογοῦσι τὴν συγγένειαν. **ἐξ αὐτῶν**, viz. τῶν υἱῶν Λευεί: not as Epiphan. Hær. lxvii. 7, p. 716, a-Lapide, al., τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, nor as Grot., from *Levi and Abraham*: and it means '*from* them,' i. e. their line of descent) **hath taken tithes of Abraham** (not *took*, aor. The sentence is cast into this form, because of the *enduring nature* of the office and priesthood of Melchisedek, which is given by the perfect tense. Doubtless the perfect might be used without any such reference, meaning, 'as the fact now stands:' indicating, as Winer, § 40. 4, that the fact endures in its significance: see below, ver. 9: but considering the connexion here, I prefer supposing it to have been intended) **and hath blessed the possessor of the promises** (Klee would urge the present sense of the participle; "*him who now possesses the promises;*" but there seems to be no necessity for this. I should rather take **ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐπαγ.** for a quasi-official designation of Abraham (see on ch. vi. 12) as the *possessor of* the promises. As to the sense, Œc. has well expressed it: ἐξῆρε τὸν Ἀβραάμ, ἵνα πλεῖον ἐξάρῃ τὸν Μελχισεδέκ):

7.] **and** (our English '*and*' is the nearest to this use of **δέ**, which is a faint '*but*,' introducing merely a new proposition. Were it not in the middle of a sentence, '*now*' after a period would best give its sense) **without all controversy** (*πάντες δὲ κοινῶς καὶ ἀναντιῤῥήτως οἴδαμεν*. Thl. See on ch. vi. 16), **the less is blessed by the better** (the neuters here serve entirely to generalize, as in τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε, 2 Thess. ii. 6, taken up by ὁ κατέχων, ver. 7: see reff.; and Winer, § 27. 5. So Thuc. iii. 11, τὰ κράτιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑποδεεστέρους ξυνεπῆγον: Xen. Anab. vii. 3. 11. On κρείττων, see note, ch. i. 4. It is obvious that the axiom here laid down only holds good where the blessing is a solemn and official one, as of a father, or a priest: as was the case here. In such cases the blesser stands in the place of God, and as so standing is of superior dignity).

8.] *Second item of superiority*, in that M.'s is an *enduring*, the Levitical a *transitory* priesthood. **And here indeed** (**ὧδε**, 'ut res nunc se habent:' the Levitical priesthood being still in existence in the Writer's time: *οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὧδε, τουτέστιν, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαμβάνοντες δεκάτας.* Thl.) **men who die** (**ἀποθν.** first for emphasis as bringing out the point of the argument: but there is also a secondary emphasis on **ἄνθρωποι**: *men*, who *die*. Otherwise it

t here only. Sir. xliv. 5 only. (see note.)
u ver. 5 reff.
v ver. 1 reff.
w ch. viii. 4 only.
x Luke i. 45 only †.
(Exod. xxix. 26. Jer. ii. 3.) see ch. ii. 10 reff. and note.

μενος ὅτι ζῇ. [9] καὶ ὡς [t] ἔπος εἰπεῖν, δι' Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Λευεὶς ὁ [q] δεκάτας [r] λαμβάνων [s] δεδεκάτωται· [10] ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ [u] ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν ὅτε [v] συνήντησεν αὐτῷ Μελχισεδέκ. [11] [w] εἰ [w] μὲν [w] οὖν [x] τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευειτικῆς

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

9. for ειπειν, ειπεν C[1] D[1][-gr]. (δι', so BD[1]ℵ c m [47].) rec (for λευεις) λευι, with C[3]DKL[P]ℵ[1] rel [vulg copt]: λευις A: txt BC[1]ℵ[3] [basm].
10. [αυτου P.] rec ins ο bef μελχισεδεκ, with AC[3]D[3]KL[P] rel [Chr-montf Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]: om BC[1]D[1]ℵ [47 Chr-ms[1]].
11. for ει, η CL[1][P]. rec λευιτικ., with ACKL[P] rel: txt BDℵ.

need not have been expressed: see below) **receive tithes** (plur. as we also use the word, signifying the different sorts of tenths taken of different things): **but there** (ἐκεῖ δέ, τουτέστιν ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μελχισεδὲκ πράγματι, Thl.), **one of whom it is testified** (ἄνθρωπος is not again expressed, nor is it to be supplied. The mysterious character of Melchisedek is still before the Writer. It is hardly needful to say that *Christ* cannot be meant, as Justiniani, Jac. Cappellus, Heinsius, and Pyle have imagined. This passive sense of **μαρτυροῦμαι** (reff.) is unknown in classical Greek. The testimony meant is certainly that of *scripture;* probably, that in Ps. cx. 4, where an eternal priesthood, and therefore duration, is predicated of Melchisedek. So Thdrt., Bleek, al. It cannot well be, as Calv., Est., Drusius, Grot., Wolf, Bengel, Bisping, al., the mere negative fact of his death not being recorded, which would not amount to a testimony that he lives: and it is improbable that in so express a word as μαρτυρούμενος the Writer should, as Böhme, al. imagine, intend to combine both the positive testimony and the inference from the omission) **that he liveth** (this clearly cannot be interpreted of the *priesthood* of Melchisedek enduring, as Œc.: ἢ ἁπλούστερον δέξαι τὸ εἰρημένον, ὅτι ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἱερωσύνης τῶν μὲν Λευϊτῶν, ἀποθνήσκει· καὶ γὰρ ἐπαύσατο, τῆς ἀληθείας φανείσης· ὁ δὲ τοῦ Μελχισεδὲκ ζῇ· ζῇ γάρ: for what is here said is eminently personal, and that Melchisedek himself is meant, is shewn by the historical reference to the fact of his receiving tithes of Abraham. As Bleek well remarks, if ἀποθνήσκοντες applies personally to the sons of Levi, ζῇ must also apply personally to Melchisedek). 9.] The Jew might reply, that it was nothing to him, if Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedek: for Abr. was no priest, and therefore paid tithes naturally to a priest: the Writer therefore proceeds to a *third proof,* shewing that *in Abrahàm even Levi himself,* the patriarch of the Jewish priesthood, *paid tithes.* So Chrys., Thdrt. **And so to speak** (τὸ δέ, **ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν,** ἢ τοῦτο σημαίνει, ὅ τι καὶ ἐν συντόμῳ εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τόλμημα ἐδόκει τὸ εἰπεῖν ὅτι ὁ Λευΐ μήπω εἰς γένεσιν παραχθεὶς ἐδεκατώθη παρὰ τοῦ Μελχισεδέκ, ἐκόλασε τοῦτο. Thl. The former of these meanings, '*in a word,*' is taken by Camerarius, Jac. Cappellus, Erasmus Schmid, Elsner; the latter by vulg. ("*ut ita dictum sit*"), Erasm., Luther, Beza, Schlichting, Grot., and most Commentators. Bleek has gone into both these meanings, and proved by many examples that either is legitimate. Both in fact run into one. The phrase is used when any thing is about to be said that is unexpected, or somewhat strained, not likely to be universally recognized, at least in the general way in which it is asserted. So sometimes it is used for 'roughly,' 'improperly'—Plato, Legg. ii. 656 E, μυριοστὸν ἔτος .... **οὐχ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν** μυριοστόν, **ἀλλ' ὄντως.** So that it may be here regarded as introducing and softening a strong saying: as Thl. above) **by means of Abraham** (Ἀβρ. is genitive, not accusative, as Aug. de Genesi ad lit. x. 19 (34), vol. iii. pt. ii., "*propter Abraham,*" and Phot. (διὰ τὸν δεκατωθέντα Ἀβραάμ)) **Levi also, who receiveth tithes** (who is the head and representative of the tithe-taking tribe. Indeed the name here is almost a collective one, the personal reference being taken up in the next clause), **hath been taken tithes of** (on the perfect, see above, ver. 6): 10.] **for he was yet in the loins of his father** (i. e. his forefather, Abraham: for Isaac was not yet born, much less Jacob. But we need not hence understand τοῦ πατρός to mean "*the patriarch,*" as, strange to say, Bleek does. On the expression cf. ver. 5) **when Melchisedek met him** (on the questions, for the most part unprofitable (cf. **ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν**), which have been raised on this proof, see Bleek, Ebrard, and Owen. It may fairly be replied to one of them, whether *Christ also did not pay tithe in Abraham,* that He never was in the loins of an earthly father).

11—25.] *Further proofs of the perfec-*

[y] ἱερωσύνης ἦν, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ [z] ἐπ' αὐτῆς [a] νενομοθέτηται, τίς ἔτι [b] χρεία κατὰ τὴν [c] τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἕτερον [d] ἀν-

y vv. 12, 24 only. 1 Chron. xxix. 22. Esdr. v. 38 al4.

z = here only. Exod. xxxiv. 27. (see note.) a ch. viii. 6 (also pass.) only. Ps. xxiv. 8 al. (-θέτης, James iv. 12. -θεσία, Rom. ix. 4.) b Luke x. 42. Sir. iii. 22. c ch. v. 6 reff. d = Acts iii. 22, 26 al. Rom. xv. 12, from Isa. xi. 10.

om ην B. rec (for αυτης) αυτη, with D³KL rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc Œc]: αυτην k o [Euthal-ms]: txt ABCD¹[LP]א m 17 Cyr₁. rec νενομοθετητο, with D³KL rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt ABCD¹[P]א 17 [47 Euthal-ms] Cyr₁. aft τις ins γαρ D¹[-gr].

tion of Christ's priesthood, as compared with the Levitical: (11—14) *in that He sprang from a tribe not recognized as a priestly one by the law, thus setting aside the law:* (15—19) *in that He was constituted priest not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life, thus impugning the former commandment as weak and unprofitable:* (20–22) *in that He was made with an oath, they without one:* (23, 24) *in that they by reason of their transitoriness were many, He, one and unchangeable.*

11.] **If again** (this seems the nearest English expression to εἰ μὲν οὖν. It takes up the reasoning, not from the point immediately preceding, but from the main line of argument, of which what has just preceded has been merely a co-ordinate illustration. So that it is not necessary to say here, as some have attempted to do, from what point in the preceding chapters the reasoning is resumed. The main line of thought is again referred to, dependently on the promise of Ps. cx. 4, as made to our Lord and verified in Him) **perfection** (in the widest sense: *the bringing of man to his highest state*, viz. that of salvation and sanctification: see on ver. 19, οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος. Commentators have too much limited it: Grot. understands *perfection of priesthood* ("quod in genere sacerdotii perfectissimum est"): Primasius and Beza, *moral perfection:* Estius, Schlichting, al., *perfect remission of sins.* But manifestly these two latter are included in the idea, which is a far more extensive one than either) **were** (ἦν may be rendered either by the imperf. subj. or pluperf. subj. The former, '*if perfection were*,' would imply '*it is not*:' the latter, '*if perfection had been*,' would imply, '*it was not*.' The difficulty of deciding here arises from the apodosis being given in an elliptic form, viz. in that of a question in which the verb is left out) **by means of** (could be brought about by the instrumentality of) **the Levitical priesthood** (on ἱερωσύνη, see note, ver. 5),—**for upon it** (i. e. τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης: not as, reading ἐπ' αὐτῇ, many Commentators, τελειώσει, *for the sake of obtaining perfection.* Three meanings are legitimate for ἐπ' αὐτῆς. 1. *Concerning it*, it being the objective basis or substratum of the νομοθέτησις: as in οὐ λέγει . . . . ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, Gal. iii. 16: σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων, John vi. 2. This is taken by Schlichting, Grot., Bleek. So 'disserere' or 'scribere *super* se.' 2. *In its time*, as ἐπ' Ὀλυμπιάδος, ἐπ' ἄρχοντος. 3. *On its ground*, it being the subjective basis or substratum of the νομοθέτησις: it being presupposed, and the law-giving proceeding on it as ex concesso. This is taken with slight variations, by De Wette, Lünemann, Ebrard, al. And this seems most agreeable to the sense. For (1) would seem hardly to account for the insertion of the parenthesis at all: that the law was enacted *concerning* the priesthood, would certainly be no reason for here introducing it: still less would the *form* of the parenthesis thus be accounted for, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς νενομ., see below: and (2) again, being a mere notice of date, would not account for the occurrence of the parenthesis. But if we consider the priesthood as the basis on which the law was constructed, so that not the priests only, but the *people* also (cf. the same παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, πάντα τὸν λαόν, in ch. ix. 19) were involved in the question of the dignity and finality of the priesthood, then a sufficient reason seems to be gained for inserting the parenthesis: q. d. not only they, but the whole system of which the priesthood was the basis and centre) **the people** (emphatic: not ἐπ' αὐτῆς γὰρ ὁ λαός, but ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς: see above) **hath received the law** (the verb νομοθετεῖν is common both in classical and Hellenistic Greek. It is used sometimes with a dative of the person, so Xen. Apol. 15, περὶ Λυκούργου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίοις νομοθετήσαντος,—sometimes with an accus. of the thing, so Xen. Rep. Laced. v. 1, ἃ μὲν οὖν ἑκάστῃ ἡλικίᾳ ἐνομοθέτησεν ὁ Λυκοῦργος. The use of the passive hence is obvious: and although not justified by Greek usage, finds a parallel in such expressions as πιστεύομαί τι, εὐαγγελίζομαι, &c.: see Winer, § 39. 1, edn. 6. The LXX use the word rather differently, for *to teach:* e. g. Ps. xxiv. 8, νομοθετήσει ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐν ὁδῷ,—ver. 12, νομοθετήσει αὐτῷ ἐν ὁδῷ: Ps. cxviii. 33, νομοθέτησόν με κύριε τὴν ὁδὸν τῶν δικαιωμάτων σου. The perfect is used, as indicating

ἵστασθαι ἱερέα, καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν [c] τάξιν Ἀαρὼν [e] λέγεσθαι; 12 [f] μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς [g] ἱερωσύνης, [h] ἐξ [h] ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου [i] μετάθεσις γίνεται. 13 [k] ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ λέγεται ταῦτα φυλῆς ἑτέρας [l] μετέσχηκεν, [m] ἀφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς [n] προσέσχηκεν

ABCDK LPℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

e ch. iii. 15. ix. 2, 3 al. f Acts vii. 16. Gal. i. 6. ch. xi. 5 bis. Jude 4 only. Deut. xxvii. 17. μετατίθεσθαι νόμους, Plato, Minos, p. 316 c. Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 14. g ver. 11. h 2 Cor. ix. 7 only. κατ' ἀν., Philem. 14. i ch. xi. 5. xii. 27 only †. 2 Macc. xi. 24 only. k = Mark ix. 12, 13. Rom. iv. 9. l ch. ii. 14 reff. m = John i. 46. xi. 1. xix. 38. n intr., 1 Tim. iii. 8. iv. 13. οἱ προσχόντες (τοῖς ναυτικοῖς), Thuc. i. 15.

[for ου, μη P.]
12. om και νομου B.
13. λεγει D¹. for προσεσχηκεν, προσεσχεν AC 17: μετεσχε [P] k: μετεσχηκεν a o: txt BDKLℵ rel [Chr₁ Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc].

the fact that the people was still remaining and observing the law),—**what further need (was there)** (what need *after that,—any longer*, that being so: so Sext. Empir. cited by Wetst.: εἰ δὲ ἅπαξ ἐξ ὑποθέσεως λαμβάνεταί τινα, καί ἐστι πιστά, τίς ἔτι χρεία ἀποδεικνύναι αὐτά;) **that a different priest** (ἕτερον, more than ἄλλον—not only another, but of a different kind) **should arise** (Herod. iii. 66, Σμέρδιν .. βασιλέα ἀνεστεῶτα. See reff. There is no idea in it of suddenness or unexpectedness, as Böhme (not Tholuck in his last edn.)), **after the order of Melchisedek, and that he** (the priest that should arise) **is said to be not after the order of Aaron** (there have been various views as to the construction. Some, as Faber Stap., Luther, al., take the whole as one sentence only, thus: τίς ἔτι χρεία λέγεσθαι κατὰ τ. τάξ. Μ. ἕτ. ἀνίστ. ἱερέα, κ. οὐ κατὰ τ. τάξ. Ἀαρ., "*what further need was there for it to be said that another priest should arise, after Melchisedek's, and not after Aaron's order?*" But thus we should have expected ἀνίστ. to be *future* (this perhaps is not decisive, but notwithstanding Tholuck's protest against Bleek, I cannot help still believing it would have been so): besides that the transposition of the infinitives is very harsh (Tholuck tries to justify this by ὅσῳ . . . τοσούτῳ τὸ τί χρὴ ποιεῖν συμβουλεῦσαι χαλεπώτερον εἶναι, Demosth. p. 66. But the case is not parallel, inasmuch as there is no ambiguity in it). Besides which, ἑτέρα can hardly have any other meaning than that in ver. 15, not = ἄλλος, but implying diversity of nature and order: in which case it cannot be the subject to λέγεσθαι, which has κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών for its predicate, thus nullifying the ἕτερον. So that we must either take λέγεσθαι impersonal, '*that it is said*,' or, which is preferable, supply as above, '*that he* (the coming priest) *is said*.' οὐ would more naturally be μή, in a sentence expressing necessity, which of itself involves a judgment, see Hartung, Partikell. ii. 125. But in such cases οὐ may stand where the denial is carried in the particle itself, which seems to bring out a negative expression as set over against a positive one: e.g. Aristoph. Eccles. 581, ἀλλ' οὐ μέλλειν ἀλλ' ἅπτεσθαι καὶ δὴ χρὴ τὰς διανοίας: Thuc. i. 51, ὑποτοπήσαντες ἀπ' Ἀθηνῶν εἶναι οὐχ ὅσας ἑώρων ἀλλὰ πλείους. So here the οὐ must be closely joined with κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρ., not with λέγεσθαι: or we must with Bleek suppose that χρεία ἦν or ἠδύνατο is to be supplied with οὐ)?

12.] **For if the priesthood is changed** (better thus than E. V., "*the priesthood being changed*," which gives the reader the idea of μετατιθείσης), **there takes place of necessity a change of the law** (not '*of law*,' which would be decidedly wrong, and would require τοῦ νόμου, as in a general sentence, implying 'the law' of the particular case in view; νόμου, anarthrous, means that law, which had already begun to be used as a proper name, the well-known law of Moses) **also** (viz. of that law, which, as above, is legislated upon the ground of that priesthood: not, as Beza, Grot., al., of the *law of the priesthood* only, nor as Calvin, a-Lapide, Jac. Cappell., Böhme, Kuinoel, al., of the *ceremonial law* only. Chrys. says rightly: εἰ δὲ ἕτερον δεῖ ἱερέα εἶναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑτέραν ἱερωσύνην, ἀνάγκη καὶ νόμον ἕτερον εἶναι· τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας· τί ἔδει καινῆς διαθήκης; The connexion is with the parenthesis in ver. 11, which was inserted to prepare the way for our verse. Bleek, De Wette, al. deny the reference to the parenthetical clause in ver. 11, and regard our verse as preparing the way for what follows: "It lays down the ground, why not without urgent cause a change of the priesthood took place" (De W.), that cause being that the law itself was to be abrogated. The Writer as yet expresses himself mildly and cautiously: the μετάθεσις here in fact amounts to the ἀθέτησις in ver. 18, but is not yet so expressed).

13.] *Confirmation of the position that a change is made in the law, by another fact indicative of a change in the priesthood.* **For He with reference to**

τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· [14] [o] πρόδηλον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα [p] ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ [q] Κύριος ἡμῶν, [r] εἰς ἣν φυλὴν περὶ ἱερέων οὐδὲν Μωυσῆς ἐλάλησεν. [15] καὶ [s] περισσότερον ἔτι [t] κατάδηλόν ἐστιν, [u] εἰ [vw] κατὰ τὴν [wx] ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδὲκ [y] ἀνίσταται

o 1 Tim. v. 24 only †. Judith viii. 29. 2 Macc. iii. 17. xiv. 39 only.
p intr., Matt. iv. 16. Mark xvi. 2. James i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 19. Gen. xix. 25 al. see Zech. iii. 9.
q see ch. ii. 3. xiii. 20.
r = Acts ii. 26. Eph. v. 32. 1 Pet. i. 11 only.
s ch. vi. 17 reff.
t here only †. Herod. iii. 68. Xen. Mem. i. 4. 14.
u = Matt. vii. 11. John vii. 23. x. 35.
v = Gal. iv. 28. Lam. i. 12.
w ch. iv. 15 only. Gen. i. 11, 12.
x as above (w). Wisd. xiv. 19 only.
y ver. 11.

14. rec ουδ. π. ιερωσυνης, with D[3]KL rel syrr [æth Chr-montf, Thdrt Damasc]: π. ιερωσ. ουδεν [C[3]]D[2]: txt ABC[1]D[1][P]ℵ[3] 17 arm[: ουδ. π. ιερεων 47 vulg(and F-lat) coptt] Chr-mss, Cyr$_1$.—μωυσης bef ουδεν ℵ[1].
15. om την B.

whom (cf. reff.: and ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶν εἰπεῖν, Plato, Legg. ii. p. 667 D) **these things** (viz. the promise in Ps. cx.: not, these which I am now saying) **are said, is member of** (*hath taken part in:* the perfect implying the enduring of His humanity) **a different tribe** (from that of Levi, which has been already sufficiently indicated in the preceding context), **of which** (sprung from which, coming from which, see reff.) **no one hath** (ever, to this day) **given attention** (applied himself, see ch. ii. 1, note; and reff. So Demosth. p. 10. 25, τῷ πολέμῳ προσέχειν: Xen. Mem. iv. 1. 2, ταχὺ μανθάνειν οἷς προσέχοιεν: Polyæn. p. 415, ταῖς γεωργίαις προσεῖχον) **to the altar** (i. e. as a general and normal practice, had any thing to do with the service of the priesthood).

14.] *Proof of ver.* 13. **For it is plain to all** (πρόδηλον, of that which lies before men's eyes, plain and undoubted. τὸ πρόδηλον, ὡς ἀναντίῤῥητον τέθεικε, Thdrt. Jos. B. J. ii. 3. 1, πρόδηλον ἦν τὸ ἔθνος οὐκ ἠρεμῆσον: and other examples in Wetst. and Bleek) **that our Lord** (this is the only place in Scripture where Christ is called by this appellation, now so familiar to us, without the addition of either His personal or official name. 2 Pet. iii. 15, τὴν μακροθυμίαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, is hardly an exception: see there) **hath arisen** (some have thought that this word, which, as an intransitive verb, is generally used of the heavenly bodies, has reference to our Lord's rising as a Sun of righteousness: so Mal. iv. 2, ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν . . . ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης: Isa. lx. 1, ἥκει σου τὸ φῶς κ. ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπί σε ἀνατέταλκεν: Num. xxiv. 17, ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, to which Thl. thinks there is allusion here: σεμνὴ ἡ λέξις τὸ ἀνατέταλκε, καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Βαλαὰμ προφητείας ληφθεῖσα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Μαλαχίου κ.τ.λ. And it is quite legitimate, and a very beautiful thought, to regard these sublime ideas as having been in the Writer's mind, while at the same time we confess, that the word is used of the springing or rising up of other things, e. g. of water, Herod. iv. 52: and especially of the sprouting of plants—Jos. Antt. i. 1, εὐθὺς φυτά τε καὶ σπέρματα γῆθεν ἀνέτειλεν: and see reff. And in this sense probably is ἀνατολή given as the rendering of צֶמַח, "Branch," Zech. iii. 1; vi. 12, though the two ideas, of the Sun, and of a branch, came to be mingled together, as in Luke i. 78) **out of Judah** (this word may be the name, either of the tribe, or of the patriarch. From Gen. xlix. 9, 10, it would appear to be the personal name: but preceded and followed as it is here by φυλῆς ἑτέρας, and εἰς ἣν φυλήν, it would rather seem to be that of the tribe), **with reference to** (εἰς nearly as ἐπί above; that which is said with reference to any one, being regarded as tending towards, and finding its issue in him: for its usage, see reff.) **which tribe Moses said nothing concerning priests** (i. e. nothing to imply that any priest should be or be consecrated out of it: πάντα γὰρ τὰ τῆς ἱερωσύνης εἰς τὴν Λευϊτικὴν ἀνέθηκε φυλήν. Thl.).

15—17.] *Another proof that the law is changed* (set aside): *for our Lord could not be of the law* (= Levitical priesthood), *seeing He is an* eternal *Priest.*

15.] **And it** (viz. the change of the law; the proposition of ver. 12.: so Œc., οὐ μόνον ἔνθεν δῆλόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ἐνηλλάγη ἥ τε λατρεία καὶ ἡ διαθήκη . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου περισσῶς δῆλόν ἐστιν . . . καὶ ἐκ τούτου κατάδηλός ἐστιν ἥ τε ἐναλλαγὴ καὶ ἡ μετάθεσις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. Chrys. takes '*it*' to mean the distinction between the Levitical and the N. T. High Priesthood: τί ἐστι κατάδηλον; τὸ μέσον τῆς ἱερωσύνης. Jac. Cappellus, and Bengel —"illud quod in ver. 11 asseritur, nullam consummationem factam esse per sacerdotium Leviticum," and so Delitzsch. Primasius, Hammond, al., that the *priesthood* is altered: Ebrard strangely supplies, "that our Lord sprung from Judah:" indeed his whole comment on this verse is one of those curiosities of exegesis which unhappily abound in his otherwise valuable commentary. But the alteration of the *law* is the proposition here: and so Estius, Schlich-

ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, 16 ὃς οὐ [z] κατὰ [a] νόμον ἐντολῆς [b] σαρκίνης γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ [z] κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς [c] ἀκαταλύτου· 17 [d] μαρτυρεῖται γὰρ [e] ὅτι σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν [f] τάξιν

z Matt. xxv. 15. Acts xxvi. 5. 2 Tim. i. 8. a = Rom. vii. 21, 23. b Rom. vii. 14. 1 Cor. iii. 1. 2 Cor. iii. 3 only. 2 Chron. xxxii. 8. Ezek. xi. 19. xxxvi. 26 only. c here only †. Dion. Hal. x. 31, τὸ τῆς δημαρχίας ἀκατάλυτον ἔσεσθαι κράτος. d ver. 8. e = Gospp. passim. Heb., ch. x. 8. xi. 18. Psa. cix. 4. f ch. v. 6 reff.

16. rec *σαρκικης*, with C-corr D³K rel Chr-montf₂ Thdrt [Thl Œc]: txt ABC¹D¹ H(in title) L[P]ℵ a¹ d f h l n 17 Dion₁ Chr-3-mss₁ Cyr[-p₂ Euthal-ms Damasc]. (The title in H runs thus: *ὅτι παύσεται ἡ τοῦ ἀαρὼν ἱερωσύνη ἡ ἐπὶ γῆς οὖσα· ἵσταται δὲ ἡ οὐράνιος ἡ χριστοῦ ἐξ ἑτέρου γένους, οὐ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ διὰ νόμου σαρκίνου.*)

17. rec *μαρτυρει* (for *-ρειται*), with CD³KL rel Thdrt [Damasc Œc]: txt ABD¹[P]ℵ 17 [syrr] coptt Chr [Euthal-ms] Cyr₁ Thl. aft *συ* ins *ει* D³K[P] b o [latt syrr coptt æth (so v. 21 also)].

ting, Seb. Schmidt, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Bleek, Lünem., al.) **is yet more abundantly** (see for *περισσότερον*, on ch. ii. 1) **manifest** (**κατάδηλος** is another stronger form of *δῆλος*, common in the classics (reff.), but found only here in LXX and N. T.), **if** (i. e. *siquidem*, seeing that: *τὸ εἰ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅτι νοήσεις, ἤγουν ἐπειδή*, Œc.: "*si* . . . rem dubitative loquitur, sed affirmative, quasi diceret . . . quia" &c., Primasius, in Bleek. See reff. *ὅτι* could not well have been used here, as the reader would have connected it with *κατάδηλον*, 'it is evident, that' &c.) **according to the similitude of** (= *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν* before) **Melchisedek ariseth a different priest** (it is best to take **ἱερεὺς ἕτερος** as the subject, *ἕτερος* being a mere epithet: not, as Schulz (also in ver. 11), *ἱερεύς* predicatively, "*another ariseth as priest*," nor as some (?) mentioned by Lünem., to take *ἱερεύς* and *ἕτερος* both predicatively, "*He ariseth as another priest*," viz. our Lord). 16.] **who** (viz. *ἱερεὺς ἕτερος. τίς; ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ οὗτος; οὔ, ἀλλ' ὁ χριστός.* Chrys.: and so Œc. Thl. mentions both ways of taking it, and expounds both at some length) **is appointed** (hath become priest) **not according to the law of a carnal commandment** (i. e. not in accordance with, following out, the rule and order of an exterior ordinance founded on the present fleshly and decaying state of things. So Thdrt., *σαρκικὴν γὰρ ἐντολὴν τοῦτο κέκληκεν, ὡς τοῦ νόμου διὰ τὸ θνητὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κελεύοντος, μετὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τελευτήν, τὸν ἐκείνου παῖδα τὴν ἱερωσύνην λαμβάνειν.* And so most Commentators. But others take **νόμος** to mean strictly the law of Moses as a whole, and *ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης* as = a plural, and designating the character of those commandments of which the law was composed. So Syr., Chrys. (*καλῶς αὐτόν—τὸν νόμον—ἐντολὴν ἐκάλεσε σαρκικήν· πάντα γὰρ ὅσα διωρίζετο σαρκικὰ ἦν. τὸ γὰρ λέγειν, περίτεμε τὴν σάρκα, χρῖσον τ. σάρκα, λοῦσον τ. σάρκα, καθάρισον τ. σάρκα, περίκειρον τ. σάρκα, ἐπίδησον τ. σάρκα, θρέψον τ. σάρκα, ἀργῆσον τῇ σαρκί, ταῦτα, εἰπέ μοι, οὐχὶ σαρκικά; εἰ δὲ θέλεις μαθεῖν καὶ τίνα ἃ ἐπηγγέλλετο ἀγαθά, ἄκουε· πολλὴ ζωή, φησί, τῇ σαρκί, γάλα κ. μέλι τῇ σαρκί, εἰρήνη τῇ σαρκί, τρυφὴ τῇ σαρκί. ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ νόμου τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἔλαβεν ὁ Ἀαρών· ὁ μέντοι Μελχισεδὲκ οὐχ οὕτω*), Œc. (*τί ἐστι, κατὰ νόμον ἐντ. σαρκ.; ὅτι ὁ νόμος τὰς ἐντολὰς σαρκικὰς εἶχεν, οἷον περιτομήν, ἀργίαν, τόδε φαγεῖν κ. τόδε μὴ φαγεῖν, ὅπερ σαρκὸς ἦν κ. οὐ ψυχῆς καθάρσια· οὐ γέγονεν οὖν ἀρχιερεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ τὰς σαρκικὰς ἐντολὰς ἐντελλομένου*). Other Commentators, who take **νόμον** as I have done above, yet understand **σαρκίνης** as a subjective epithet, a law which was in itself transitory: so Böhme, Kuinoel, al.), **but according to the power of an indissoluble life** (the two clauses closely correspond in rhythm, as is much the practice of the Writer. The *power* here spoken of does not, however, strictly correspond, in its relation to the priesthood spoken of, with 'the law of a carnal commandment' above. That was the rule, by and after which the priesthood was constituted: this, the vigour inherent in the glorious priesthood of Christ,—for it is of His enduring Melchisedek-priesthood in glory (see Delitzsch and Hofmann) that this is spoken—to endure for ever. Camero, Calovius, al., have thought **δύναμις** to be, Christ's power to confer life on others: Carpzov, al., the enduring nature of the divine decree which constituted this priesthood: but both are shewn to be wrong by the next verse, in which the *ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* is the point brought out). 17.] *Proof of the last clause*: *κατασκευάζει πῶς εἶπε τὸ ἀκαταλύτου ζωῆς, καί φησιν ὅτι ἡ γραφὴ λέγει αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα εἶναι ἱερέα.* Thl. The stress of the citation is on **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. For he** (the *ἱερεὺς ἕτερος*) **is borne witness of that** (just as in *μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ*, ver. 8. The **ὅτι** belongs, not to the citation, but to the verb. If the rec. *μαρ-*

Μελχισεδέκ. [18] [g] ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται [h] προαγούσης ἐντολῆς διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς [i] ἀσθενὲς καὶ [k] ἀνωφελές, [19] οὐδὲν γὰρ [l] ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, [m] ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ [n] κρείττονος [o] ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς [p] ἐγγίζομεν τῷ [p] θεῷ. [20] Καὶ [q] καθ'

...ελπιδος d.
ABCDK LPℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

g ch. ix. 26 only †. (-τεῖν, ch. x. 28.) h = 1 Tim. i. 18 †. lit., Matt. xxi. 9 al. fr. Wisd. xix. 11. i = Gal. iv. 9. constr., Rom viii. 3. k Tit. iii. 9 only. Prov. xxviii. 3. Jer. ii. 8. l ch. ii. 10 reff. and note. m here only †. σβέννυσθαι τὸ πρὸς τὴν προτέραν φιλόστοργον ἑτέρας ἐπεισαγωγῇ, Jos. Antt. xi. 6. 2. see Thuc. viii. 92. n ch. i. 4 reff. o = ch. iii. 6 reff. p James iv. 8 only. Exod. xix. 22. xxxiv. 30. Lev. x. 3. Isa. xxix. 13. lviii. 2. Ps. cxlviii. 14. q ch. iii. 3. ix. 27. see ch. viii. 6.

18. προσαγουσης D[1][-gr]. 19. επεισαγωγης D[1][-gr]. εγγιζωμεν A 31.

τυρεῖ be taken, ὁ θεός must be supplied, as in ch. i. 6, and passim in this Epistle. And then also the ὅτι belongs to the verb) **Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek.** 18, 19.] These verses belong to the proof of 15—17, expanding the conclusion thence derived, and expressing it more decidedly than before in ver. 12.

For moreover (μὲν γάρ, at the same time that by the γάρ it carries on the reasoning, by the elliptic μέν suggests some succeeding position as introduced by a δέ. So Eurip. Med. 698, ξυγγνωστὰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν σε λυπεῖσθαι, γύναι—"certainly, I concede it, thy grief was pardonable, . . . (but . . .):" and in a sentence made as an example, ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ Διονύσιος ἐδειπνοῦμεν, σὺ μὲν γὰρ οὐ παρεγένου—"for you, you will remember, were not there (but we were)." See Hartung, Partikell. ii. 414. So here we may regard the μέν as elliptical, and pointing at an understood contrast in the permanence of the ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος just mentioned. It is hardly possible, even with the right construction of the sentence (see below), to regard this μέν as answering to the δέ following ἐπεισαγωγή: its connexion with the γάρ will not allow this. If this had been intended, we should have expected the form of the sentence to be ἀθέτησις γὰρ γίνεται τῆς μὲν προαγούσης ἐντολῆς) **there takes place** (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ τὸ γίνεται, Œc.: that is, it belongs to both ἀθέτησις and ἐπεισαγωγή—see below) **an abrogation** (τί ἐστιν ἀθέτησις; ἄμειψις, ἐκβολή, Chrys.: ἀθέτησις, τουτέστιν ἐναλλαγὴ κ. ἐκβολή, Thl. Though no where else found in all Greek, except in the two places in this Epistle, it is a perfectly regular word from ἀθετέω, as νουθέτησις, νομοθέτησις) **of the preceding commandment** (ἐντολῆς is anarthrous because the epithet προαγούσης is thrown strongly forward into emphasis, which emphasis would be weakened by τῆς preceding, and altogether lost in τῆς ἐντολῆς τῆς προαγούσης. The ἐντολή intended is that mentioned in ver. 16, according to which the priesthood was constituted, not, as Chrys., Thdrt., Œc., Thl., Prim., Calv., Grot., Hamm., Kuinoel, al., the whole Mosaic law, however much that may be *involved* in the assertion, cf. the parenthesis in ver. 11. This commandment went before—not merely in time, but was an introduction to and gave way before the greater and final ordinance) **on account of its weakness and unprofitableness** (on the neuter concrete where the abstract substantive would rather be looked for, see Winer, edn. 6, § 34. 2, and besides reff., Rom. ii. 4; ix. 22: ch. vi. 17 al. Rom. viii. 3, as Gal. iv. 9, is remarkably parallel, both in thought and mode of expression: one of those coincidences which could hardly take place where there was not community of thought and diction),—**for the law perfected nothing** (this parenthetical clause is inserted to explain the implication contained in αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς κ. ἀνωφελές. The law had not the power to bring any thing whatever to perfection, to its appointed end and excellence:—perfection, in any kind, was not by the law. This assertion must not be limited by making οὐδέν represent a masculine, as Chrys. (τί ἐστιν, οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν; οὐδένα, φησίν, τέλειον εἰργάσατο παρακουόμενος. ἄλλως δέ· οὐδὲ εἰ ἠκούσθη, τέλειον ἐποίησεν ἂν καὶ ἐνάρετον. τέως δὲ οὐ τοῦτό φησιν ὁ λόγος ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐδὲν ἴσχυσε· καὶ εἰκότως· γράμματα γὰρ ἦν κείμενα, τόδε πρᾶττε καὶ τόδε μὴ πρᾶττε· ὑποτιθέμενα μόνον, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ δύναμιν ἐντιθέντα. ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ τοιαύτη). Similarly Œc. and Thl.),—**and** (δέ, see above on μὲν γάρ: '*and*' is the only English conjunction which will preserve the true connexion and construction of the sentence) (there takes place; γίνεται belongs to this also, see below) **an introduction** (ἐπεισαγωγή, *superintroductio*, a *bringing in besides:* the law being already there, this is brought in to and upon it: see ref.) **of a better hope** (the contrast is between the προάγουσα ἐντολή, weak and unprofitable, and a better thing, viz. the ἐλπίς which brings us near to God. This κρείττονός τινος, τουτέστιν, ἐλπίδος κ.τ.λ., is expressed by κρείττονος ἐλπίδος. This seems more natural, than with Chrys., Œc., Thl., Prim., to suppose any comparison between

r ch. i. 4. x. 26. Rev. xviii. 7. s ch. ix. 7.

q r ὅσον s οὐ s χωρὶς t ὁρκωμοσίας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς t ὁρκω- ABCDK LPℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

t here (3ce) and ver. 28 only. Ezek. xvii. 18, 19. Esdr. viii. 93 (90) only. (see note.)

20. om οι μεν γαρ χωρις ορκωμοσ. (*homœotel*) D[1] 2. 21. 114 syr [(æth)].

the earthly hopes held out in the old covenant, and the heavenly hope of the new (*εἶχε καὶ ὁ νόμος ἐλπίδα, φησίν, ἀλλ' οὐ τοιαύτην· ἤλπιζον γὰρ εὐαρεστήσαντες ἕξειν τὴν γῆν, μηδὲν πείσεσθαι δεινόν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐλπίζομεν εὐαρεστήσαντες, οὐ γῆν καθέξειν, ἀλλὰ τὸν οὐρανόν.* Chrys.)), **by means of which we draw near to God** (this note, of personal access to God, has been twice struck before, ch. iv. 16; vi. 19, and is further on in the Epistle expanded into a whole strain of argument. See ch. ix. 11 ff.; x. 19 ff. It is that access, which was only carnally and symbolically open to them by shedding of the blood of sacrifices, but has been spiritually and really opened to us by the shedding of Christ's blood once for all, so that we being justified by faith can approach the very throne of God. The word *ἐγγίζειν* is the technical term in the LXX for the *drawing near* of the priests in their sacrificial ministrations.

Notice the reading *ἐγγίζωμεν*, found in A al., as throwing light on the famous *ἔχωμεν*, Rom. v. 1). It remains to treat of the connexion of the above sentence, vv. 18, 19, which has been entirely mistaken by many, and among them by E. V. The ending clause, *ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, has been wrongly joined with *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος*: and that, either, 1. as *subject* to *ἐτελείωσεν*, as E V., "*but the bringing in of a better hope did*" (Beza appears here, as in so many other cases, to have led our translators into error; and so also render Castellio, Paræus, Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Michaelis, Stuart, al.): or, 2. as predicate to *νόμος* preceding, "*For the law perfected nothing, but was the introduction,*" &c. So Faber Stap., Erasmus (par., "Lex . . . in hoc data est ad tempus ut nos perduceret ad spem meliorem"), Vatabl., Calvin, Jac. Cappel., Pyle, al. This latter is successfully impugned by Beza, on the ground that the law was not an *ἐπεισαγωγή* at all, from the very meaning (see above) of that word. The form of the sentence is also against it, in which the first member of the predicate, *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελ. ὁ ν.*, has a definite verb expressed, whereas the verb of the second member would have to be understood. But neither is Beza's own connexion allowable: for first, it would be difficult to take out a positive verb and object from the clause *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελ. ὁ νόμος* to supply after the subject *ἐπεισαγωγή*: secondly, there is no proper opposition in the arrangement of the two clauses *οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . ἐπεισαγωγὴ δέ*: as the object was thrown emphatically forward in the first, so should it be at least expressed in the second: and thirdly, the position and anarthrousness of *ἐπεισαγωγή* itself are against the rendering: we should at least expect *ἡ δὲ ἐπεισαγωγή*, and probably *ἡ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος ἐπεισαγ.* There is a third alternative, which Calvin takes, "nihil enim lex perfecit, sed accessit introductio." But this, though tolerable sense, is harsher than either of the others. Ebrard indeed approves it, and in his usual slashing manner calls the interpretation of Bleek &c. ein sinnloser Gedanke: but as usual also, he misunderstands the intent of that Gedanke: viz. that *in these words, σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰ. κ.τ.λ.*, there takes place both the *ἀθέτησις* and the *ἐπεισαγωγή*—a thought which, whether right or wrong, is surely not without sense.

20—22.] See summary at ver. 11. *Further proof of the superiority of the Melchisedek-priesthood of Christ—in that he was constituted in it by an oath,* thus giving it a solemnity and weight which that other priesthood had not. **And inasmuch as (it was) not without an oath** (Thdrt. and some of the older Commentators (hardly Chrys.) join this clause with the former verse, and understand it to apply to the certainty of the *κρείττων ἐλπίς. αὕτη ἡμᾶς προσοικειοῖ τῷ θεῷ· ὅρκος δὲ ἡμῖν βεβαιοῖ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν.* Thdrt. And so Calvin, "Nihil enim lex perfecit, sed accessit introductio ad spem potiorem per quam appropinquamus Deo: atque hoc potiorem, quod non absque jurejurando res acta sit." So Luther. The vulg., "et quantum est, non sine jurejurando," is apparently meant as an exclamation, as indeed Primas. and Justiniani take it. But there can be little doubt that the right connexion is to take **καθ' ὅσον** as the protasis, the following, **οἱ μέν** to **αἰῶνα**, as a parenthesis, and **κατὰ τοσοῦτο** κ.τ.λ. as the apodosis. So, distinctly, Thl. (having before said on *καθ' ὅσον κ.τ.λ.,—ἰδοὺ ἄλλη διαφορὰ τοῦ τε νέου ἱερέως πρὸς τοὺς παλαιοὺς κ.τ.λ.*, he explains *κατὰ τοσοῦτο, τουτέστι, καθόσον ὤμοσεν ἀεὶ αὐτὸν ἔσεσθαι ἱερέα*). And so I believe Chrys. meant, though ordinarily quoted on the other side. He is by no means clear: and indeed the notes of his lectures on parts of this Epistle are evidently very imperfect. So almost all the modern Commentators, including Delitzsch. As

μοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, [21] ὁ δὲ μετὰ [t] ὁρκωμοσίας διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν, [u] Ὤμοσεν Κύριος καὶ οὐ [v] μεταμεληθήσεται, Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· [22] κατὰ [r] τοσοῦτο καὶ [w] κρείττονος [x] διαθήκης γέγονεν [y] ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς.

u Psa. cix. 4.
v Matt. xxi. 29, 32. xxvii. 3. 2 Cor. vii. 8 bis only. Jer. xx. 16. see Rom. xi. 29.
w ch. i. 4 reff.
x (see note.) Matt. xxvi. 28. 2 Cor. iii. 6. ch. viii. 6 all5. Exod. xxiv. 8. Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 31.
y here only †. Sir. xxix. 15, 16. 2 Macc. x. 28 only. ἔγγυον τῶν εἴκοσι ταλάντων, Polyb. v. 27. 1. (-υᾶσθαι, Prov. vi. 1.)

21. μεθ' AB² k m Cyr-jer₁ Chr Thdrt: μετ' [B¹C]ℵ³ [Euthal-ms]. om εις τον αιωνα ℵ¹(ins in marg ℵ³). [aft συ ins ει D²KP vss Eus₁(om₁).] rec at end ins κατα την ταξιν μελχισεδεκ, with ADKL[P] ℵ³-marg rel syrr copt [æth] Eus₂ Chr Thdrt Chron: om BCℵ¹ 17 vulg sah arm [Euthal-ms] Ambr.

22. rec τοσουτον, with D³KLℵ³ rel [Ath-ed₁ Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]: txt ABCℵ¹ 17 Ath-ms₁ [-τω D¹P]. rec om και, with AC²DKL[P]ℵ³ rel [vulg copt Ath₁ Chr Thdrt Thl]: ins BC¹ℵ¹ Damasc.

regards the ellipsis here, it is variously supplied. Some fill it up out of the apodosis, διαθήκης ἔγγυος γέγονε. And this seems on the whole more natural, and more agreeable to the style of our Epistle, than to put in, as E. V. after Œc., and Bengel, Lünem., al., γέγονεν ἀρχιερεύς, or as Bleek, al., τοῦτο (viz. ἐπεισαγωγὴ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος) γέγονεν (or γίνεται). **ἡ ὁρκωμοσία**, the swearing of an oath, is not found in classical Greek, but τὰ ὁρκωμόσια, in Plato, Phædr. p. 241 A, and Crito, p. 120 B, θύματα or ἱερεῖα being understood. Still, as Wolf remarks, ἡ ἀπωμοσία, ἡ διωμοσία, and many similar forms, are actually found),—**for they, as we know** (on μὲν γάρ, see above, ver. 18), **without swearing of an oath are made priests** (εἰσὶν γεγονότες, not only for the sake of rhythm, but as more strongly marking the existence of these priests at the time of writing. The quasi-aoristic use of γεγόνασιν is so common, that it would not convey to the reader here the meaning intended. Paulus and Klee render, "*are without an oath made priests:*" Böhme, "*sunt sacerdotes, sed sine juramento* (illi quidem singuli deinceps) *facti:*" which would require εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς χωρὶς ὁρκ. γεγονότες. Michaelis would render it "*fuerunt*, i. e. *esse desierunt:*" which is against both grammar and context), **but He with swearing of an oath, by Him who saith** (i. e. certainly not the Psalmist, as some (hardly Schlichting), who cannot be said to have spoken this πρὸς αὐτόν, unless indeed we take πρός in the mere secondary sense of 'with reference to.' In the following citation it is the words of address only to which this refers: the former part is the mere introduction to them. Not seeing this has led to the above mistake. It was God who addressed Him, God who made Him priest, God who sware unto Him) **to Him, The Lord** (κύριος, as commonly in LXX, for יְהוָה) **sware, and will not repent** (so ref. Jer. Heb., יִנָּחֵם וְלֹא: i. e. the decree stands fast, and shall undergo no change), **Thou art a priest for ever** (see var. readd.):—**of so much** (in that same proportion, viz. as the difference between the oath and no oath indicates) **better a testament** (the meanings of **διαθήκη**, 1. an appointment, without concurrence of a second party, of somewhat concerning that second party,—of which nature is *a last will and testament;* 2. a mutual agreement in which all parties concerned consent, = *a covenant*, in the proper sense,—being confessed, our business here is, not, as Ebrard absurdly maintains, to enquire what is the fixed theological acceptance of the word, and so to render it here, irrespective of any subsequent usage by our Writer himself; but to enquire, 1. how he uses it in this Epistle, 2. whether he is likely to have used it in more than one sense:—and to render accordingly. Now it cannot well be doubted, that in ch. ix. 16, 17, he does use it in the sense of "*testament.*" And just as little can it be questioned, that he is speaking there of the same thing as here; that the καινὴ διαθήκη there answers to the κρείττων διαθήκη here, this first mention of it being in fact preparatory to that fuller treatment. I therefore keep here to the E. V., which Bleek also approves in spite of Ebrard's strong but silly dictum, that every passage is to be interpreted as a reader would understand it who had never read any further) **also hath Jesus become surety** (**ἔγγυος**, see reff., occurs in the Apocrypha, and in the later classics, e. g. Xen. Vectig. iv. 20, τῷ δημοσίῳ ἐστὶ λαβεῖν ἐγγύους παρὰ τῶν μισθουμένων, and Polyb. in reff.: but the form ἐγγυητής is much more common. Bl. remarks that Mœris's notice is wrong, ἔγγυον Ἀττικῶς, ἐγγυητὴν Ἑλληνικῶς. "Jesus is become the surety of the better covenant, i. e. in His person security and certainty is given to men, that a better covenant is made and sanctioned by God. For Christ, the

23 καὶ οἱ μὲν [z] πλείονές εἰσιν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ [a] κωλύεσθαι [b] παραμένειν· 24 ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ [c] μένειν αὐτὸν [c] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, [d] ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν [e] ἱερωσύνην.

z = Luke xi. 53. Acts ii. 40. xiii. 31 al. Num. ix. 19.
a Acts xvi. 6 al. Exod. xxxvi. 6.
b 1 Cor. xvi. 6. Phil. i. 25. James i. 25 only. Gen. xliv. 33 (see note).
c John viii. 35 bis. xii. 34. 2 Cor. ix. 9, from Ps. cxi. 9. 1 Pet. i. 25, from Isa. xl. 8. 1 John ii. 17 only. see ver. 3.
d here only † (see note).
e ver. 11.

23. rec γεγονοτες bef ιερεις, with BL[P]א rel vulg (Syr) syr copt [æth arm Euthal-ms] Eus_2 Chr Thdrt Damasc: om γεγ. K: txt ACD 17 Chr-ms Cyr_2[-p]. [τω P $Eus\text{-}ms_1$.]

24. for ιερωσυνην, ιερατιαν D^1.

Son of God, became man, to publish this covenant on earth,—has sealed it with His sufferings and death, and by His resurrection from the dead was declared with power to be sent by God as the Founder of such a Covenant." Lünemann. This seems better, considering the context, in which our hope mainly, and not at present Christ's satisfaction, is in question, than to bring in, as Calov., al., that satisfaction, or to regard His suretyship (Limborch, Baumgarten, al.) as meaning His mediatorship (see ch. viii. 6, where He is described as κρείττονος διαθήκης μεσίτης) seen from both sides—that He is God's surety for man and man's surety for God. Ἰησοῦς is emphatically placed at the end: cf. John xix. ult.).

23—25.] *Further proof still of the superiority of Christ's priesthood, in that the Levitical priests were continually removed by death: Christ is undying and abiding.* This point was slightly touched before in ver. 8, and again in ver. 16 f.: in the first place, it was to shew the abiding nature of the superiority of the priesthood—its endurance in Melchisedek, and in Christ, Melchisedek's antitype, as contrasted with dying men who here receive tithes. In the second, it was to bring out the difference between the ordinances which constituted the two priesthoods: the one, the law of a carnal commandment, the other, the power of an endless life. Here, the *personal* contrast is dwelt on: the *many*, which change: the ONE, who abides. **23.**] **And they indeed** (the οἱ μὲν γάρ of ver. 20: i. e. the Levitical priests) **are appointed** (on **εἰσὶν γεγονότες**, see above, ver. 20. **ἱερεῖς** is interposed to give it the secondary emphasis) **priests in numbers** (the chief emphasis is on **πλείονες**, as contrasted with ἀπαράβ. below. The alternative rendering given as possible in Bleek, "they indeed are many, who have been made priests," is hardly probable, seeing that thus the article **οἱ** would more naturally precede **ἱερεῖς**), **on account of their being by death hindered from continuing** (in *life?* or, in their *priesthood?* The latter is taken by Œc., Grot., Seb. Schmidt, Ernesti, Wahl and Bretschneider, Kuinoel, al. And this is the more probable. The verb is a vox media, and may be applied to any sort of endurance treated of in the context (so in the examples cited from Herod. i. 30, καί σφι εἶδε ἅπασι τέκνα ἐκγενόμενα καὶ πάντα παραμείναντα, and Artemidor. ii. 27, γυναῖκά τε κ. παῖδας μὴ παραμένειν μαντεύεται): which clearly here treats of abiding in the priesthood: besides which, it would be somewhat tautological to say that they were hindered by death from continuing in life. The other view is taken by Raphel, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, Schulz, De Wette, Lünemann; not seeing, says Delitzsch, was das für eine närrische platte Rede ist), **24.**] **but He, on account of his remaining for ever** (here again, our former argument conversely applies, and obliges us to understand this μένειν of endurance now in *life*, not in priesthood. It would be tautology to say, as Estius, Seb. Schmidt, al., "because He remains a priest for ever, He has an unchangeable priesthood:" besides that thus the members of the parallelism would not correspond. They, on account of their deaths, are subject to continual renewal: He, because He lives for ever, has, &c. See, besides reff., John xxi. 22 f.: 1 Cor. xv. 6: Phil. i. 25), **hath his priesthood unchangeable** (such is the construction: as in such sentences as εἶπε μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ,—and χαλεπὴν ἔχει τὴν ἀποκάθαρσιν, Plut. de Discr. Am. et Adult., § 35, in Bl. The art. in such case is quasi-personal, and the adjective a pure predicate, not an epithet. **ἀπαράβατος** is a word of later Greek: see Lob. on Phryn. p. 313 (ἀπαράβατον παραιτοῦ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἀπαραίτητον: on which Lob. says, "Ratio convenit: nam παράβατον vetus est sed poeticum: ἀπαράβατον neque vetus, neque oratoricum"). Many expositors, Thdrt., Œc., Thl., al., take it actively, διάδοχον οὐκ ἔχουσαν, μὴ παραβαίνουσαν εἰς ἄλλον. But it seems doubtful whether the word ever has this meaning. Palm and Rost give it, but cite only this place as justifying it. On the other hand, the examples in Bleek and Wetst. all tend to substantiate the passive meaning, *unalterable;* which may not

25 [f] ὅθεν καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ [g] παντελὲς δύναται τοὺς [h] προσερχομένους δι᾽ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ, πάντοτε ζῶν [i] εἰς τὸ [k] ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. 26 [l] τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν [m] καὶ [n] ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεύς, [o] ὅσιος [p] ἄκακος [q] ἀμίαντος, [r] κεχωρισμένος

...ακακος C. ABDKL Pℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

f ch. ii. 17 reff. g Luke xiii. 11 (there also w. εἰς) only†. Jos. Antt. vi. 2. 3. (-λῶς, 2 Macc. iii. 12.) h ch. iv. 16 reff. and note. i Acts iii. 19. vii. 19. Rom. i. 11, 20. ch. ix. 28 al. k Acts xxv. 24. Rom. viii. 26, 34. xi. 2 only†. 2 Macc. iv. 36 al. (-τευξις, 1 Tim. ii. 1.) l see ch. viii. 1. 1 Cor. v. 1. m ch. vi. 7. n = ch. ii. 10 reff. o of persons, Acts ii. 27 & xiii. (34,) 35, from Ps. xv. 10. Tit. i. 8. (1 Tim. ii. 8.) Rev. xv. 4. xvi. 5 only. Ps. iv. 3 al. p = here (Rom. xvi. 18) only. Jer. xi. 19. q ch. xiii. 4. James i. 27. 1 Pet. i. 4 only†. Wisd. iii. 13. 2 Macc. xiv. 36. r = Rom. viii. 35, 39 (see note). Neh. ix. 2.

26. rec om 1st και, with CKL[P]ℵ rel latt copt [æth arm Bas_1 Chr_1 Euthal-ms Thdrt]: ins ABD syrr Eus_1. aft ακακος ins και A.

be passed by or put aside. So Galen i. in Hippocr. says, *πρὸς γὰρ τὸ κατεπεῖγον ἀεὶ χρὴ τὸν ἰατρὸν ἵστασθαι, καὶ μὴ καθάπερ νόμον ἀπαράβατον φυλάσσειν τὰ κελευθέντα πράττεσθαι.* The same expression, *νόμος ἀπαράβατος*, is found in Epictet. 75. The sun, in Plut. de Oracul. Defect. p. 410, has a *τάξις ἀπαράβατος*: and Hierocles, Aur. Carm. p. 26, has, *τὸ ἀπαράβατον τῆς ἐν τοῖς δημιουργηθεῖσιν εὐταξίας*, and p. 72, *ἡ τῶν καθηκόντων τήρησις ἀπαράβατος.* So vulg. and D-lat., "*sempiternum:*" Ambr. de Fuga Sæculi c. 3 (16), vol. i. p. 424, "*imprævaricabile:*" Aug. de Pecc. Mer. i. 27 (50), vol. x. pt. i., "*intransgressibile*").

25.] Whence (*ἐπειδή, φησίν, ἀεὶ ζῇ*) **also** (as a natural consequence, something else, flowing from and accompanying the last: but with a slightly characteristic force: a new and higher thing follows. It is not easy to say whether *καί* belongs to *σώζειν* or to *δύναται*. Rather, perhaps, to the whole sentence, to *δύναται-σώζειν-εἰς-τὸ-π. κ.τ.λ.*) **He is able to save** (in its usual solemn N. T. sense, to rescue from sin and condemnation) **to the uttermost** (the Syr., vulg., Chrys. (*οὐ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν μόνον φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ζωῇ*), Œc., Thl., Luth., Calv., Schlicht., Grot., al. take **εἰς τὸ παντελές** of *time:* "He is ever able to save," or "He is able to save for ever." But this is not the usage of the word. Bleek has shewn by very many instances, that *completeness*, not *duration*, is its idea: as indeed its etymology would lead us to expect. It *may* refer to time, when the context requires, as in Ælian, V. H. xii. 20, *λέγει Ἡσίοδος τὴν ἀηδόνα μόνην . . . διὰ τέλους ἀγρυπνεῖν, τὴν δὲ χελιδόνα οὐκ εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἀγρυπνεῖν, καὶ ταύτην δὲ ἀπολωλεκέναι τοῦ ὕπνου τὸ ἥμισυ.* But even then it is *entirely, throughout*, and only thus comes to mean '*always.*' We have *εἰς τὸ π. ἀφανισθῆναι*, Philo, Leg. ad Caium, § 21, vol. ii. p. 567: *γηραιὸς δὲ ὢν* (Isaac) *κ. τὰς ὄψεις εἰς τὸ π. ἠφανισμένος*, Jos. Antt. i. 18. 5: *τοὺς λεπροὺς εἰς τὸ π. ἐξήλασε τῆς πόλεως*, ib. iii. 2. 3, &c. &c.) **those that approach** (cf. *ἐγγίζομεν* above, ver. 19) **through Him** (*διὰ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως*, Œc., Thl. The contrast is to those, whose approach to God was through the Levitical priesthood) **to God, ever living as He does** (this participial clause in fact is epexegetical of the **ὅθεν**, giving the reason which is wrapt up in that conjunction) **to intercede for them** (on *ἐντυγχάνειν*, see reff. "As regards its usage, it is found with a dative frequently in classic Greek: but in the definite meaning of '*adire aliquem*' in reference to (*περί*) a person or occasion, to approach any one interceding (*ὑπέρ*) or complaining (*κατά*), it is not found until the later Greek, Polyb., Plut., Themestius, Ælian: see Wetst. on Rom. viii. 26. Here it implies the whole mediatorial work, which the exalted Saviour performs for his own with his Heavenly Father, either by reference to his past death of blood by which He has bought them for himself, or by continued intercession for them. See Rom. viii. 34, below, ch. ix. 24: 1 John ii. 1. And cf. Philo on the mediatorial and intercessory work of the *λόγος*, Vita Mos. iii. 14, vol. i. p. 155: *ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρί, παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, πρός τε ἀμνηστείαν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν*: and Quis Rer. Div. Hær. 42, p. 501, *ὁ δ᾽ αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μέν ἐστι τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον, πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον.*" Bleek).

26—28.] *Further and concluding argument for the fact of Christ being such a High Priest: that such an one was necessary for us.* This necessity however is not pursued into its grounds, but only asserted, and then the description of His exalted perfections gone further into, and substantiated by facts in his own history and that of the priests of the law (ver. 28).

26.] For such (i. e. such as is above described: retrospective, not prospective, as some have taken it. Then the following adjectives serve as appositional predicates, carrying forward **τοιοῦτος**, and enlarging on the attributes of our High Priest, which

k ch. i. 3 reff. l see ch. iv. 16. Matt. xix. 28. xxv. 31. Isa. xxii. 23. m ch. i. 3 reff.

ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, [l] ὃς ἐκάθισεν [k] ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ [l] θρόνου τῆς [lm] μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς [n] οὐρανοῖς, [2] τῶν [o] ἁγίων [p] λειτουρ-

ABDKL ℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

n ch. iv. 14 reff. o = ch. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25. x. 19. xiii. 11. p ch. i. 7 reff. see note.

-kommen, and Bengel, "Resolve: filius, semel consummatus, constitutus est sacerdos in æternum." The E. V. has obliterated both sense, and analogy with ch. ii. 10 and v. 9, by rendering τετελ., "*consecrated*").

CHAP. VIII. 1—13.] *Not only is Christ personally, as a High Priest, above the sons of Aaron, but the service and ordinances of the covenant to which his High Priesthood belongs are better than those of that to which they belong.*

1.] **Now the principal matter** (κεφάλαιον most usually has this meaning. So Thuc. iv. 50, ἐν αἷς (ἐπιστολαῖς) πολλῶν ἄλλων γεγραμμένων, κεφάλαιον ἦν κ.τ.λ.: Plato, Gorg. p. 453 A, ἡ πραγματεία αὐτῆς (τῆς ῥητορικῆς) ἅπασα κ. τὸ κεφάλαιον εἰς τοῦτο τελευτᾷ: Demosth. p. 815. 6, καὶ τὸ μὲν κεφάλαιον ἀδικημάτων, ὡς ἂν συντομώτατ' εἴποι τις, τοῦτ' ἐστίν: and see many more examples in Bl. and Wetst., as in Thl., τὸ μέγιστον καὶ συνεκτικώτερον. The other meaning, *sum total*, would be apposite enough here, were the sense of κεφ. confined to ver. 1, which has been treated of before: but ver. 2 contains new particulars, which cannot be said to be the *sum* of any things hitherto said. Besides, even were that condition fulfilled, this sense would require not the present participle λεγομένοις, but the past, λεχθεῖσιν, or εἰρημένοις, and the participle itself would more probably be in the genitive, as in Isocr. Nicocl. p. 90, κεφάλαιον τῶν εἰρημένων: Themist. de Pace, p. 230, κεφάλαιον τοῦ παρόντος λόγου. κεφάλαιον is not, "*a* principal matter," as Lünem.:—words thus thrown forward do not require the article to make them definite: cf. the examples given above) **in the things which we are saying** (ἐπί, '*upon*:' lying as it were, by, and among. This seems best; we might render it, as in Luke xvi. 26, '*besides*,' but the present part. seems to forbid rendering "the things already said," as most Commentators and E. V. Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1, p. 287 f., adopts a curious arrangement: taking κεφάλαιον δέ by itself, he understands ἀρχιερεῦσιν after λεγομένοις, and renders, "besides these, who are called high priests, we have," &c. This is far-fetched and unnatural: for had λεγομένοις borne any such meaning, we should certainly have had the predicate, which would thus be emphasized, expressed, and not understood: as in 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6, εἴπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ κ.τ.λ., ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς κ.τ.λ.): **we have such an High Priest** (emphasis on τοιοῦτον, which refers, not to what preceded, but to what is to follow, viz. ὃς ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ.) **who sat down** ("In ch. i. 3, the sitting at the right hand of God was mentioned as a pre-eminence of the Son above the angels, who stand as ministering spirits before the presence of God: here, where the same is said of Christ as High Priest, Schlichting, Limborch, Klee, al. rightly remark that there is again a pre-eminence in καθίσαι over the Jewish high priests: for these, even when they entered the holiest place, did not sit down by the throne of God, but only stood before it for a moment: cf. ch. x. 11, 12, καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἀρχιερεὺς ἕστηκεν καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν . . . . οὗτος δὲ . . . . εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ." Bleek. Lünem. calls this fanciful: but such distinctions are not surely to be overlooked altogether) **on the right hand of the throne of majesty in the heavens** (better thus, than "of *the* majesty in the heavens," τῆς μεγ. τῆς ἐν τοῖς οὐρ. The last words, ἐν τοῖς οὐρ., may belong not merely to τῆς μεγαλωσ., but to the whole preceding, ἐκάθ. ἐν δεξ. τοῦ θρ. τῆς μεγ. But see on ch. i. 3, where we have the very similar expression, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς: and where it seems simpler to join ἐν ὑψ. with τῆς μεγαλωσύνης. If taken as above, it will be best for this reason also to drop the English definite art. before '*majesty*,' and regard τῆς μεγ. as abstract. Hofmann (Schriftb. ii. 1. 289, and Weissagung u. Erfüllung, ii. 190) strangely joins ἐν τοῖς οὐρ. with what follows, an order which hardly could be imagined in this Epistle, and wholly unnecessary for the sense, in which, Christ having been once asserted to have sat down in the heavens, it necessarily follows that the ἅγια afterwards spoken of are ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. On the expression ὁ θρόν. τῆς μεγ. Thl. remarks, τὸν πατρικόν φησι, ἢ ὅτι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ λεχθείη ἂν αὐτῷ μεγαλωσύνη, ἢ ὅτι ἁπλῶς οὕτω θρόνος μεγαλωσύνης ὁ μέγιστος θρόνος. The former and not the latter is evidently the sense here. All such mere periphrases of the adjectival predicate would be unworthy of the solemnity and dignity of the subject and style), 2.] **minister** (λεῖτον ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸ δημόσιον, ὅθεν λειτουργεῖν τὸ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον ἐργάζεσθαι ἔλεγον. Schol. in Demosth. Lept.

γος, καὶ τῆς [qr] σκηνῆς τῆς [s] ἀληθινῆς, ἣν [rt] ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. [3] πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ [u] προς-

q = ver. 5. ch. ix. 1, &c. xiii. 10. Acts vii. 44. r Exod. xxxiii. 7. Josh. xviii. 1. s = ch. ix. 24. John i. 9. vi. 32. xv. 1. 1 Thess. i. 9. 1 John ii. 8. Jer. ii. 21. t here only. u ch. v. 1 (reff.).

2. rec ins και bef ουκ, with AD[3]KL[P] rel vulg syrr copt [æth arm] Eus$_1$ *Cyr*[-p Chr Thdrt Damasc] Chron: om BD[1]א 17 Eus$_1$.

The LXX use the verb and subst. to express the Heb. שֵׁרֵת and מְשָׁרֵת, in reference to the sacerdotal service in the sanctuary: see, for the verb, Exod. xxviii. 31, 39 (35, 43); xxix. 30; xxxv. 18: Deut. xvii. 12: 3 Kings viii. 11: 1 Chron. vi. 32: 2 Chron. xiii. 10: Ezek. xliv. 27, where we have λειτουργεῖν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ: xlv. 4 al.: and for the subst., Neh. x. 39: Isa. lxi. 6: Sir. vii. 30) of the holy places (τῶν ἁγίων is taken as *masc.* by τινες in Thl., and by Œc., τῶν ἡγιασμένων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων· ἡμῶν γάρ ἐστιν ἀρχιερεύς. But ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεὺς and ἡμῶν λειτουργὸς are very different things. The λειτουργός is *subordinate* to those whose minister he is, as in Josh. i. 1 A, τῷ Ἰησοῦ . . . τῷ λειτουργῷ Μωυσῇ: see also 2 Kings xiii. 18: 3 Kings x. 5: 4 Kings iv. 43; vi. 15: 2 Chron. ix. 4. See also Num. iii. 6; xviii. 2. It is taken by Luther (und ist ein Pfleger der heiligen Güter) as importing *holy things*, as it seems to be in Philo, Leg. Alleg. iii. 46, vol. i. p. 114, τοιοῦτος δὲ ὁ θεραπευτὴς κ. λειτουργὸς τῶν ἁγίων, and De Profug. 17, p. 560, ἡ Λευϊτικὴ φυλὴ νεωκόρων κ. ἱερέων ἐστίν, οἷς ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ἀνάκειται λειτουργία. But this does not seem to answer to the usage of τὰ ἅγια in our Epistle. Cf. reff., in which τὰ ἅγια imports the holy place, i. e. the holy of holies. It does not seem necessary to supply any thing after τῶν ἁγίων, as τῶν ἀληθινῶν, or τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: this distinction is brought out by what follows. As yet Christ is spoken of as being in common with the Levitical priests τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός. See below), and of the true (archetypal, *only true*, as so often in St. John, and in one passage of St. Luke, xvi. 11: see reff. The difference between ἀληθινός and ἀληθής is well sketched by Kahnis, Abendmahl, p. 119, cited in Delitzsch: "ἀληθής excludes the untrue and unreal, ἀληθινός that which does not fulfil its idea. The measure of ἀληθής is reality, that of ἀληθινός ideality. In ἀληθής, the idea corresponds to the thing, in ἀληθινός, the thing to the idea") tabernacle, which the Lord (here evidently the Father: see note on ch. xii. 14) pitched (the usual LXX word of fixing the tabernacle, or a tent: see reff. And so in the classics: e.g. Herod. vi. 12, and many examples in Bleek and Wetst. It is used similarly of the heaven in Isa. xlii. 5, ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ πήξας αὐτόν), not (any) man (not οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, which would be the literal way of expressing 'not man,' generically: because by the indefinite ἄνθρωπος, anarthrous, every individual man is excluded. It is an important question, symbolically considered, whether any and what distinction is intended by the Writer, between τῶν ἁγίων and τῆς σκηνῆς. Delitzsch, in loc., has gone into it at length, and Hofmann has treated of it in two places especially, Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 188 ff. and Schriftb. ii. 1. 405 f. Both are agreed that τὰ ἅγια betokens the immediate, immaterial presence of God, the veritable Holy of Holies, beyond, and approached through, the heavens, ch. iv. 14. But as regards σκηνή, they differ. Hofmann maintains it to be the glorified body of Christ, and argues that it alone will satisfy such expressions as that in ch. ix. 11, οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως: in order to satisfying which, this σκηνή must belong to the new creation, the παλιγγενεσία, which commences with the glorification of Christ. This glorified body of His is the new and abiding temple of God, in which He dwells and meets with us who are united to and have put on that glorified body, our house, eternal in the heavens: for so Hofmann interprets 2 Cor. v. 1 ff. On the other hand, Delitzsch controverts this view as inconsistent with the symbolism in ch. ix. 11, 12, where Christ διὰ τῆς μείζονος κ. τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς . . εἰσῆλθεν . . εἰς τὰ ἅγια, taking this connexion of the words: and also with our ver. 5, where the Mosaic tabernacle is set forth as the representation and shadow of the heavenly. Accordingly, he believes the σκηνή here to be the heavenly Jerusalem, the worship-place (Anbetungsstätte) of blessed spirits (Ps. xxix. 9) and of those men who have been rapt in vision thither (Isa. vi.),—the ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου of Rev. xv. 5,—the place where God's *visible* presence (in contradistinction to His personal and invisible presence in the ἅγια) is manifested to His creatures angelic and human. See much more, well worth studying, in his note here. In weighing these two opinions, I own they seem to me to run into one, and of that one by far the

v ch. ii. 17 reff. w = Acts xiii. 46. 2 Cor. ix. 5. Phil. i. 24. ii. 25. 2 Macc. ix. 21. x ch. vii. 11 only.

φέρειν u δῶρά τε καὶ u θυσίας u καθίσταται· v ὅθεν w ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ u προσενέγκῃ. 4 x εἰ x μὲν x οὖν

ABDKL Pℵ b a c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

3. The last και is added over the line by ℵ[1] or ℵ-corr[1].

4. rec (for ουν) γαρ, with D[3]KL rel syr [arm] Chr Thdrt Damasc: txt ABD[1][P]ℵ

larger component is on Hofmann's side. For what is the heavenly Jerusalem? What, but the aggregate, in their persons and their glorious abiding-place, of the triumphant saints and servants of God? And what is this aggregate, but the mystical body, of which Christ is the Head and they are the members, in its fulfilment and perfection? That glorified body of His, in which they are accepted before God, and in which as a heavenly temple, they serve God, and God dwells, He has passed through, not by passing out of it, but by finally establishing it as an accomplished thing in God's sight, and in and as proceeding forth from it carrying on his intercession and *λειτουργία τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς* in the *ἅγια* itself. See more on this subject, ch. ix. 11: and the views of Bleek, Tholuck, al.: also a sermon of Schleiermacher's on the text, vol. ii. of his Predigten, p. 504. The idea of the *σκηνή* being the body of Christ is found in Joh. Philoponus (Cent. vii.) on Gen. i. (in Bleek): *τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, "καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς . . . . ἄνθρωπος," οὐχ οὕτω περὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λελέχθαι μοι δοκεῖ, καθά τινες ἔφρασαν, ὡς περὶ τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος, εἰ ἐπιστήσει τις ἀκριβῶν τῷ τόπῳ, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον,—καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.* It is also the view of Beza, Gerhard, Owen, Bengel, al.). 3—6.] *This heavenly office and work our High Priest must have, if He be veritably a High Priest.* 3.] **For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices** (see the very similar passage, ch. v. 1, and note there): **whence it is necessary that this (High Priest) also have somewhat which he may offer** (there is here considerable difficulty. For the Writer is evidently, from what follows, laying the stress on the *heavenly* λειτουργία of Christ: and this **ὃ προσενέγκῃ** applies therefore to His work not on earth, but in heaven. If so, how comes it to be said that He has somewhat to offer in heaven, seeing that His offering, of Himself, was made once for all, in contradistinction to those of the Levitical priests which were being constantly offered? See especially ch. x. 11, 12, which, on this view, brings the Writer here into direct contradiction to himself. In order to avoid this, Lünemann and Hofmann (Schriftb. ii. 1. 288) attempt to make the aor. προσενέγκῃ retrospective: "it is necessary for Him to have (there, in heaven) somewhat (viz. His body) which he may have offered." But surely this is a view of the aorist which cannot be admitted. In such sentences, the uses of the aor. and pres. seem to regard not the time, objectively, of the act expressed, but its nature, subjectively, as an act rapidly passing in each case, or enduring. The straightforward construction of our sentence makes it necessary that προσενέγκῃ should refer to an act done in the state pointed out by the ἔχειν, however the nature of that act may be, in each case of its being done, such as to be accomplished at the moment, and not enduring onwards: which latter, expressed by ὃ προσφέρῃ, would certainly involve the contradiction above spoken of. Thus regarded then, what is it which our High Priest in heaven has to offer? In ch. v. 7, He is described as προσενέγκας prayers and supplications in the days of His flesh: and it might be thought that His ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ch. vii. 25, might be here meant, the offering being those intercessions. But this would hardly satisfactorily give the τι, which as Delitzsch remarks, is too concrete for such an interpretation. It must be something with which and by virtue of which, and as offering and applying which, our High Priest enters and ministers in the Holy of Holies above. Now if we look to the analogy of ch. ix. 7, 12, we see, 1. that the high priest entered the holy place *οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ κ. τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων*,—2. that Christ is entered into the *ἅγια* of heaven *οὐ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*: see also ib. ver. 25. This BLOOD of the one offering, Christ is represented as bearing into the Holy Place, and its application is ever set forth to us as a continuing and constantly repeated one. Thus this *blood of sprinkling* is regarded as being *in heaven*, ch. xii. 24: *as being sprinkled on the believer as the end of his election*, 1 Pet. i. 2: as *cleansing us from all sin*, 1 John i. 7: as *that wherein the saints wash their robes and make them white*, Rev. vii. 14. Still, as Delitzsch also remarks, this is not the place to enlarge on this matter, seeing that it is merely incidentally introduced here, the present object being to shew that it is in heaven, and not

ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἦν ἱερεύς, ὄντων τῶν [u] προσφερόντων [y] κατὰ [y] νόμον τὰ [u] δῶρα, [5] [z] οἵτινες [a] ὑποδείγματι καὶ [b] σκιᾷ [c] λατρεύουσιν τῶν [d] ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς [e] κεχρημά-

y Acts xxii. 12. Phil. iii. 5 al.
z = Matt. xvi. 28. Mark iv. 20. Acts x. 41, 47 al. fr.
a ch. iv. 11 reff.
b = Col. ii. 17. ch. x. 1.
c = ch. ix. (9) 14. (x. 2.) xii. 28. (xiii. 10.) Matt. iv. 10, from Deut. vi. 13.
d ch. iii. 1 reff.
e = Matt. ii. 12, 22. Acts x. 22. ch. xi. 7. xii. 25. Job xl. 3. Jos. Antt. iii. 8. 8, Μωυσῆς...εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν εἰσιὼν ἐχρηματίζετο περὶ ὧν ἐδεῖτο παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.

17 latt copt [Euthal-ms]. rec ins *των ιερεων* bef *των προσφεροντων*, with D³KL rel syrr æth-pl [Thdrt] : om ABD¹[P]א 17 latt copt æth-rom arm [Euthal-ms]. rec ins *τον* bef *νομον*, with DKL[P]א³ 37 [Chr Euthal-ms Damasc] : om ABא¹ 17 Thdrt.

on earth, that our High Priest ministers. The Roman Catholic interpretation of this place, as represented by Corn. a-Lapide, is worth noticing, if only to remark how absolutely inconsistent it is with the argument of the Epistle: "Ergo Christus in cœlo suas hostias et munera offert, scilicet suum in cruce sacrificium, quod olim in monte Calvariæ obtulit, nunc quoque id ipsum per continuum commemorationem Patri in cœlo offert. Secundo, *et proprie*, Christus in cœlo offert sacrificia missæ, quæ toto orbe quotidie celebrantur; in his enim primus et primarius sacerdos qui consecrat, offert, et transubstantiationem peragit, est Christus." Estius, more cautiously, "Probabile est apostolum loqui de ea oblatione qua se ipsum quondam in cruce passum et oblatum, continuo nunc repræsentat Patri in cœlis. Nam de altera (Christum, etsi in cœlo regnantem, offerre quotidie se ipsum adhuc in terris per ministros et vicarios suos sacerdotes) apostolus prorsus tacet, quia mysterium est, quod intelligendum relinquit fidelibus mysteriorum consciis." This last would make a curious canon of interpretation). **4.] Yea, if** (or as rec., "*For if* . . .," which follows more smoothly and naturally on the position of ver. 2, and on that very account is probably a correction. Hofmann, as above, laying all the stress on the aor. *προσενέγκῃ*, takes the **γάρ** as justifying that aorist: Er muß ein nicht erst darzubringendes, sondern dargebrachtes Opfer haben:—denn wäre er auf Erden . . . But see on this above. The connexion is obvious: 'our High Priest must have somewhat to offer. But *on earth* this could not be: for' &c.) **he were** (not, "*had been*," though grammatically it might be so: the pres. part. *ὄντων*, which follows, and *λατρεύουσι*, continuing it, shew that this *ἦν* is spoken of a continuing, not of a past hypothesis) **on earth** (some, as Grot., Wolf, al., supply *μόνον* after *γῆς*—and something in the same view Œc., *τοῦτο δὲ ἦν εἰ μὴ ἐτεθνήκει, μηδὲ ἐγερθεὶς ἀνελήφθη*: and Thdrt., *περιττὸν ἦν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ γῇ διαιτώμενον ἱερέα καλεῖν*: others, as Gerhard, Heinrichs, al., supply *ἀρχιερεύς* or *ἱερεύς*: but this it seems to me would stultify the argument. There is no need of any thing supplied) **He would not even *be* a priest** (observe the emphasis: which is not, as Bleek, He would not even be a *priest, much less a High Priest* (*οὐδ᾽ ἱερεὺς ἂν ἦν*), but the stress is on the verb *ἦν*, and it is taken ex concesso that the *ἀρχιερεύς* belonged to the genus *ἱερεύς*: 'He would not even belong to the category of priests.' In the background lies, 'and if not so, certainly could not be a High Priest:' but it is not brought forward, nor does it belong to the argument, which continues *ὄντων*, not *ὄντος*), **since there are** (*ὄντων*, emphatic: 'there are already:' not, "*were*" (as Grot.: "*erant*, nempe quum Psalmus iste scriberetur"), as is shewn by *λατρεύουσιν* below. The time indicated is that of writing the Epistle) **those who offer the gifts according to (the) law** (*the* law, equally, with or without the article: not only because but one law can be meant, but because the art. is so constantly omitted after a preposition even when required in translation), **5.] men who** (*ἱερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων φησί*, Œc. By **οἵτινες** is pointed out the class, or official description: mean those who') **serve** (**λατρεύειν** occurs eight times in St. Luke, four times in St. Paul, and six times in this Epistle. It has more the general sense of 'serving,' either God, as almost always, or some especial portion of divine service or sacred things, as here and ch. xiii. 10. *λειτουργεῖν* is the more proper word for priestly ministration. On the construction, see below) **the delineation** (*ὑπόδειγμα* cannot as in ch. iv. 11 mean, a pattern, or example: but must be taken, less usually but more strictly as answering to *ὑποδεικνύναι*, 'oculis subjicere,' here and in ch. ix. 23, as meaning a suggestive representation, or sketch. So Thl., *ὑποδείγματα, τουτέστιν ἀμυδρὰ δείγματα καὶ οἷον σκιαγραφήματα τὰ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ ὑποδειχθέντα τῷ Μωυσεῖ*. It corresponds to *δειχθέντα σοι* in the following citation) **and shadow** ('adumbration,' *σκιαγράφημα*. See on ch. x. 1, where *σκιά* and *εἰκών* are contrasted. As regards the construction: Calvin, Bengel, al. take *λατρεύουσιν* absolutely, and *ὑποδείγματι*

τισται Μωυσῆς μέλλων [f] ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν, [g] Ὅρα γάρ φησιν, ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν [h] τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει. [6] νυνὶ δὲ [i] διαφορωτέρας [k] τέτυχεν [l] λειτουργίας, [m] ὅσῳ καὶ [n] κρείττονός ἐστιν [o] διαθήκης [p] μεσίτης, [q] ἥτις

ABDKL Pℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

f Rom. xv. 28. 2 Cor. vii. 1. viii. 6 al. 1 Kings iii. 12.
g Exod. xxv. 40. xxvi. 30.
h Acts vii. 44. 1 Cor. x. 6. Rom. v. 14 al. l. c. and Amos v. 6 (cited in Acts vii. 43) only.
i compar., ch. i. 4 only.
k = Luke xx. 35. Acts xxiv. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 10. ch. xi. 35. 2 Macc. iv. 6.
l = Luke i. 23. (ch. ix. 2 reff.)
m constr., ch. iii. 3.
n ch. i. 4 reff.
o ch. vii. 22 reff.
p ch. ix. 15. xii. 24. Gal. iii. 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 5 only. Job ix. 33 only. (-τεύειν, ch. vi. 17.)
q ver. 5 reff.

5. rec ποιησης: txt ABDKL[P]ℵ rel $Orig_1$ Eus_2 [Euthal-ms].

6. νυν BD[1] Ath_1 [$Antch_1$ $Damasc_1$]. rec τετευχε, with BD[3]ℵ[3] rel $Damasc_1$: τετυχηκε [P 47] a b[1] Ath-3-mss [Chr_1 Thdrt $Antch_1$ $Damasc_1$], τετυχεκε 17: txt AD[1] KLℵ[1] Ath_1. om και D[1]K m vulg-mss(not am fuld &c) [arm] Thdrt(but ins ms_1) $Damasc_1$. διαθ. bef εστιν [KP] ℵ-corr[1]: the words from εστιν to κρειττοσ(. .) are omd by ℵ[1], but ℵ-corr[1] has supplied them except the last σ.

κ.τ.λ. ablatively: "who serve (God) in a delineation and shadow" &c. But this is far-fetched, and unnecessary, especially in the presence of ch. xiii. 10, where it is hardly possible to regard τῇ σκηνῇ otherwise than as the objective dative to λατρεύοντες) **of the heavenly things** (i. e. the things in heaven, in the heavenly sanctuary: correspondent to τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει: see also ch. ix. 23, 24. Chrys. understands it of *spiritual* things: τίνα λέγει ἐνταῦθα τὰ ἐπουράνια; τὰ πνευματικά· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς τελεῖται, ἀλλ' ὅμως τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰσιν ἄξια,—and then goes on to instance the work of the Spirit in baptism, the power of the keys, the utterance of Christian praise, &c. And Luther renders, der himmlischen Güter. But the context clearly requires the other view): **even as Moses was commanded** ("*admonished of God*," E. V., an excellent rendering. χρηματίζω is used in the later classics, but as early as Demosthenes, for to give a decisive answer, "responsum ex deliberatione reddere," as Reiske. Hence it came afterwards to be appropriated mainly to responses, warnings, commands, given from the Deity: so Diod. Sic. iii. 6, τοὺς γὰρ θεοὺς αὐτοῖς ταῦτα κεχρηματικέναι: xv. 10, περὶ δὲ τῶν χρησμῶν ἔφησε, μὴ χρηματίζειν τὸν θεὸν καθόλου περὶ θανάτου. And so constantly in the Scriptures both LXX and N. T. reff. and Jer. xxxii. (xxv.) 30; xxxvii. (xxx.) 2: Luke ii. 26. The earlier classical verb is χράω of the deity giving the oracle, χράομαι of the person consulting it. Observe the perfect, not the aor., giving a fine distinction not reproducible in English: viz. that these figures of the heavenly things were still subsisting as ordained to Moses, when the Epistle was written) **when about to complete** (not in distinction from *beginning*, as if he were about to put the finishing stroke to the work already nearly ended: but involving the whole work: 'to take in hand and carry on to completion') **the tabernacle: for** (γάρ justifies the assertion by the following citation) **Take heed, He says** (supply ὁ θεός; there can be no doubt of this here, where the words following are God's own), **that thou makest** (ποιήσῃς and ποιήσεις give a like sense, and in English must be expressed by the same. The former is better Greek; the latter according to the LXX: manuscript authority must prevail) **all things** (πάντα is not in the LXX, nor in the Heb., but is supplied also by Philo, Legg. Allegor. iii. 33, vol. i. p. 108, κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει πάντα ποιήσεις) **according to the pattern which was shewn** (LXX, δεδειγμένον) **thee in the mount.** If now we ask what this **τύπος** was, we are met with various replies. Faber Stapulensis says, "Arbitror id insinuare, non nudam veritatem in monte Mosi fuisse ostentatam, sed veritatis adumbrationem et remotam quandam ideam. Et quomodo etiam vidisset veritatem, nisi per speciem nude et revelate divina conspexisset, quod viatorum et adhuc in vita mortali peregrinantium non est. Typus igitur erat quod videbat, nondum ipsa veritas et archetypus." And so Schlichting, concluding, "adeo ut tabernaculum antiquum exemplar tantum fuerit exemplaris, et umbra umbræ." This view, which is that also of Bleek and Storr, is strongly controverted by Delitzsch, who takes the **τύπος** to be the veritable heavenly things themselves, not seen however by Moses directly and naturally, which would be impossible, but made visible to him in a vision. I do not see that there is much to choose between the two views. If the latter be taken, then surely the vision thus vouchsafed to Moses was itself only an intermediate representation, and so this view comes much to the same as the other.

6.] **But now** (the logical, not the temporal νυνί, as in ch. ix. 26; xi. 16 (νῦν), and frequently in St. Paul: 'ut res se habet:' νυνὶ δέ φησιν, ἐπειδὴ μή ἐστιν

[r] ἐπὶ [n] κρείττοσιν [s] ἐπαγγελίαις [t] νενομοθέτηται. [7] Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν [u] ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο [v] τόπος. [8] [w] μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει [x] Ἰδοὺ [y] ἡμέραι

r see ver. 1.
s plur., ch. vi. 12 reff.
t ch. vii. 11 (reff.) only.
u Luke i. 6. Phil. ii. 15. iii. 6. 1 Thess. iii. 13 only. LXX, Job only, exc. Gen. xvii. 1. Wisd. x. 5, 15. (-τως, 1 Thess. ii. 10.)
v Acts xxv. 16. ch. xii. 17.
w Rom. ix. 19 (Mark vii. 2 rec.) only +. Sir. xi. 7. xli. 7. 2 Macc. ii. 7 only.
x Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 31—34.
y so Luke xxiii. 29. Jer. ix. 25. xvi. 14 al.

7. for δευτερας, ετερας B[1].   8. αυτους AD[1]K[P]א[1] 17 [Euthal-ms] Thdrt.

ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, βελτίονος ἐπέτυχε λειτουργίας, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ βελτίονα λειτουργίαν ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεύς. Œc.) **He hath obtained** (**τέτευχα** (rec.) is properly the Ionic form of the perfect, but occurs in Aristotle and later writers: but **τέτυχα** is also found in later writers, as Plutarch and Diod. Sic. The other reading here, τετύχηκεν, is the true Attic form) **a more excellent ministry** (than that of any earthly priests), **in proportion as** (there is an ellipsis in the earlier clause of τοσούτῳ, which now lurks under the comparative: so in ch. iii. 3) **He is also** (καί, introducing a special reference to an already acknowledged fact, as in ch. vi. 7, where see note) **mediator** (see reff. The meaning of **μεσίτης**, a later Greek word, is not far from that of ἔγγυος,—one who becomes a goer between two persons, assuring to each the consent of the other to some point agreed on in common. The Atticists give us the Attic Greek for it, μεσέγγυος. Philo uses the title of Moses, οἷα μεσίτης κ. διαλλακτὴς . . . τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐποιεῖτο. And so St. Paul, in ref. Gal. The genitive after μεσίτης may either be of the *persons between whom*, as in ref. 1 Tim., εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπων: or of *one of the parties concerned*, as in Jos. Antt. xvi. 2. 2, τῶν παρ' Ἀγρίππα τινῶν ἐπιζητουμένων μεσίτης ἦν: or of the *object of the mediation*, the agreement or covenant, as Diod. Sic. iv. 54, μεσίτην γεγονότα τῶν ὁμολογιῶν ἐν Κόλχοις: Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 7, ταῦτα ὀμνύοντες ἔλεγον καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην ὧν ὑπισχνοῦντο ποιούμενοι. And in this last sense is the gen. here. Jesus is the mediator, between God and us) **of a better covenant, of one which** (**ἥτις**, '*quippe quæ*,' as always. This specific relative brings the thing referred to into its category, not only identifying it as ἥ would do, but classing it, and educing its property as belonging to the matter in hand: and thus having a ratiocinative force) **has been laid down** (see on ref. The word **νόμος** is also used of the new covenant by St. James, i. 25; ii. 12: see also iv. 12, and St. Paul, Rom. iii. 27; viii. 2; ix. 31) **upon** (on the condition of . . .: so Xen. Hell. ii. 2. 20, ἐποιοῦντο εἰρήνην, ἐφ' ᾧ τά τε μακρὰ τείχη . . . καθελόντας κ.τ.λ.) **better promises** (viz. those which are about to be particularized in the following citation. Theodoret says, ἡ μὲν γὰρ παλαιὰ διαθήκη σωματικὰς ἐπαγγελίας εἶχε συνεζευγμένας, γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα κ. μέλι . . . καὶ παίδων πλῆθος, κ. τὰ τούτοις προσόμοια· ἡ δὲ καινὴ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κ. οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν. And so Œc., Thl., Primas., Bengel, al. But as Bleek objects, it would be very improbable that the Writer should intend to refer the promises, on which the old covenant was based, to mere earthly blessings, in the face of such a designation of the hope of Abraham and the patriarchs as we find in ch. xi. 10—19).

7.] *Argumentation, exactly as in ch. vii. 11, from sayings of God, to shew the imperfection of the former covenant.* So Chrys.: ὥσπερ γὰρ λέγει ὅτι εἰ ἡ τελείωσις κ.τ.λ. (vii. 11), οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῷ αὐτῷ συλλογισμῷ κέχρηται. **For if that first** (covenant) **were** (or, had been. We are never sure of ἦν in such sentences, seeing that it is both imperfect and aorist. I prefer here the imperfect, seeing that the first covenant, in its ceremonial part, was yet observed. Bleek, after the vulg. ("si . . . culpa vacasset, non . . locus inquireretur"), prefers the aorist) **blameless** (τὸ ἄμεμπτος ἀντὶ τοῦ τελεία τέθεικε, τουτέστιν ἀποχρῶσα πρὸς τελειότητα, ἀμέμπτους τοὺς ἐργαζομένους ἐργαζομένη. Thdrt. It is the contrary of ἀσθενὲς κ. ἀνωφελές, ch. vii. 18), **a place would not be sought** (i. e. space opened, viz. in the words of the following prophecy, which indicate the substitution of such a covenant for the old one. Bleek gives a rather far-fetched interpretation,—that the **τόπος** is the place in men's hearts, as distinguished from the tables of stone on which the first covenant was written; referring to 2 Cor. iii. 3 for a similar distinction. But it is far better to understand it of a *place in history*, and regard the expression as τόπον εὑρίσκειν and τόπον λαμβάνειν in reff., see also τόπον διδόναι, Rom. xii. 19. ἐζητεῖτο must not be rendered pluperfect, as in E. V., al., but, as in vulg. above, imperf.) **for a second** (the emphasis is on **δευτέρας**).

8—12.] *Proof, that a place for a second is contemplated*, by citation from Jeremiah. 8.] **For** (there is an ellipsis of ζητεῖται δέ, and the γάρ introduces the substantiation of the assertion) **blaming them** (so ref. 2 Macc., μεμψάμενος αὐτοῖς

[y] ἔρχονται, [z] λέγει κύριος, καὶ [ab] συντελέσω [c] ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ [c] ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα [bd] διαθήκην [d] καινήν, 9 οὐ κατὰ τὴν [e] διαθήκην ἣν [e] ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν,

ABDKL PℵA b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

z Jer. l. c. Aℵ. φησί, B.
a = Rom. ix. 28. Lam. ii. 17.
b (l. c. διαθήσομαι) Jer. xli. (xxxiv.) 8, 15.
c LXX, τῷ οἴκῳ.
d Luke xxii. 20 ‖. 2 Cor. iii. 6. ch. ix. 15.
e (l. c. διεθέμην) 2 Chron. xxxiv. 32. Isa. xxviii. 15. Jer. xli. (xxxiv.) 18.

om 2nd επι D[1]. for 2nd οικον, οι (sic) ℵ[1].

εἶπεν. The dative after μέμφομαι is common in Greek: see Herod. iii. 4; iv. 180: Xen. Cyr. i. 4. 6, and many other examples in Bleek. But seeing that it appears difficult, after the word ἄμεμπτος has been used of the *covenant*, to apply the blame in μεμφόμενος to any object but the covenant, many Commentators have taken the participle absolutely, and joined αὐτοῖς with λέγει. So Faber Stapulensis, Piscator, Schlichting, Grot., Limborch, Peirce, Michaelis, Storr, Kuinoel, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., al. But I cannot believe that the objective pronoun would be so loosely and ambiguously put, were it meant to be joined to λέγει. It surely must have been λέγει αὐτοῖς. And there is a propriety, which the ancients have not failed to observe, in αὐτοῖς, instead of αὐτῇ or αὐτήν. So Chrys., having explained εἰ . . . . ἦν ἄμεμπτος, by εἰ ἀμέμπτους ἐποίει, proceeds, ὅτι γὰρ περὶ τούτου φησίν, ἄκουε τὰ ἑξῆς· . . . οὐκ εἶπε μεμφόμενος δὲ αὐτῇ, ἀλλά, μ. δὲ αὐτοῖς. And so Syr., vulg., Œc., Thl., Luther, Calv., Beza, Bengel, Wolf, al.) **He saith** (the following citation is the great prophetic passage Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii.) 31—34, see also Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27. "After the sack of Jerusalem, Jeremiah with the other captives was brought in chains to Rama, where Nebuzaradan had his head-quarters. There took place, at God's special command, his prophecies of the future entire restoration of Israel, of another David, of Rachel's wailing over her children at Rama, and their future return, of the new covenant resting on absolute and veritable forgiveness of sins which Jehovah would make with his people, these prophecies forming the third part of the third trilogy of the three great trilogies into which the prophecies of Jeremiah may be divided: ch. xxi.—xxv., the book against the shepherds of the people; ch. xxvi.—xxix., the book of Jeremiah's conflict against the false prophets; ch. xxx. xxxi., the book of restoration." Delitzsch. "The question which has before now been abundantly handled, whether the saying refers to the return of the exiles, or to the covenant of which Christ is the mediator, or to the future general conversion of the Jews, or whether some things in it to one of these, some to another, or whether the whole in its lower literal sense to the return of the exiles and in its higher spiritual sense to Christ and His kingdom, must be answered by the considerations before adduced on ch. i. 5. It belongs throughout to the cycle of Messianic prophecies, and is one of the most beautiful and sublime of them; and its true fulfilment can only be sought in the covenant brought in by the Saviour, and in the salvation through Him imparted to mankind, and ever more and more unfolded and completed. This is the case, however this salvation, in the perception and declaration of the Prophet, is bound up with the restoration of the ancient covenant people and their reunion in the land of their home." Bleek), **Behold, the days come, saith the Lord** (φησι κύριος LXX-B, but λέγει Aℵ. "The prophecy, taken from this rich cycle of eschatologic prophecies, whose clear Messianic sense allows of no evasion, begins with Jeremiah's constant formula, ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται." Delitzsch), **and** (καί explicative, answering to the Heb. ו in an apodosis), **I will accomplish upon** (LXX, διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ κ.τ.λ. The difference is beyond doubt intentional, to set forth the completeness of the new covenant. Twice in this same book (reff.), the LXX have rendered this same Heb. expression, כָּרַת בְּרִית by συντελεῖν διαθήκην. Augustine urges the word "consummabo," De Spir. et Lit. c. 19 (34), vol. x. pt. i., "Quid est consummabo, nisi implebo?" ἐπί, with the accusative of motion, the covenant being brought upon them) **the house of Israel and upon the house of Judah** (both these, Israel first and Judah afterwards, were sent into captivity for their sins: and both are specified severally in God's promise of grace and restoration) **a new covenant** (on διαθήκη see on ch. vii. 22), 9.] (this covenant is first specified negatively: it is *not* to be like that first one) **not according to the covenant** (לֹא כַבְּרִית, different in quality from, not after the measure of) **which I made** (LXX again, διεθέμην: see reff.) to (not "*with*:" it is a pure dative, and betokens mere agency on the part of the subject, God: the people of Israel, the objects, being only recipients, not co-agents) **their fathers, in the day of my**

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ [f] ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ [g] ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθηκῃ μου, κἀγὼ [h] ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, [i] λέγει κύριος. 10 ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν [k] διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, [l] λέγει κύριος, [l] διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν [m] διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ [n] ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν [o] ἐπιγράψω

f ch. ii. 16 reff. constr., here only? g constr., Acts xxviii. 30. Gal. iii. 10 (from Deut. xxvii. 26) only. dat., Acts xiv. 22. h ch. ii. 3 reff. i φησί, LXX. k Luke xxii. 29 bis. Acts iii. 25. ch. ix. 16, 17. x. 16 (from l. c.) only. Gen. xv. 18. l = 1 Thess. iv. 8. Rev. xvii. 17. 2 Cor. i. 22 al. Neh. vii. 5. m Matt. xxii. 37 ||. Eph. ii. 3. iv. 18 al. 1 Chron. xxix. 18. n with gen., Rev. xiv. 1. Exod. xxxiv. 28. xxxvi. 39 (= xxxix. 30 F.). Num. xvii. 2, 3. Deut. xxvii. 3, 8. 2 Kings i. 18. Isa. xxx. 8. with accus., Rev. iii. 12. Deut. iv. 13. v. 22. vi. 9. x. 2, 4. xi. 20. 4 Kings xxiii. 3. Ps. cxxxviii. 16. Ezek. xxxvii. 16. o Mark xv. 26 (|| L. v. r.). Acts xvii. 23. ch. x. 13. Rev. xxi. 12 only. Prov. vii. 3.

9. *ημεραις* B 34. for *γης*, *της* D.
10. aft *διαθηκη* ins *μου* (*as* LXX-B) AD: om (*as* LXX-A *Frid-Aug*(=א)) BKL[P]א rel latt syrr coptt [Chr Euthal-ms]. *καρδια εαυτων* B[1](sic, see Table), *in corde* vulg Bede: *καρδιαν αυτων* (*as* LXX-א) Kא[1] g Clem: *καρδιαις αυτων* [P] 31, *in cordibus* D-lat Primas: txt [*as* LXX-B] ADLא[3] rel [Chr$_1$ Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]. (om from *αυτων* to *αυτων* o.) *γραψω* (*as* LXX-B) B.

taking hold of their hand (the idiom is Hebraistic: בְּיוֹם הַחֲזִיקִי בְיָדָם. Justin M. Dial. c. Tryph. c. 11, p. 112, cites it *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐπελαβόμην*. This expression would shew beyond a doubt, being one which the Writer of our Epistle would never have adopted in a translation of his own, that he is quoting the LXX) **to bring them out of the land of Egypt: because they abode not in my covenant, and I disregarded them** (thus, making ὅτι render a reason for the foregoing, and attaching it to the whole following sentence, most of the moderns: and this is apparently most agreeable to the Heb., אֲשֶׁר־הֵמָּה הֵפֵרוּ אֶת־בְּרִיתִי, where, says Bleek, the אֲשֶׁר is only a particle of relation or connexion with the preceding, either for the subject, "quippe illi," or for the object, "quod fœdus meum:" and either way it = "*for* (or *because*) *they broke my covenant*." But many take the sentence beginning with ὅτι as an independent one —"because they abode not in my covenant, I also disregarded them." So Chrys. (*αὐτὴν τὴν αἰτίαν δεικνύς, δι' ἣν καταλιμπάνει αὐτούς*), Thl., Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, al.), **saith** (φησί, LXX) **the Lord.**

On the fact, **οὐκ ἐνέμειναν**, Delitzsch gives a striking quotation from Schelling, Offenbarungsphilosophie,—"The Law appears to be the mere ideal of a religious constitution, as it has never existed in fact: in practice, the Jews were almost throughout polytheists. The substance of their national feeling was formed by heathendom: the accidents only, by revelation. From the queen of heaven down to the abominations of the Phœnicians, and even to Cybele, the Jews passed through every grade of paganism." "In fact," adds Delitzsch, "there is no period of the history of Israel before the captivity, in which more or less idolatry was not united with the worship of Jehovah, except the time of David and the first years of Solomon, during which the influence of Samuel still continued to be felt. And when by the captivity Idol-worship was completely eradicated from the people, as far at least as regards that part of it which returned, it is well known that a hypocritical letter-worship got the mastery over them, which was morally very little better." See note on Matt. xii. 43. **10.] For** (כִּי: 'because' is too strong: the only reason rendered is for the expression *καινήν* above: '*new, I say: for . . .*') **this** (predicate, explained in what follows) **is the covenant which I will establish to the house** (cf. Aristoph. Av. 438, *ἢν μὴ διάθωνταί γ' οἵδε διαθήκην ἐμοί*) **of Israel** (Israel here in its wider sense, comprehending both Israel proper and Judah: because then all Israel shall be again united), **after those days** (Œc. understands *τὰς τῆς ἐξόδου, ἐν αἷς ἔλαβον τὸν νόμον*: Thl. says, *ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ περὶ ἐκείνων τῶν ἡμερῶν λέγειν, περὶ ὧν ἀνωτέρω εἶπεν, ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται. μεθ' ὃ οὖν διέλθωσιν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, τοιαύτην διαθήκην διαθήσομαι, οἵαν ἑξῆς ἀκούσῃ*. But the **ἐκείνας** seems to point immediately to the time indicated by the aorist **ἠμέλησα**: and thus **μετὰ τὰς ἡμ. ἐκ.** will be, after the end of that dispensation, when those days of disregard are over), **saith** (φησί LXX) **the Lord; giving** (the LXX-Bא have *διδοὺς δώσω*: the Heb. נָתַתִּי. But A agrees with the text: and by the Writer repeating the same in ch. x. 16, it is probable that he had this reading in his copy of the LXX. The participle, as it stands, is best joined, as Œc., with *διαθήσομαι*, and *καὶ . . . ἐπιγράψω* taken as a fresh and independent clause. This is

αὐτούς, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς ᵖ εἰς θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι ᵖ εἰς λαόν. [11] καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν ᑫ πολίτην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων ʳ Γνῶθι τὸν ʳ κύριον, ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με ˢ ἀπὸ μικροῦ ˢ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν, [12] ὅτι ᵗ ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ

ABDKL Pℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

p = ch. i. 5 reff. q Luke xv. 15. xix. 14. Acts xxi. 39 only. Prov. xi. 9, 12. xxiv. 28. Jer. xxxvi. (xxix.) 23. r here only. see Rom. i. 21. Gal. iv. 9. 1 John iv. 6 al. 1 Kings iii. 7. s Acts viii. 10. Isa. xxii. 24. t Matt. xvi. 22 only. constr., 3 Kings viii. 34, 36, 50 al.

for μοι, μου ℵ[1](corrd "ipsa ut videtur manu").

11. διδαξουσιν D[3] Chr-2-mss Cyr₁. rec (for πολιτην) πλησιον, with a c f vulg syr-mg [æth] Chr[-montf Euthal-ms] Cyr₁ [Thl]: txt ABDKLℵ rel syrr coptt arm Chr-mss Thdrt Damasc Aug. for 1st αυτ., εαυτου D[1]. om 2nd αυτου D[1] 46. The ησ. of ειδησουσιν is written above by the first hand in B. rec aft μικρου ins αυτων (as LXX-Bℵ), with D[3]L rel syrr copt [æth] Thdrt Damasc Thl Œc: om (as LXX-A) ABD[1]K[P]ℵ 1 o 17 latt [basm arm Clem₁ Euthal-ms] Chr₁ Cyr₁. [syr coptt Clem₁ om αυτων at end.]

the first of the κρείττονες ἐπαγγελίαι on which the new covenant is established) **my laws into their mind** (διάνοια, their inward parts, their spiritual man, as distinguished from the mere sensorium which receives impressions from without: Heb. קֶרֶב), **and on their heart** (LXX-A, καὶ ἐπιγρ. αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς κ. αὐτῶν. Either gen., dat. (as B), or accus. is suitable: if accus., the act of transference by inscription, rather than the fact of being inscribed, is in view: if gen. sing., which from the analogy of διάνοιαν, and of Prov. vii. 3 [Alex.] Ald. [so Tromm.: not Holmes] (ἐπίγραψον ἐπὶ πλακὸς τῆς καρδίας σου), our καρδίας most likely is, then the fact of their superimposition and covering of the heart: if the dat., then that of their situation upon its tablet. See instances of the gen. and accus. in reff.) **will I inscribe** (γράψω LXX-B) **them** (contrast to the inscription of the old law, which was on tables of stone: see 2 Cor. iii. 3): **and I will be to them for** (εἶναι εἰς, הָיָה לְ, as ch. i. 5, which see) **a God, and they shall be to me for a people.**

11.] *Second of the* κρείττονες ἐπαγγελίαι —universal spread of the knowledge of God: following on the other, that God would put His laws in their minds and write them in their hearts. **And they shall not have to teach** (see var. readd., which give the later usage of οὐ μή with the indic. fut.) **every man his (fellow-)citizen** (אִישׁ רֵעֵהוּ. LXX-A ἀδελφόν: Bℵ, as text. The LXX have several times rendered רֵעֵהוּ by πολίτης, see reff.), **and every man his brother** (LXX-A πλησίον), **saying Know** (Heb. דְּעוּ, plural: "Know ye") **the Lord: because all shall know** (εἰδήσω is properly an Ionic future of εἴδω, but used, at least in its aoristic form εἴδησα, by the Attics also, e. g. Aristot. de Anima i. 2 (so Lobeck: but I cannot find it). See Lobeck, Phryn. p. 743, where more examples are given, but none of the Attic use of εἰδήσω: nor does this fut. seem to occur elsewhere either in the LXX or N.T.) **me, from the small (one)** (the Heb. bears out the rec. here (which agrees with LXX-Bℵ) in expressing the αὐτῶν: לְמִקְּטַנָּם וְעַד־גְּדוֹלָם. The formula is found generally without the pronoun, as in reff. and Gen. xix. 11: 1 Kings v. 9; xxx. 2, 19: 4 Kings xxiii. 2; xxv. 26, &c.: but with it in Jer. vi. 13: Jonah iii. 5) **even to the great (one) of them** (that is, "they shall be all taught of God," as cited by our Lord in John vi. 45, from Isa. liv. 13, as written ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, alluding to such passages as this and Joel ii. 28, 29. See also 1 John ii. 20, 27, and notes there. Under the old covenant, the priests' lips were to keep knowledge, and they were to teach the people God's ways: under the New, there is no more need for the believer to have recourse to man for teaching in the knowledge of God, for the Holy Spirit, which is given to all that ask, reveals the things of Christ to each, according to the measure of his spiritual attainment and strength of faith. And the inner reason of this now follows, making, formally, the third of these better promises, but in fact bound up with, and the condition of, the last mentioned):

12.] **because** (not, as Michaelis on Peirce, "shall know me, that:" but ὅτι is the causal particle: see above, and cf. the conclusion, Isa. xxxiii. 24. "By God passing by the former guilt of His sinful people, and beginning a new relation of grace with them, is this blessed change made possible." De Wette. Bleek and Delitzsch have good notes here) **I will be merciful** (אֶסְלַח. "In other places also is the verb סָלַח given in the LXX by the formula ἵλεως εἰμι: always of God only, in reference to men; sometimes absolutely, 3 Kings viii. 30, 39: 2 Chron. vi. 21: Amos vii. 2; but generally with a dative, either of the per-

τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι. [13] [u] ἐν τῷ λέγειν καινήν, [v] πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην· τὸ δὲ [v] παλαιούμενον καὶ [w] γηράσκον [x] ἐγγὺς [y] ἀφανισμοῦ.

IX. [1] Εἶχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη [z] δικαιώματα [a] λατρείας

u ch. ii. 8. iii. 15. v here bis. Luke xii. 33. ch. i. 11 (reff.) only. see note. w = here (John xxi. 18) only. Job xiv. 8. x = ch. vi. 8. y here only. Deut. vii. 2. Jer. xxviii. (li.) 37 al. fr. z = Luke i. 6. 1 Kings viii. 9, 11. x. 25. see Rom. i. 32. a = ver. 6. Rom. ix. 4 (xii. 1. John xvi. 2) only. Exod. xii. 25, 26.

12. rec aft *αμαρτ. αυτων* ins *και των ανομιων αυτων* (*prob from ch* x. 17: *see Bleek*), with ADKLℵ[3] rel [47 transposes *ανομ.* and *αμαρτ.*] syr [arm] Chr Thdrt Damasc: om Bℵ[1] [17] vulg Syr coptt [æth] (Clem). (In m the ver begins (*by homœotel*) *και των ανομιων*: but for *αυτων*, it has *αυτου*.) [*μνησθησομαι* 17.]

Chap. IX. 1. om *και* B a[1] b[1] k Syr coptt Thl. om *η* D[1]. rec aft *πρωτη* ins *σκηνη*, with rel copt [Euthal-ms Thdrt]; *εκεινη* m: [*testamentum* æth:] om ABD KL[P]ℵ h l n[1] 17 latt syrr basm arm Thaum Chr_1 Cyr_1 Damasc Thl.

son whom God forgives, Num. xiv. 20: Jer. v. 1, 7; xxvii. (l.) 20, or the sins which are forgiven, 1 (3) Kings viii. 34, 36, 50: Jer. xliii. (xxxvi.) 3." Bleek) **to their iniquities** (plur. in N. T. here only, but frequently in LXX, e. g. 1 Kings iii. 13: Jer. ii. 22; xviii. 23: Ezek. xii. 2: Hosea x. 13 &c.), **and of their sins** (see var. readd.) **will I make mention no more.**

13.] Transition to the antithetical parallel which he is about to draw between the former, earthly and ceremonial, and the latter, heavenly and actual tabernacle: see summary at ch. ix. 1. **In saying** (cf. reff. Here, as in each of those, the subject is God, belonging here to the following verb *πεπαλαίωκεν*: '*when God saith*'), "**a new (covenant),**" **He hath made old** (*παλαιόω*, a word peculiar to biblical usage, and in the N. T. to Heb. and St. Luke. The LXX have it a few times, in this same meaning: e. g. Lam. iii. 4, *ἐπαλαίωσεν σάρκα μου καὶ δέρμα μου*: Job ix. 5, *ὁ παλαιῶν ὄρη*. Cf. also Job xxxii. 15: Isa. lxv. 22: Dan. vii. 25 Theod. *Made old*, viz. by speaking of,—and where God is the speaker, actually in decree establishing, seeing that all God's sayings are realities,—a new one. Some have taken the word as signifying "*hath set aside, abrogated*," "*antiquavit*," as Erasmus. But this, besides being unexampled, and not answering to the technical meaning of 'antiquare,' does not tally with the present participle of the same verb below, which cannot be rendered 'is being abrogated:' see below. Far better is the rendering, of somewhat questionable Latinity, but very expressive, "veteravit," of the ital. and vulg.: see again below) **the first (covenant). Now** (transition, by *δέ*, from a particular assertion, to an axiomatic general truth: as in Rom. xiv. 23) **that which is being made old** (the saying of God *πεπαλαίωκεν* that first covenant: the state of *παλαίωσις* thereby induced, continues, as the perfect (not aor., *ἐπαλαίωσε*, because the act was not a passing one, contemporaneous with the saying) shews,—and hence the covenant *παλαιοῦται* continually. The vulg., which had "veteravit" before, here adopts "*antiquatur*" for the old ital. "veteratur," which, as above shewn, was far better) **and getting into old age** (see reff.: and cf. Xen. Vectig. i. 4, of fruits of the earth,—*τοῖς ἐπ' ἐνιαυτὸν θάλλουσί τε καὶ γηράσκουσι*: id. Ages. ii. 14, *ἡ μὲν τοῦ σώματος ἰσχὺς γηράσκει, ἡ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ῥώμη . . . ἀγήρατός ἐστιν*: Herodian iii. 2. 15, *τὰ ἐκείνων γηράσαντα καὶ παρ' ἀλλήλοις συντριβέντα Μακεδόσιν εὐάλωτα καὶ Ῥωμαίοις δοῦλα γεγένηται*), **is nigh unto** (see ref. and note) **vanishing away** (*εἰς ἀφανισμὸν εἶναι* or *γενέσθαι* is a common phrase with the LXX. See reff., and 3 Kings ix. 7: 4 Kings xxii. 19 &c., in Trommius. The Writer uses the expression of the whole time subsequent to the utterance of the prophecy. At that time the *παλαίωσις* began, by the mention of a new covenant: and from that time the first covenant might be regarded as ever dwindling away, so to speak, and near its end, which God might bring on at any time. It is far better to regard the **ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ** thus, than, with some, to place it at the time of the Writer, when in fact it had already taken place).

Chap. IX. 1.] The chief train of thought and argument, although in the main forwarded, has been for the present somewhat broken, by the long citation in the last chapter. It is now resumed. Christ is the High Priest of a heavenly tabernacle, the Mediator of a covenant established upon better promises. This latter has been shewn out of Scripture: and it has been proved that the old covenant was by that Scripture pronounced to be transitory and near its end. As such, it is now *compared in detail with this second and better one, as to its liturgical apparatus, and proffered means of access to God.* These are detailed somewhat minutely, mention being

b = ch. viii. 2 reff. Exod. xxxviii. 23 [29]. τό τε [b] ἅγιον [c] κοσμικόν. [2] σκηνὴ γὰρ [d] κατεσκευάσθη ἡ
c Tit. ii. 12 only †. (see note.) d ch. iii. 3, 4 reff.

2. [κατεσκευασται 17.]

even made of some which are not insisted on, nor their symbolism explained: and the main point of comparison, the access into the holiest place, is hastened on. In this particular especially the infinite superiority of the new covenant is insisted on: and the whole access of Christ into God's presence for us is elaborately contrasted with the former insufficient ceremonial access by means of animal sacrifices. In one point, above all, is this contrast brought out: *the supreme efficacy of the blood of Christ, as set against the nullity of the blood of bulls and of goats to purge away sin.* Then the subject of the heavenly tabernacle and holy place is recurred to, and the future prospect of Christ's re-appearing from thence opened. 1—5.] *The liturgical appliances of the first covenant.* 1.] **Now accordingly** (μέν answers to δέ ver. 6, not to δέ ver. 11, see there. οὖν takes up the thought of ch. viii. 5, where the command is recited directing Moses to make the tabernacle after the pattern shewn him in the mount. In pursuance of that command it was that ἡ πρώτη κ.τ.λ.) **the first (covenant)** (not, the first *tabernacle*, as the rec. wrongly and clumsily glosses. There is no question between a first and second *tabernacle*: the μείζων καὶ τελειοτέρα σκηνή is a prototype, not an after-thought. The gloss has probably arisen from a blunder in interpreting τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς in ver. 8: see there) **had** (it was no longer subsisting in the Writer's time as a *covenant*, however its observances might be still surviving. ἐπεὶ ἔλεγε, τότε εἶχε, νῦν οὐκ ἔχει· δεικνυσιν ἤδη τούτῳ αὐτὴν ἐκκεχωρηκυῖαν· τότε γὰρ εἶχε, φησίν. ὥστε νῦν, εἰ καὶ ἕστηκεν, οὐκ ἔστιν. Chrys. Or perhaps the εἶχε may refer back to the time indicated in ch. viii. 5, when Moses made the tabernacle: had, when its liturgical appliances were first provided. But I prefer the other view) **also** (as well as this second and more perfect covenant: not that this has all the things below mentioned, but that it too possesses its corresponding liturgical appliances, though of a higher kind) **ordinances** ("The vulg. renders '*justificationes culturæ*.' But the idea of δικαίωμα is ever passive. It imports always the product of either right appointment, or righteous judgment, or righteous conduct: the ordinance having the force of right (ref. Luke), the righteously uttered judgment (Rom. v. 16), the decree according to righteousness (Rev. xv. 4), the righteous performance (Rom. v. 18); here beyond doubt, and ver. 10, in the first of these senses, in which the LXX have it for מִשְׁפָּט, חֹק and their synonyms. It is from δικαιοῦν, to give the force of law, to make of legal obligation. The old covenant also had liturgical ordinances, which were 'juris divini,' ordinances which rested their obligatory right upon revelation from God and declaration of His will." Delitzsch) **of service** (*worship*: see ch. viii. 5 and note), **and its** (or, *the*: see below) **worldly sanctuary** (Thom. Aq., Luther, al. take ἅγιον not in a local but in an ethical sense, = ἁγιότης: Wolf understands by it "vasa sacra totumque apparatum Leviticum." But as the whole passage treats of the distinction between two sanctuaries, one into which the Levitical priests entered, and the other into which Christ is entered, it is certain that the signification must be local only. As regards the meaning of κοσμικόν, it must not be taken with Homberg as = κόσμιον, 1 Tim. ii. 9; iii. 2, for both usage and the art. are against this: nor again, with Theodor.-mops., Thdrt., Œc.(alt.), Grot., Wetst., Hammond, as σύμβολον τοῦ κόσμου: nor again as Kypke, "toto terrarum orbe celebratum," as Jos. B. J. iv. 5. 2, where the high priests Ananus and Jesus are described as τῆς κοσμικῆς θρησκείας κατάρχοντες, προσκυνούμενοί τε τοῖς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης,—a meaning which would apply only to the temple, not to the tabernacle, which, from ver. 2, is here spoken of: nor again as Chrys. (ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ Ἕλλησι βατὸν ἦν, κοσμικὸν αὐτὸ καλεῖ· οὐ γὰρ δὴ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι κόσμος ἦν), Thl., Erasmus, al., which would only be true of a part of the ἅγιον, viz. the court of the Gentiles: but as in ref., and constantly in the Fathers, "*mundanus*," belonging to this world. So Plut., Consol. in Bl., κατὰ . . . . . τὴν κοσμικὴν διάταξιν: Hierocl. Carm. Aur. 126, τῆς κοσμικῆς εὐταξίας. So that it stands opposed to ἐπουράνιον, and is an epithet distinguishing the sanctuary of the first covenant from that of the second, not one common to the two. This is also shewn by the art. τό, to the consideration of which we now come. The art. itself is remarkable, as is also the non-repetition of it before κοσμικόν. And this latter circumstance has induced some, among whom is Delitzsch, to take κοσμικόν as a predicate, "and its (or, the) sanctnary, a worldly one." For the necessity or veri similitude of this, usage is alleged, and such

πρώτη, ἐν ᾗ ἥ τε [e] λυχνία καὶ ἡ [f] τράπεζα καὶ ἡ [g] πρόθεσις

e Matt. iv. 15. Luke viii. 16 ‖ Mk. xi. 33 only, exc. Rev. i. 12 al6. Exod. xxv. 31—39. f Matt. xv. 27 al. fr. Exod. xxv. 23—30. g 2 Chron. xiii. 11. 2 Macc. x. 3. elsw., ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως, as Matt. xii. 4 ‖. Exod. xl. 21. (23.)

passages as τὸ σῶμα θνητὸν ἅπαντες ἔχομεν, where we have ἔχω with a definite subst. as an object, and an indefinite predicate attached. But if I do not mistake, the peculiar arrangement of the clause here forbids such a rendering. For, 1. εἶχεν is not peculiar to this clause, but common to the two of which the sentence consists: and we should therefore expect, especially from a writer so careful of rhetorical equilibrium, that the objects in the two clauses should correspond: not that the first of them should be *merely* objective, and the second predicative. Again, 2. the use and position of the copula τε seems to forbid any such disjoining of substantive and epithet: being, however loosely used in later Greek, a closer copula than καί. I conceive the article to be rather used to distribute the object and epithet which follow it: the first covenant had not merely *a* worldly sanctuary, but the only sanctuary which was upon earth: that one which was constructed after the pattern of things in the heavens. Possibly another reason for inserting it might be, to define beyond doubt the substantival use of the neuter adj. ἅγιον when joined with an epithet such as κοσμικόν. As to the omission of the art. before κοσμικόν, it is no bar to rendering the adj. as an epithet: cf. τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ, Gal. i. 4).

2—5.] *Epexegetic of* τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν, *by a particular detail.* 2.] **For the tabernacle** (most Commentators, as De Wette, Bleek, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al., render (correctly enough for the Greek, cf. ch. vi. 7: Acts x. 41; xix. 11; xxvi. 22), "*a* tabernacle," and then take ἡ πρώτη as specifying. But I should rather query, whether this be not carrying nicety too far for the idiom of modern languages: and whether we can come closer in English to σκηνὴ ἡ πρώτη, and σκηνὴ ἡ λεγομένη ἁγία, than by 'the tabernacle, namely, the first one,' and 'the tabernacle which was called holy.' For as Delitzsch remarks, "the general idea σκηνή is put forward anarthrously, and afterwards defined by appositional epithets having the article." But when we say 'a tabernacle,' we do not express the general idea σκηνή, but an indefinite concrete example of it. The English only admits such expressions in plurals and abstracts: e. g. γῆ ἡ πιοῦσα, "land which hath drunk:" δυνάμεις οὐχ αἱ τυχοῦσαι, "miracles of no common sort." Or we may say that in both cases σκηνή being thrown emphatically forward, loses its article. At all events, by rendering it "a tabernacle" in both places, as Delitzsch (not the rest, that I can discover), we give a tinge of indefiniteness which certainly does not belong to it, and seem to lose the solemn reference to the well-known tabernacle) **was established** (on κατασκευάζω, see on ch. iii. 3. It is often found of the setting up or establishing of a tent: Xen. Cyr. ii. 1. 25, σκηνὰς αὐτοῖς κατεσκεύασε: ib. 30, Κῦρος δὲ αὐτῷ σκηνὴν μὲν κατεσκευάσατο: Jos. c. Apion. ii. 2, Μωυσῆς, ὅτε τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν τῷ θεῷ κατεσκεύασεν) **the first one** (πρώτη, in situation, to those entering: see Acts xvi. 12 note, and compare the Homeric expression ἐν πρώτῃσι θύρῃσι. In the citation from Josephus above, the expression is used in a *temporal* sense, as distinguished from the subsequent one, in the temple of Solomon. The question, whether the Writer thinks (locally) of two tabernacles, or is speaking of the *first portion* of one and the same tabernacle, is of no great importance: the former would be but a common way of expressing the latter: and we can hardly deny that 'two tabernacles' are spoken of, in the presence of σκ. ἡ λεγομένη ἅγια ἁγίων below), **in which were** (not, "*are*," as Lünem., holding it to be ruled by λέγεται below. But λέγεται only refers to a name, now, as then, given: the position of the articles enumerated in the πρώτη σκηνή must be contemporaneous with κατεσκ. above) **the candlestick** (with seven lights: of gold, carved with almond flowers, pomegranates and lilies: see Exod. xxv. 31—39; xxxvii. 17—24. There were *ten* of these in the temple of Solomon, see 1 Kings vii. 49: 2 Chron. iv. 7: but in the second temple, the Mosaic regulation was returned to, and *only one* placed in the tabernacle: see 1 Macc. i. 21; iv. 49: Jos. Antt. xii. 7. 6: also B. J. v. 5. 5 (see below); vii. 5. 5, where he describes Vespasian's triumph, and the candlestick as borne in it, which is now to be seen in relief on the arch of Titus at Rome) **and the table** (for the shewbread; of shittim (acacia?) wood, overlaid with gold, Exod. xxv. 23—30; xxxvii. 10—16, of which there was *one only* in the Mosaic tabernacle, and in the second temple (1 Macc. ut supra), but *ten* in Solomon's temple, see 2 Chron. iv. 8; also ib. ver. 19: 1 Chron. xxviii. 16: 1 Kings vii. 48) **and the shew of the bread** (there can be little doubt that Tholuck and Delitzsch are right, who understand ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων not of the *custom of exhibiting* the bread, but, seeing that

h = ch. viii. 5 reff.
i ch. vi. 19 reff. Exod. xxvi. 31 ff.
k Num. iv. 19. 3 Kings viii. 6. 2 Chron. iv. 22. v. 7.
l here only (see note.) 2 Chron. xxvi. 19. Ezek. viii. 11 only. (-ιαν, Luke i. 9. -αμα, ib. 10, 11.)
m ch. xi. 7 reff.
n Rev. xi. 19. Exod. xxxi. 7. Num. Deut. Josh. passim.

τῶν [g] ἄρτων, [h] ἥτις λέγεται [h] ἅγια. [3] μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον [i] καταπέτασμα σκηνὴ ἡ λεγομένη [k] ἅγια ἁγίων, [4] χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα [l] θυμιατήριον, καὶ τὴν [mn] κιβωτὸν τῆς [n] διαθήκης

ABDKL Pℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

aft *αρτων* ins *και το χρυσουν θυμιατηριον*, omg *χρ. θυμ. και* in ver 4, B basm [æth]. ins *τα* bef *αγια* B. aft *αγια.* (sic A) ins *αγιων* AD[1] [Orig-int$_1$].

3. ins *τα* bef *αγια* and *των* bef *αγιων* BD[3]KLℵ[3] [*των* (but not *τα*) P 47 coptt]: om AD[1]ℵ[1] rel [Chr Euthal-ms Cyr$_1$ Thdrt Damasc].

the Writer is speaking of concrete objects, as 'strues panum,' the heap of bread itself thus exhibited. **πρόθεσις**, says Del., is the Greek word for מַעֲרֶכֶת. We have it similarly used in LXX, ref. 2 Chron. There it is in the plural, which Bleek maintains would have been the case here were it so meant, in reference to the double row of pieces: but I cannot see why the whole mass should not be called the *πρόθεσις*): **which tabernacle** (the categorical **ἥτις**, 'that tabernacle namely, which') **is called the holy place** (Erasmus, Steph., Eras. Schmid, Mill, al. write this **ἁγία**, as fem., and agreeing with *σκηνή*, and so Luther, die Heilige, and E. V., "the sanctuary." The vulg., "quæ dicitur sancta," appears to refer the clause to "propositio panum" immediately preceding. D-lat. (see D[1] in digest) has "sancta sanctorum." There can be no doubt that it is neut. plur. This is insisted on as early as by Thdrt.: *προπαροξυτόνως ἀναγνωστέον τὰ ἅγια· οὕτω γὰρ ἡμᾶς διδάσκει νοεῖν τὸ ἕτερον ὄνομα*: viz. *ἅγια ἁγίων*, ver. 3. So Erasm. (annot.) and all the moderns. But even thus the omission of the art. is significant. The Writer is not so much speaking of the holy place by *name*, *τὰ ἅγια*, as by quality and predication, (the) holy (places). **3.**] **But** (as bringing out by anticipation the same contrast which we have in vv. 6, 7, *εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην . . . εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν*) **after** (i. e. in entering: '*behind*,' as we should say, if regarding it 'in situ.' So Herod. iv. 49, *οἱ ἔσχατοι πρὸς ἡλίου δυσμέων μετὰ Κύνητας οἰκέουσι*) **the second veil** (**καταπέτασμα**, class. *παραπέτασμα*, see ch. vi. 19, is used in the LXX for the veil or curtain hanging before the sanctuary. There were in reality two of these, as described in Exod. xxvi. 31—37: one before the holy of holies itself, פָּרֹכֶת (vv. 31—35), the other before the tabernacle door, מָסָךְ (vv. 36, 37). For both of these the LXX in Exod. l. c. have *καταπέτασμα*, and so also for the first veil in Num. iii. 26. And Josephus, B. J. v. 5. 4, *πρὸ δὲ τούτων* (the gates of the *πρῶτος οἶκος*) *ἰσόμηκες καταπέτασμα*: and below, § 5, *τὸ δ' ἐνδοτάτω μέρος . . . διείργετο ὁμοίως καταπετάσματι πρὸς τὸ ἔξωθεν*. Similarly in Antt. viii. 3. 3, *κατεπέτασε δὲ καὶ ταύτας* (the outside doors) *τὰς θύρας, ὁμοίως τοῖς ἐνδοτέρω καταπετάσμασι*. Usually however in the LXX, the exterior veil is called *κάλυμμα* or *ἐπίσπαστρον*, and the word *καταπέτασμα* reserved for the interior one. So Exod. xxvi. 36: cf. Levit. xxi. 23, *πλὴν πρὸς τὸ καταπέτασμα οὐ προσελεύσεται*: xxiv. 3: Num. iv. 5. And so in Philo, Vita Mos. iii. 9, vol. ii. p. 150, *ὅπερ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν πρόναον, εἰργόμενον δυσὶν ὑφάσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἔνδον ὃν καλεῖται καταπέτασμα, τὸ δ' ἐκτὸς προσαγορεύεται κάλυμμα*: so also above, § 5, p. 148. But elsewhere he calls both by the name *καταπέτασμα*, by implication at least: e. g. De Victim. § 10, p. 246, *ἀντικρὺ τοῦ πρὸς τοῖς ἀδύτοις καταπετάσματος, ἐσωτέρω τοῦ προτέρου*: and De Gigant. § 12, vol. i. p. 270, *τὸ ἐσώτατον καταπέτασμα κ. προκάλυμμα τῆς δόξης*) **the** (not "*a*," see above) **tabernacle which is called holy of holies** (*ἅγια* again, not *ἁγία*, see above. קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים, sometimes *τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων*, a periphrasis of the superlative adopted from the Heb.), **4.**] **having** (on **ἔχουσα**, see below) **a golden censer (or, altar of incense)** ("Maxima totius epistolæ difficultas in verbis hisce consistit, atque hic locus fortasse præter cæteros dubium apud veteres reddidit hujus epistolæ auctoritatem." Calmet, in Tholuck. The first difficulty is respecting the meaning of the word **θυμιατήριον**. And here the etymology gives us no help. For the word is a neut. adj., importing any thing having regard to or employed in the burning of incense. It may therefore mean either an *altar upon which*, or a *censer in which*, incense was burnt. The latter meaning is found in Demosth. p. 617. 3, *ἐκπώματα δὲ ἢ θυμιατήρια, ἂν μὲν ὑπερβάλλῃ τῷ πλήθει κ.τ.λ.*: Thuc. vi. 46, *ἐπέδειξαν τὰ ἀναθήματα, φιάλας τε καὶ οἰνοχόας καὶ θυμιατήρια κ.τ.λ.*: and so LXX, reff.: Josephus, Antt. iv. 2. 4, *κομίζων ἕκαστος θυμιατήριον οἴκοθεν σὺν θυμιάμασι*. The former, in Herod. iv. 162, *Εὐέλθων, ὃς τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θυμιατή-*

[o] περικεκαλυμμένην [p] πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ᾗ [q] στάμνος

o (Exod. xxv. 11.) Mark xiv. 65 || L. only. Exod. xxviii. 20. 3 Kings vii. 43. viii. 7 only. p Mark i. 45. Luke xix. 43 only. Jer. xx. 9. Sir. li. 7. Sus. 22 only. q here only. Exod. xvi. 33. 3 Kings xiv. 3 A (in B the omitted passage follows xii. 24) only.

4. [παντaχοθεν 47.]

ριον ἰδὼν ἀξιοθέητον ἀνέθηκεν: Ælian, V. H. xii. 51, *καὶ κατακλιθέντι* (Μενεκράτει) *θυμιατήριον παρέθηκε* (Φίλιππος), *καὶ ἐθυμιᾶτο αὐτῷ*. It is true, the LXX have generally called the altar of incense *τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος* or *-των*, cf. Exod. xxx. 1, 27: Levit. iv. 7: 1 Chron. vi. 49; xxviii. 18: 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 19: or *τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν*, Exod. xl. 5, 24 (26): Num. iv. 11: 3 Kings vii. 48: 2 Chron. iv. 19: or *τὸ θυσιαστ. τὸ ἀπέναντι κυρίου*, Levit. xvi. 12, 18: or merely *τὸ θυσιαστήριον*, where the context shews which altar is meant, Levit. xvi. 20: Num. iv. 13, 14: Deut. xxxiii. 10: 3 Kings vi. 20: and also *θυσιαστήρια*, where both the altars, of burnt-offering and of incense, are intended, Exod. xxxi. 8: Num. iii. 31. But later, the more appropriate word *θυμιατήριον* became the usual Hellenistic name for the altar of incense. So Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 46, vol. i. p. 504, *τριῶν ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις σκευῶν, λυχνίας, τραπέζης, θυμιατηρίου, τὸ μὲν θυμιατήριον κ.τ.λ.*: and id. Vita Mos. iii. § 7, vol. ii. p. 149, *ἐδημιουργεῖτο καὶ σκεύη ἱερά, κιβωτός, λυχνία, τράπεζα, θυμιατήριον, βωμός*. And Josephus, Antt. iii. 6. 8; iii. 8. 2, 3: B. J. v. 5. 5, *καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον μέρος . . . εἶχεν ἐν αὐτῷ τρία θαυμασιώτατα κ. περιβόητα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἔργα, λυχνίαν, τράπεζαν, θυμιατήριον*. So also Clem.-alex. Strom. v. 6. 33, pp. 665 f. P., and other Fathers. And thus it has been taken here by the old lat. in D, by Œc. on ver. 7 (*καὶ θυμιάσει ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, τουτέστιν, ἐπὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ θυμιατηρίου οὗ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις τῶν ἁγίων κ.τ.λ.*), and of later expositors Tostatus (on Exod. xxv. qu. 6; on 1 Kings vi. qu. 16), Calvin, Justiniani, Estius, Corn. a-Lap., La Cerda (Adverss. c. 81, p. 112), Schlichting, Junius, J. Cappellus. Gerhard, Brochmann, Mynster, Owen, Bleek, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünemann, Delitzsch. On the other hand, the meaning "*censer*" is adopted by Syr., vulg. ("*turibulum*"), Thl. (*μετά γε τοῦ χρυσοῦ θυμιατηρίου ἅπαξ εἰσῄει τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων· ἄλλο γὰρ θυμιατήριον καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον*, on ver. 7), Anselm, Th. Aquin., Lyra, Luther, Grot., Villalpandus (on Ezek.), Hammond, De Dieu, Calov., Reland, Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetst., Carpzov, Deyling, Michaelis, Schulz, Böhme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Von Gerlach, Stier, Bisping, al. And on this side of the question it is remarkable, that much stress is laid by the Mischna upon *the censer to be used on the day of expiation*, as distinguished from that used on any other day: on the fact of its being *of gold*, and of a particular and precious kind of gold. I give nearly the whole passage from Surenhusius, Ordo Festorum, ii. 229, as certainly forming an important element in deciding the difficulty. "In omni die deprompsit thuribulo argenteo et in aureum infundebat: hodie deprompsit aureo, et intrabat cum eo. In omni die deprompsit thuribulo quod quatuor cabos continebat, et in alterum infundebat quod tres cabos capiebat: hodie deprompsit thuribulo quod tres cabos capiebat, et intrabat cum eo. . . . In omni die grave, hodie leve: in omni die manus ejus brevis erat, hodie longa: in omni die aurum ejus viride erat, hodie rufum" (on which Sheringham notes, "Thuribulum quo singulis diebus odores incendebantur, ex auro viridi constabat, quod minus pretiosum erat, sed pretiosum tamen. Martial. xii. 15, 'miratur Scythicas virentis auri Flammas Jupiter, et stupet superbi Regis delicias.' Sed in die expiationis thuribulum rutilante auro coruscabat, quod genus auri pretiosissimum et præstantissimum fuit, et זהב פרוים, ut aiunt Talmudici, vocabatur, quia juvencorum sanguinem specie referebat. Quamvis verisimilius videtur a nomine loci sic vocari: vide 2 Chron. iii. 6"). See also the citation below on *τὴν κιβωτόν*. If this latter interpretation be adopted, we are involved in the following difficulty. This *golden censer* is no where named in the law: the word rendered "*censer*" by E. V., in Levit. xvi. 12, is מַחְתָּה, a shallow basin, in which the high priest on the day of atonement was to take incense from the incense-altar into the holy place: and is called in the LXX *πυρεῖον*, not *θυμιατήριον*. Besides which, it is not specified as golden; nor was it kept in the holy of holies. Indeed it could not have been, or the high priest would have been obliged to fetch it from thence before burning incense in it, which is most improbable. Of these, the first-mentioned objection is not decisive; for our Writer is speaking, not of Mosaic usage only, but of several things outside the provisions of the law itself; and thus our explanation of any difficulty need not be sought in the provisions of the law only, but also in subsequent Jewish usage. This especially against Delitzsch, who, strictly confining

r John vi. 31, 49. Rev. ii. 17 only. Num. xi. 6. 11. Isa. xxvi. 6.

χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ [r] μάννα, καὶ ἡ [s] ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ [st] βλασ-

ABDKL Pℵab cfghk lmno 17. 47

s Num. xvii. 1—11.

t Matt. xiii. 26. Mark iv. 27. James v. 18 only. Gen. i.

om η (bef βλαστησασα) B m.

us to Mosaic ordinance *here*, and asserting that the Writer speaks of it and nothing else, yet *below*, on the pot of manna, &c., confesses that he follows tradition. If now, influenced by the above difficulties, we adopt the interpretation '*altar of incense*,' for θυμιατήριον, a difficulty arises, certainly not less than any of those adduced above. On the one hand the word **ἔχουσα** at first sight seems to admit of no other meaning than a local one, '*containing*.' The parallelism with **ἐν ᾗ** above appears to demand this, and the fact that the other things mentioned are beyond question intended to be *in*, not merely belonging to, the Holy of holies. On this, see more below. Taking it as our first impression, we are startled by the fact, that the altar of incense *was not in* the Holy of holies, but *outside it*, *ἔσω τοῦ προτέρου καταπετάσματος*, as Philo de Vict. Off. § 4, vol. ii. p. 253. Hence Bleek, De Wette, and Lünemann, suppose that the Writer has fallen into a mistake, and Bleek infers from this that he was not an inhabitant of Palestine, but an Alexandrine. But as Delitzsch observes, whichever he were, he must have been a Monstrum von Unwissenheit, to have fallen into any such error. "Then," continues Delitzsch, "since we cannot submit him to such an imputation, is there any intent which our Writer may have had, inducing him to ascribe the altar of incense to the Holy of holies, notwithstanding that he knew its local situation to be in the Holy place?" There is such an intent, recognized even by Bleek himself. "The Author," says Bleek, and after him Tholuck, "treats the Holy of holies, irrespective of the veil, as symbolical of the heavenly sanctuary, and had also a motive to include in it the altar of incense, whose offerings of incense are the symbol of the prayers of the saints, Rev. viii. 3 f." And even so it is. Not only the N. T. writings, but the O. T. also, Isa. vi. 6, speak of a heavenly altar, which is the antitype there of the earthly מִזְבַּח הַזָּהָב. Considering the fact that this antitypical altar belonged to the Holy of holies, into which Christ entered through the torn veil, it was obvious for our Writer to reckon the typical altar also among the things belonging to the Holy of holies. Philo, who regarded the λυχνία as the type of heaven, the θυμιατήριον as *σύμβολον τῶν περιγείων, ἐξ ὧν αἱ ἀναθυμιάσεις* (Vita Mos. iii. 10, vol. ii. p. 251), had no such motive. Our second question then is, whether our Writer is justified, having this motive, in reckoning the altar of incense among the furniture of the Holy of holies. And our answer is, Entirely so: but not for the reason given by Ebrard, because the smoke of the incense was not intended to roll backwards, but to penetrate into the holiest place as the symbol of supplication and homage: which reason is none at all (but see below), seeing that the same might be said of the smoke of the fat of the altar of burnt-offering, and in the same way the golden table and the shewbread might be reckoned in the Holy of holies; for the cakes, a thank-offering of the twelve tribes for the blessing bestowed on them, lay on the table, that He who sat between the cherubim might behold them. Nor can we refer to Exod. xxvi. 35, where the only reason for the altar of incense not being named among the furniture outside the veil, is, that its construction was not yet prescribed;—nor can we adduce the fact of its being called in Exod. xxx. 10, קֹדֶשׁ־קָדָשִׁים, holy of holies, seeing that the altar of burnt-offering is in Exod. xl. 10, distinguished by the same name. But the following considerations have weight: *α*. that the altar of incense, by Exod. xxx. 6 and xl. 5, is to be placed before the ark of the covenant or before the Capporeth (mercy-seat), i. e. in the middle between the candlestick on the right and the table of shewbread on the left, so that its place is subordinate to the ark of the covenant: *β*. that on the day of atonement, it, as well as the mercy-seat, was sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering: *γ*. that in 1 Kings vi. 22, as well as by our Writer, it is reckoned to the Holy of holies, being there called הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר לַדְּבִיר, the altar belonging to the sanctuary (E.V., "*the altar that was by the oracle*"). Thenius indeed holds לַדְּבִיר to be an error for לִפְנֵי הַדְּבִיר, "before the sanctuary," but Keil maintains rightly that that passage of Kings and our passage here mutually defend and explain one another. The solution to be gathered from this would be, that the altar of incense, being appointed by the Mosaic ordinance to stand in immediate contiguity to the veil separating the Holy of holies, and being destined in its use especially for the service of the Holy of holies (for this, notwithstanding

τήσασα, καὶ αἱ [u] πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης· [5] [v] ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς

u 2 Cor. iii. 3 bis only. Exod. xxxi. 18. xxxii. 19. 3 Kings viii. 9.
v Eph. i. 21. iv. 10 only. Deut. xxvi. 19.

5. *υπερ δε αυτην* D[1], *super eam* D-lat, *superque eam* vulg.—*υπεραvων* m.

the objection brought by Delitzsch, might have weight; the exterior altar of burnt-offering did not belong in any such strict sense to the sanctuary and mercy-seat), and being described in more than one place of Scripture (e.g. Exod. xxx. 6: 1 Kings vi. 22) as connected with the sanctuary, is taken by the Writer as appertaining to the Holy of holies: he choosing, thus to describe it, the somewhat ambiguous word **ἔχουσα**, and not ἐν ᾗ as before. For we may set off against what was just now said about the strict parallel at first sight between ἐν ᾗ in the former clause and ἔχουσα in this, that it may be fairly alleged, that the very fact of variation of terms, in such a parallelism, points to some variation of meaning also. I have thus given both views of the solution to be sought: and will now state the result. 1. On either hypothesis, **ἔχουσα** cannot be kept to its stricter meaning of *containing*. For neither the censer nor the incense-altar was *kept in* the holy of holies. 2. The language of the Mischna concerning the golden censer is very strong, and more weight still is given to it when we reflect that it is especially of the day of expiation that our Writer is preparing to speak. 3. The word χρυσοῦν should not be overlooked in the consideration. When the ark of the covenant by and by is spoken of, which like the altar of incense was overlaid with gold, it is not said to be χρυσοῦν, but only περικεκαλυμμένη πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ. And this predicate being thus emphatically thrown forward, it is hardly possible to help feeling that a stress is laid on it, and it is not used without design. And if we enquire what this design is, we can hardly find fault with the reply which says that it is to distinguish a χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον from some other kinds of θυμιατήρια. 4. On the whole then I should say that the balance inclines towards the 'censer' interpretation, though I do not feel by any means that the difficulty is removed, and should hail any new solution which might clear it still further) **and the ark of the covenant** (see Exod. xxv. 10 ff.; xxxvii. 1 ff.: called by this name, אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית, Josh. iii. 6 and passim) **covered round on all sides** (*ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν*, Exod. xxv. 11) **with gold** (χρυσίῳ, not χρυσῷ, perhaps for a *portion* of gold, or perhaps, as Delitzsch, for *wrought* gold. See Palm and Rost's Lex. But all distinction between the words seems to have been lost before Hellenistic Greek arose, and the tendency of all later forms of speech is to adopt diminutives where the elder forms used the primitives. The ark, a chest, was of shittim (acacia) wood, overlaid with plates of fine gold, Exod. l. c. The ark of the covenant was in the Holy of holies in the Mosaic tabernacle, and in the temple of Solomon, 1 Kings viii. 4, 6. In the sack by the Chaldeans, it disappeared. See a legend respecting its fate in 2 Macc. ii. 1—8, where curiously enough τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θυμιάματος are classed together. The second temple did not contain it, but it was represented by a stone basement three fingers high, called אֶבֶן שְׁתִיָּה, "the stone of foundation" (Delitzsch: see Gesen. Thesaurus, under שָׁתָה, iii.). So in the Mischna, "Ex quo abducta est arca, lapis ibi erat a diebus priorum prophetarum, et lapis fundationis fuit vocatus; altus e terra tribus digitis, et super ipsum thuribulum collocabat." So Jos. B. J. v. 5. 5, of the sanctuary, in his time, τὸ δ' ἐνδοτάτω μέρος εἴκοσι μὲν ἦν πηχῶν· διείργετο δὲ ὁμοίως καταπετάσματι πρὸς τὸ ἔξωθεν. ἔκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ, ἄβατον δὲ κ. ἄχραντον κ. ἀθέατον ἦν πᾶσιν, ἁγίου δὲ ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο), **in which (was) a golden pot** (Exod. xvi. 32—34. The word *'golden,'* λάβε στάμνον χρυσοῦν ἕνα, is added by the LXX: so also Philo de Congr. Quær. Erud. Gr. 18, vol. i. p. 533, ἐν στάμνῳ χρυσῷ: the Heb. has merely "a pot," as E. V.) **containing the manna** (viz. an omer, each man's daily share, laid up for a memorial, cf. Exod. xvi. 32 with ib. 16. That this pot was to be placed *in the ark*, is not said there, but it was gathered probably from the words "before the Lord." In 1 Kings viii. 9 and 2 Chron. v. 10, it is stated that there was nothing in the ark in Solomon's temple, except the two tables which Moses put therein at Horeb. But this, as Delitzsch observes, will not prove any thing against the pot of manna and the rod having *once* been there; nay rather, from the express declaration that there was *then* nothing but the tables of stone, it would seem that formerly there had been other things there. The Rabbis certainly treat of the pot of manna as of the rod, as *being in the ark*: see the testimonies of Levi ben Gershom and Abarbanel in Wetst., h. l.), **and the rod of Aaron which budded** (see Num. xvii. 1—11. It was to be laid up "before the testimony," in which Ben Gershom

[w] χερουβὶν [x] δόξης [y] κατασκιάζοντα τὸ [z] ἱλαστήριον· περὶ ὧν οὐκ [a] ἔστιν νῦν λέγειν [b] κατὰ [bc] μέρος. [6] τούτων δὲ οὕτως

ABDKL ℵ a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

w here only. Exod. xxv. 17 ff.
x = Acts vii. 2. Ps. xxviii. 3. Sir. vii. 4. xxiv. 16. xlv. 7. l. 7. see Sir. xlix. 8.
y here only †. (-σκιος, Ezek. xx. 28.) = συσκιάζ., l. c. σκιάζ., Exod. xxxviii. 8 A (not F.) B. περικαλύπτ., 3 Kings viii. 7.
z Rom. iii. 25 only. Exod. l. c. xxxi. 7 al.
a = here only. (see 1 Cor. xi. 20.)
b here only. Prov. xxix. 11. Plato, Theæt. p. 157 B. Polyb. i. 4. 6 al.
c = 1 Cor. xii. 27. xiv. 27. Rom. xi. 25 al.

rec χερουβιμ, with KL rel [vulg(with demid) copt Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc (-βειμ AP m Chr-2-mss)]: txt [D[1]]ℵ [am(with fuld) sah Primas] (-βειν BD[3]).
ins και bef δοξης D[1]. κατασκιαζον A[P] 17. ενεστιν (but εν erased) ℵ.

sees a proof that it was in the ark: "ex eo autem, quod dicit coram testimonio potius quam coram arca, discimus, intra arcam fuisse." Abarbanel refers to "traditio quædam Rabbinorum nostrorum." See Wetst. as above. The Gemara (Joma 52 b) mentions a tradition that with the ark disappeared the pot of manna, and the cruse of anointing oil, and the rod of Aaron with its almonds and blossoms, and the chest which the Philistines sent for a trespass-offering, 1 Sam. vi. 4, 8), and the **tables of the covenant** (viz. the tables of stone on which the ten commandments were written by the finger of God, Exod. xxv. 16; xxxi. 18: Deut. x. 1—5: 1 Kings viii. 9: 2 Chron. v. 10, as above. It will be seen from these references, that these tables were ordered to be put in the ark):

5.] and (δέ, as contrasted to 'within') **over above it** (the ark of the covenant) **(the) cherubim** (the well-known fourfold animal forms, fencing from human approach, and at the same time bearing up and supporting, the glory of God: symbolizing, as I believe and have elsewhere maintained (Hulsean Lectures for 1841, Lect. i. See also note on Rev. iv. 6—8), *the creation of God*. See more below) **of glory** (ἢ τὰ ἔνδοξα, ἢ τὰ ὄντα τῆς δόξης, τουτέστι τοῦ θεοῦ: Œc., Cyril, similarly Thl., ... ἢ τὰ λειτουργικὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, κ. πρὸς δόξαν αὐτοῦ ὄντα: and Chrys., ... ἢ τὰ ὑποκάτω τοῦ θεοῦ. There can be little doubt that the latter class of meanings is to be taken, though Camerar., Beza (vers.), Est., Corn. a-Lap., Schlichting, Kuinoel, al. adopt the former. For we may well say, why such a periphrasis if a mere epithet were intended, when we have already the epithets χρυσοῦν and περικεκαλυμμένην χρυσίῳ? The **δόξα** is the Shechinah, or bright cloud of glory, in which Jehovah appeared between the cherubic forms, and to which, as attendants, and watchers, and upholders, they belonged. The want of the art. before δόξης is no argument for the other view, as δόξα is often used thus anarthrous for the Shechinah: cf. Exod. xl. 28 (34), κ. ἐκάλυψεν ἡ νεφέλη τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου, κ. δόξης κυρίου ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή: 1 Kings iv. 22: Ezek. ix. 3; x. 18 al. On the Cherubim, see further Winer, Realw. sub voce) **overshadowing** (casting shadow down upon, causing to be κατάσκιον: see reff. Exod. χερουβίν here, as usually, is neuter: cf. Gen. iii. 24: Exod. xxv. 18 al.: sometimes the LXX have used it masc.: e. g. Exod. xxv. 20; xxviii. 23 al. There seems to be a reason for the variation: the neut. being employed when they are spoken of merely as *figures*, the masc. when as *agents*. The neut. prevails in Philo: Josephus has οἱ χερουβεῖς Antt. iii. 6. 5, and αἱ χερουβεῖς ib. viii. 3. 3) **the mercy-seat** (the ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα of Exod. xxv. 17: the massive golden cover of the ark of the covenant, on which the glory of Jehovah appeared between the cherubim: Heb. כַּפֹּרֶת, cover. It was that upon which especially the blood of the propitiatory sacrifice was sprinkled on the day of atonement, Levit. xvi. 15, and from this circumstance apparently, the propitiation taking place on it, it obtained its name of ἱλαστήριον. It was the footstool of God, 1 Chron. xxviii. 2: Ps. xcix. 5; cxxxii. 7: Lam. ii. 1; the spot where He, the God of the covenant, met with Israel, the people of the covenant: see Exod. xxv. 22: Levit. xvi. 2: Num. vii. 89. See also Philo de Prof. § 19, vol. i. p. 561, τῆς δὲ ἵλεως δυνάμεως, τὸ ἐπίθεμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, καλεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ ἱλαστήριον: Vita Mos. iii. 8, vol. ii. p. 150, ἧς ἐπίθεμα ὡσανεὶ πῶμα τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἱλαστήριον: ib., τὸ δὲ ἐπίθεμα τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἱλαστήριον. Thl., h. l., says, ἱλαστήριον ἐλέγετο τὸ πῶμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, ὡς ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς αὐτῆς μαθήσῃ ἀκριβέστερον· καὶ μὴ ἀπατηθεὶς τοῖς τινων λόγοις, ἄλλο τι νοήσῃς τοῦτο εἶναι): **concerning which it is not (opportune)** (this use of ἐστιν with inf., = ἔξεστιν, is pure Attic) **now to speak one by one** (i. e. particularly, 'singillatim:' so κατὰ μέρος in Plato, Theæt. 157 B, δεῖ δὲ καὶ κατὰ μέρος οὕτω λέγειν καὶ περὶ πολλῶν ἀθροισθέντων: Polyb. iii. 32. 3; 19. 11, περὶ ὧν ἡμεῖς τὰ κατὰ μέρος . . . . διασαφήσομεν, al. in Bleek. The clause refers evidently not to the Cherubim only, but to all the contents of the sanctuary just mentioned. So Chrys., ἐνταῦθα ᾐνίξατο ὅτι οὐ ταῦτα ἦν μόνον τὰ

[d] κατεσκευασμένων εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν [e] διὰ παντὸς [f] εἰςίασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς [g] λατρείας [h] ἐπιτελοῦντες, 7 εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν [i] ἅπαξ τοῦ [i] ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς [k] οὐ [k] χωρὶς αἵματος, ὃ [l] προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ [m] ἀγνοημάτων· 8 τοῦτο [n] δηλοῦντος τοῦ [o] πνεύματος

d ch. iii. 3, 4 reff.
e Acts ii. 25 (from Ps. xv. 8). x. 2. Rom. xi. 10. (Exod. xxx. 7 ff.)
f w. εἰς, Acts iii. 3. xxi. 26 only. w. πρός, Acts xxi. 18 only†.
g ver. 1.
h ch. viii. 5 reff. of sacred rites, Lev. vi. 22. τὸν μέγαν ἀρχιερέα, ὁπότε μέλλοι τὰς νόμῳ προστεταγμένας ἐπιτελεῖν λειτουργίας, Philo, de Somn. i. 37, vol. i. p. 653.
i Exod. xxx. 10. Levit. xvi. 34. see ver. 25.
k ch. vii. 20.
l ch. v. 1 reff.
m here only. Gen. xliii. 12. Judith v. 20. Sir. xxiii. 2. li. 19. 1 Macc. xiii. 39 only.
n ch. xii. 27. 1 Cor. i. 11. iii. 13. Col. i. 8. 1 Pet. i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 14 only. Exod. vi. 3.
o ch. iii. 7 reff.

δρώμενα, ἀλλὰ αἰνίγματά τινα ἦν, περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι φησὶ νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος, ἴσως ὡς μακροῦ δεομένων λόγου). **6, 7.**] We now have that whereunto the above details have been tending, viz. *the use made of the sanctuary by the high priest on the day of atonement.* **6.**] **But** (transitional) **these things being thus arranged** (it is impossible in English to give the force of the perfect participle as connected with the present which follows. To say 'having been arranged,' and follow it by 'enter,' would be a solœcism: which shews, that our participle 'having been' is not so much a perfect as an aorist. Resolved, the sentence would be: '*these things have been thus arranged* (i. e. were thus arranged and continue so), *and the priests enter.*' In taking our present-perfect participle, 'being,' we lose the historical past involved in the perfect, pointing to the time when they were so arranged. To carry the sense of 'abiding even now,' in the perfect, so far, as to suppose the Writer to imagine that the ark &c. *were still*, at the time he was writing, *in the Sanctuary* (Bl., Lünem., De W.), is quite unnecessary, and indeed unreasonable: he clearly conceives of the whole system and arrangement as subsisting, but not in every minute detail. The arrangement was essential to the system: the failure of some of its parts, accidental to it. κατεσκευασμ. in allusion to the same word ver. 2), **into the first** (foremost) **tabernacle** (**indeed**) **continually** (i. e. day by day, at any time, without limits prescribed by the law: certainly, twice at least in every day, see Exod. xxx. 7 ff.) **enter** (on the *present*, see above. It must not, as in vulg., be rendered by an imperfect, "introibant;" D-lat., "intrabant:" Luther, gingen: and E. V., "went," which is remarkable, as Beza's version has "ingrediuntur") **the priests** (the ordinary priests) **accomplishing the services** (so Herod., ἄλλας τε θρησκίας μυρίας ἐπιτελέουσι: he uses ἐπιτελεῖν likewise of θυσίας, ii. 63; iv. 26: εὐχωλάς, ii. 63: ὁρτάς, iv. 186. See other examples in Bl. The services meant are the morning and evening care of the lamps, the morning and evening offering of incense, and the weekly change of the shew-bread), **7.**] **but into the second** (innermost, the Holy of holies) **once in the year** (i. e. on the day of atonement, the 10th day of the 7th month: the same expression is used in reff. Exod. and Levit. The entrance took place, *on that day*, twice at least, from Levit. xvi. 12—16: the Mischna says, four (three?) times, Joma v. 1; vii. 4. Much trouble has been spent by antiquarians on the question: see the whole treated in Bleek, if it be thought worth while: it may suffice here to say that the Writer follows the ordinary way of speaking among the Jews and ourselves, meaning by 'once,' *on one occasion.* No one would think, if I said I was in the habit of seeing a certain person but once in every year, of asking how long I spent in his company during that day, and how often I looked upon him. Cf. Philo, Leg. ad Cai. § 39, vol. ii. p. 591, εἰς ἃ (ἄδυτα) ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὁ μέγας ἱερεὺς εἰςέρχεται τῇ νηστείᾳ λεγομένῃ μόνον ἐπιθυμιάσων. So ἅπαξ δι' ἔτους, id. de Monarch. ii. 2, p. 223: ἅπαξ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, Jos. B. J. v. 5. 7: and 3 Macc. i. 11) **the high priest alone, not without** (see ch. vii. 20) **blood, which he offers** (see ch. viii. 3) **on behalf of himself and the ignorances** (sins of ignorance, see ch. v. 2: cf. Philo, Plant. Noë, § 25, vol. i. p. 345, αἱ . . . θυσίαι . . . ὑπομιμνήσκουσαι τὰς ἑκάστων ἀγνοίας τε κ. διαμαρτίας. See Schweighäuser's Lexicon Polybianum, where he gives as the sense of ἄγνοια, "peccatum, delictum, præsertim errore et per imprudentiam commissum:" giving numerous instances. But further on, he says, "Nonnunquam tamen de graviori culpa et deliberato crimine usurpatur:" giving also examples. And similarly under ἀγνοέω, "nude, peccare: πολεμεῖν τοῖς ἀγνοήσασι, bellum gerere cum eis qui peccarunt, deliquerunt, v. 11. 5: τὰ ἠγνοημένα, errata, peccata, xxxviii. 1. 5." So that here the word may have a wider meaning than mere sins of ignorance) **of the people** (it has been a question, whether

τοῦ ἁγίου, [p] μήπω [q] πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν [r] τῶν ἁγίων [s] ὁδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης [t] στάσιν, 9 [u] ἥτις [v] παρα-

ABDKL PℵN a b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

p Rom. ix. 11 only. q Rom. xvi. 26 al. fr. Jer. xl. (xxxiii.) 6 only. r = ch. viii. 2 reff. s w. gen., Matt. x. 5. Gen. iii. 24. Prov. vii. 27. Jer. ii. 18 al. t = here (Luke xxiii. 9 ∥ Mk., 26. Acts xv. 2 al4.) only. Polyb. v. 5. 3. τῶν ἐτησίων ἤδη στάσιν ἐχόντων = τῶν ἐτ. ἐπεχόντων, id. c. 6. u = ch. viii. 5 reff. v Gospp., passim (but Mt. Mk. L. only). Epp., ch. xi. 19 only. Eccl. i. 17 A(not F.)Bℵ.

8. μηπως πεφανερωσαι D[1][-gr]. for ετι, επι D[1][-gr].
9. aft ητις ins πρωτη D[1], *qui priori parabula* D-lat.

ἑαυτοῦ can be taken as dependent on *ἀγνοημάτων*—"on behalf of his own sins and those of the people." So vulg. ("pro sua et populi ignorantia"), Luth., Calv. (vers.), Schlichting, Limborch (vers.), al.: but as above Syr., D-lat. ("pro se et populi delictis"), Faber Stap., Vatabl., Erasm. (vers.), Beza (vers.), Calov., Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, De Wette, al. And no doubt grammatically this latter is in strictness right: the other rendering requiring *τῶν* before *ἑαυτοῦ*. The question however in all such cases is not whether the sense would not be better expressed by a more elegant construction, but whether the N. T. dialect was likely to have expressed it without that more elegant construction. And here, though I prefer the more strictly grammatical rendering, I am by no means sure that the other is absolutely excluded. The parallel of ch. vii. 27, *πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν, ... ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ*, is very strong: and we have a similar irregularity of grammatical construction in 1 John ii. 2, *ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου*):

8.] **the Holy Spirit signifying** (by the typical arrangement of the sanctuary, excluding all from it except the high priest once a year: **δηλοῦντος** is not, as Semler, to be referred back to the prophecy of Jeremiah above quoted. We often have the verb in this meaning of '*signifying by a representation*:' so in ch. xii. 27, and Jos. Antt. iii. 7. 1, *περιτίθεται τὸν μαναχασὴν λεγόμενον, βούλεται δὲ συνακτῆρα μὲν δηλοῦν, διάζωμα δ' ἐστὶ κ.τ.λ.*: ib. 7. 7, *δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἥλιον κ. τὴν σελήνην τῶν σαρδονύχων ἑκάτερος*: cf. also viii. 6. 2. See Libanius and Hermogenes in Wetst. In the latter, *δηλοῦν*, "subindicare," is opposed to *φανερῶς λέγειν*) **this** (which follows), **that the way to** ('*of*:' so in reff.,—see Kühner ii. p. 176, Anm. 4: but not in *τὴν εὐθὺς Ἄργους κἀπιδαυρίας ὁδόν*, Eur. Hipp. 1197, where the genitives are governed by *εὐθύς*: cf. *εὐθὺς σφῶν . . . πλεῖν*, Thuc. viii. 96, and Lob. on Phryn. p. 144) **the holy places** (i. e. the true holy places in heaven: for it is of antitype, not of type, that the Writer is here speaking. Hence there is no danger of mistaking **τὰ ἅγια** here for the outer tabernacle: it is as in reff., and *τὸ ἅγιον* in Ezek. xli. 23 and Levit. xvi. 16, 17, 20, 23, 27, *the holy place κατ' ἐξοχήν*. Syr. has a curious rendering—"the way of the holy ones" (masc.)) **has not yet been manifested** (not, *had* not: the present form is maintained throughout: see below) **while the first tabernacle is as yet standing** (*what first tabernacle?* That which was first in *time*, or *first in order of space?* Clearly the latter, which has already been used in ver. 6: no reason can be given for changing the sense to the temporal one, especially as the Writer is regarding the whole as present, and drawing no contrast as to time. In fact, if time be regarded, the *heavenly*, not the earthly tabernacle is the first. Still less, with Peirce and Sykes, can we understand the tabernacle in the wilderness, as distinguished from the temple: which would yield no assignable sense. Bleek supposes that *ἡ πρώτη σκηνή*, thus understood, symbolizes the whole Jewish Levitical worship which took place in the first or outer tabernacle: Ebrard, that the whole, exterior and interior tabernacle, is symbolical, the exterior of relative, the interior of absolute holiness: and he sees an equality of ratios which he thus expresses—*πρώτη σκηνή* : *ἅγια ἁγίων* :: (*πρώτη σκηνή* + *ἅγια ἁγίων*) : Christ. But both of these ideas are well refuted by Delitzsch, who reminds us that the first as well as the second tabernacle was symbolical of heavenly things. Thl. says, *ἄρχεται λοιπὸν ἀναγωγικώτερον θεωρεῖν τὰ περὶ τῶν σκηνῶν, καὶ φησίν, ὅτι ἐπειδὴ τὰ μὲν ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων ἄβατα ἦν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱερεῦσιν, ἃ τύπος εἰσὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἡ μέντοι πρώτη σκηνή, τουτέστιν ἡ μετὰ τὸ ἔξωθεν θυσιαστήριον τὸ χαλκοῦν πρώτη εὐθὺς οὖσα, βάσιμος ἦν αὐτοῖς διὰ παντός, σύμβολον οὖσα τῆς κατὰ νόμον λατρείας, ἐδηλοῦτο συμβολικῶς, ὅτι ἕως οὗ ἵσταται ἡ σκηνὴ αὕτη, τουτέστιν ἕως οὗ κρατεῖ ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ κατ' αὐτὸν λατρεῖαι τελοῦνται, οὐκ ἔστι βάσιμος ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδός, τουτέστιν ἡ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἴσοδος, τοῖς τὰς τοιαύτας λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τούτοις μὲν ἀφανής ἐστι καὶ ἀποκέκλεισται, μόνῳ δὲ τῷ ἑνὶ ἀρχιερεῖ χριστῷ ἀφωρίσθη ἡ ὁδὸς αὕτη*. The phrase *στάσιν ἔχειν*, besides ref. Polyb., occurs in Plut. Symp. viii. 8, *εἰ νέα πάθη τότε*

βολὴ [w] εἰς τὸν [w] καιρὸν τὸν [x] ἐνεστηκότα, [y] καθ' ἣν [z] δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι [z] προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ [a] συνείδησιν [b] τελειῶσαι τὸν [c] λατρεύοντα, 10 μόνον [d] ἐπὶ [e] βρώμασιν

w Luke i. 20. 1 Pet. i. 11 only. x = Rom. viii. 38. 1 Cor. iii. 22. vii. 26. Gal. i. 4. 2 Thess. ii. 2. 2 Tim. iii. 1 only. 1 Macc. xii. 44. y = Acts xv. 11. xxvii. 25. 2 Thess. ii. 3 al. z ch. v. 1 reff. a Acts xxii. 1. 1 Cor. viii. 7, &c. x. 25, &c. 2 Cor. i. 12. ch. x. 2 al. Eccl. x. 20. Wisd. xvi. 11 only. b ch. ii. 10 reff. c absol., ch. x. 2 reff. (ch. viii. 5 reff.) d ch. viii. 1 reff. e plur., Matt. xiv. 15 ‖ L. Mark vii. 19. Luke iii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 13. 1 Tim. i. 3. ch. xiii. 9 only. Job vi. 5.

rec (for ἥν) ὅν, with D[3]KL[P] rel D-lat [Euthal-ms] Thdrt Thl: txt ABD[1]ℵ 17 vulg [Chr] Damasc Œc Primas.

πρῶτον ἔσχεν ἐν τῇ φύσει γένεσιν κ. στάσιν: and in Dion. Hal. vi. p. 415, μέχρις ἂν οὐρανός τε καὶ γῆ τὴν αὐτὴν στάσιν ἔχωσι. See other examples in Kypke. On the sense, cf. Jos. Antt. iii. 7. 7, τὴν δὲ τρίτην μοῖραν (τῆς σκηνῆς) μόνῳ περιέγραψε τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις), **9.**] **the which** (ἥτις = 'quippe quæ,' as almost always. **ἥτις**, viz. the first or anterior tabernacle, and that especially considered as obstructing, by its yet remaining, the way into the holiest. This is better than with Primasius to understand *quæ res*, and account for the gender by attraction) **is** (not, "*was*," see above) **a parable** (τουτέστι τύπος κ. σκιαγραφία, Thl. **παραβολή** is predicate, not subject, as Calvin, Storr, De W., al. If we make it subject, the verb to be supplied would not be the mere copula, but a significant verb, which would require to be expressed) **for** (in reference to: or it may be taken as indicating the terminus ad quem, '*until:*' but I prefer the other: see reff.) **the time** (period, or season, with reference to the divine dispensations) **now present** (so Primasius, commenting on the "parabola temporis instantis" of the vulg., "Quod enim agebatur in templo tum temporis, figura erat et similitudo istius veritatis quæ jam in ecclesia completur." And thus recently, and to my mind decisively, Delitzsch. But observe, the first tabernacle was not a parable *of* the present time, so that ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς should be the thing represented:—but a parable,—*for*, reserved unto, or given in reference to, the present time,—of heavenly things, to which the access is in the present time revealed. This application of **τὸν καιρ. τ. ἐνεστ.** to *the time now present*, has not been the general view of Commentators. καιρὸν ἐνεστηκότα, says Chrys., ποῖον λέγει; τὸν πρὸ τῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ παρουσίας· μετὰ γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ χριστοῦ οὐκέτι καιρός ἐστιν ἐνεστώς· πῶς γάρ, ἐπιγενόμενος καὶ τέλος ἔχων; and thus Œc., Thl., Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Baumg., Bengel, Stein, al. But this meaning, "*the time which was instant,*" would not agree with the pres. **προσφέρονται**, to which consequently those interpreters are obliged to do violence. Accordingly we have modifications of this view, e. g. that of Ebrard, al., reading **καθ' ὅν** below, that ὁ καιρ. ὁ ἐνεστηκώς is the present time of offering O. T. sacrifices, in which the readers of the Epistle were still taking a part. "The author might have called the time of the O. T. worship 'the past time,' and he would doubtless have so called it, had he been minded to speak from his own standing-point: but with practical wisdom he here speaks from that of his readers, who yet joined in the temple worship, and for whom the period of sacrifices was not yet passed away." Ebrard:—that of Bleek, Tholuck, and Lünemann, "This πρώτη σκηνή is, or there lies in its establishment, a parabolic setting forth of the character of the present time in general, i. e. of the time of the O. T.,—of Judaism." Bl. And so E. V., "which was a figure for the time then present." See more below under καιροῦ διορθώσεως), **according to which** (παραβολήν: so Œcum., καθ' ἣν παραβολὴν καὶ καθ' ὃν τύπον: i. e. *in accordance with which typical meaning;* a specification accounting for and justifying the profitless character of the ordinances about to be spoken of. Some (as Lün., al.) have referred **ἥν** to πρώτης σκηνῆς, but **καθ' ἥν** would hardly thus apply: we should rather expect ἐν ᾗ. Those who read καθ' ὅν naturally refer it to καιρόν, thereby modifying their view of what is to be understood by τὸν καιρ. τ. ἐνεστηκότα: see above) **both gifts and sacrifices are offered** (see reff. for these words. The *present* implies only the matter-of-fact endurance of the Levitical offerings, not their subsistence in the divine plan) **having no power** (μὴ δυν., subjective, 'quæ non valeant:' not οὐ δυν., 'invalida,' 'quæ non valent.' The gender of the participle, as so often, is taken from the subst. next to it) **to perfect in conscience** (see below) **him that serveth** (i. e. not the priests, as Est., al., who ἐπετέλουν τὰς λατρείας, but the people, who offered through them. "The offering Israelite assures,—doing, as he does, that which God's law requires,—his part, as a

καὶ [f] πόμασιν καὶ [g] διαφόροις [h] βαπτισμοῖς, [i] δικαιώματα [k] σαρκός, [l] μέχρι [m] καιροῦ [n] διορθώσεως [o] ἐπικείμενα. [11] χρι-

ABDKL PℵA b c f g h k l m n o 17. 47

f 1 Cor. x. 3 only. Ps. ci. 9 only. Dan. i. 16, Theod. g Rom. xii. 6 (ch. i. 4. viii. 6) only. Deut. xxii. 9. h = ch. vi. 2 reff. i Luke i. 6. Rom. i. 32. ii. 26. v. 16, 18. viii. 4. ver. 1. Rev. xv. 4. xix. 8 only. Exod. xv. 25, 26. k see Col. ii. 13. l of time, Matt. xi. 23. Acts xx. 7. 1 Tim. vi. 14. ch. iii. 14 al. Ps. civ. 19. m and constr., Luke xix. 44. Acts iii. 19. 2 Tim. iv. 6 al. Ps. xxxvi. 39. n here only †. Polyb. v. 88. 2 al. fr. o Luke v. 1. xxiii. 23. John xi. 38. xxi. 9. Acts xxvii. 20. 1 Cor. ix. 16 only. Job xix. 3.

10. rec και δικαιωμασι, with D[3]KL rel vulg syr Chr Thdrt Damasc : δικαιωμα D[1] (and lat) sah : και δικαιωματα Bℵ[3] 67[2]. 219 : txt A[P]ℵ[1] 17 Syr copt arm [Euthal-ms] Cyr$_1$. (*The question seems to be whether* δικαιωμασι *was an alteration to suit the precedg datives, or* δικαιωματα *to suit the follg* επικειμενα. *In the former case* και *would find its way into the txt and the readg of* B *is a conjunction of the two : in the latter* και *would naturally be struck out as coupling different cases and the readg of* B *was previous to its being expunged.*)

member, in the people of the law and of the promised salvation: he obtains also, if he does this with right feeling, operations of divine grace, which he seeks in the way prescribed: but, seeing that the Holy of holies is not yet unveiled, the offerings cannot τελειῶσαι him κατὰ συνείδησιν, i. e. cannot put his moral-religious consciousness, in its inward feeling, into a state of entire and joyful looking for of salvation, so that his συνείδησις should be an onward-waxing consciousness of perfect restoration, of entire clearing up, of total emancipation, of his relation to God." Delitzsch: who continues, "The material offerings of animals are only parables, referring to the time when that which is parabolically set forth becomes actual and passes into reality. They are, considered of themselves, incapable of any action on the inner part of a man, they are"),

10.] **only (consisting) in** (supply οὖσαι or προσφερόμεναι, and understand ἐπί as pointing out the ground whereupon, the condition wherein, the offering of the δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι subsisted. Some of the ancient Commentators joined ἐπί with τελειῶσαι,—"not able to perfect .... in his conscience, only as regards meats and" ... So Œc., αἱ λατρεῖαι, φησίν, οὐκ ἴσχυον ψυχικῶς τινα τελειῶσαι, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὴν σάρκα εἶχον τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ. τὰ σαρκικὰ κ.τ.λ. And so recently Ebrard. But this is not the fact, as it would be here stated. The gifts and offerings, e. g. those of the day of atonement, had far other *reference* than merely to meats and drinks and washings: nay, these were parables in reference to higher things. Another set joined it with λατρεύοντα, "him who serveth under condition of meats" &c. But this is questionable as to usage, and would make a very lame and dragging sentence. Thl. apparently joins ἐπί with ἐπικείμενα below: μόνον, φησίν, ἐπικείμενα τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις κ. διατασσόμενα περὶ βρωμάτων κ. πομάτων. Others, as Grot., Bengel, Bleek, De Wette, give ἐπί the meaning "*together with*," which is hardly either philologically or contextually suitable. If **δικαιώμασιν** be read, then on this view it would be more likely ἄλλοις δικαιώμασιν: if **δικαιώματα**, it could hardly be said that the meats and drinks and washings were δικαιώματα in the same sense as the δῶρά τε κ. θυσίαι, seeing that they were only their conditions, not their cognates) **meats and drinks and divers washings** (probably the Writer has in mind both the legal and the Talmudical conditions imposed upon the λατρεύοντες. See the very parallel place, Col. ii. 16. The law prescribed much about eating: nothing about drinking, except some general rules of uncleanness, such as Levit. xi. 34,—and in peculiar cases, such as the prohibition of wine to the Nazarite, Num. vi. 3,—and to the priests when on actual service in the tabernacle, Levit. x. 9. But subsequent circumstances and usage added other observances and precedents: as e. g. Dan. i. 8: Hagg. ii. 13. See Matt. xxiii. 24: Rom. xiv. 21. So there is no necessity to suppose that the allusion is to the feasts after sacrifice (ch. xiii. 10), or to the passover. The **διάφοροι βαπτισμοί** *may* refer to all the various washings ordained by the law, Exod. xxix. 4: Levit. xi. 25, 28, 32, 40; xiv. 6—9; xv. 5 ff.; xvi. 4, 24 ff.: Num. viii. 7; xix. 17 ff. al. But it seems likely that not the sacerdotal washings, so much as those prescribed to or observed by the people, are mainly in view: such as those mentioned in Mark vii. 4), **ordinances of (the) flesh** (i. e. belonging to flesh, as opposed to spirit. They regarded material things, gifts, sacrifices, meats, drinks, washings, which from their very nature could only affect the outward, not the inward man. Of course **δικαιώματα σαρκός** is in apposition with δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι. The ordinary reading, καὶ δικαιώμασιν, has, besides manuscript authority, these two objections against it: 1. seeing that the things mentioned were themselves δικαιώματα σαρκός, we should rather require (see above) καὶ ἄλλοις δικαιώμασιν: 2. we should have δυνάμεναι followed by ἐπικείμενα, which,

στὸς δὲ [p] παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν [q] μελλόντων [q] ἀγα-

p = Matt. iii. 1. 1 Macc. iv. 46.
q ch. x. 1. see ch. ii. 5. vi. 5. xiii. 14. Rom. v. 14.

11. for μελλοντων, γενομενων BD¹ syrr Chr-ms(secunda manu), *factorum* D-lat: txt AD³KL[P]ℵ rel vulg syr-mg coptt æth [arm] Eus₂ Cyr-jer₂ Cyr₁ Chr-2-mss(and montf) [Euthal-ms Ps-Ath₁ Procl] Thdrt Damasc.

however possibly allowable, would certainly be very harsh), **imposed** (cf. Il. ζ. 458, κρατερὴ ἐπικείσετ' ἀνάγκη: also Acts xv. 10, 28, which is a remarkable parallel. ἐπεὶ δὲ ζυγὸς ἦν ὁ νόμος βαρύς, εἰκότως εἶπε τὸ ἐπικείμενα. Thl.: who then, as Œc., quotes Acts xv. 10) **until the season of rectification** (i. e. when all these things would be better arranged, the substance put where the shadow was before, the sufficient grace where the insufficient type. **διόρθωσις**, cf. ref. and Aristot. Polit. 8: τῶν πιπτόντων οἰκοδομημάτων κ. ὁδῶν σωτηρία καὶ διόρθωσις. See many more instances of its use in Lobeck's note on Phryn. p. 250 f. The expression probably refers to ch. viii. 8 f.,—the time when God would make with His people a better covenant. I need hardly remind the reader who has kept pace with what has been said on τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα above, that this **καιρὸς διορθώσεως** is one and the same with that. Those who give another meaning there, yet agree in referring these words to Christian times). 11, 12.] *The fulfilment of these types by Christ.* **But** (the contrast is to the μὴ δυνάμ. and the μέχρι καιρ. above—to the ineffectiveness and the merely provisional nature of the Levitical offerings) **Christ** (not 'Jesus' here: because the Writer will introduce with emphasis that name which carries with it the fulfilment of all type and prophecy. Nor again, ὁ χριστός (παραγεν. δὲ ὁ χρ.), because he will not say that 'the Messiah' was come, but will use that well-known name as a personal name belonging to Him whom now all Christians know by it) **having appeared** (**παραγίγνεσθαι** is the usual word for *appearing* or *coming forward* as a historical person: appearing on the stage of the world: see reff. And it is of this appearance of Christ in history that the word is here used. That appearance was the point of demarcation between prophecy and fulfilment, between the old covenant and the new. So that **παραγενόμενος** is rather to be taken of the whole accomplished course of Christ summed up in one, than either of His first incarnation upon earth, or of His full inauguration into His Melchisedek High Priesthood in heaven. Chrys., Thl., al. join it so closely to ἀρχιερεὺς τ. μ. ἀγ. as to make that predicatory clause the very object of His παραγενέσθαι: so Thl., οὐκ εἶπε δὲ γενόμενος ἀρχ. ἀλλὰ παραγενόμενος ἀρχ., τουτέστιν εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐλθών. οὐ πρότερον παρεγένετο, εἶτα, συμβὰν οὕτω, ἐγένετο ἀρχιερεύς, ἀλλ' ὁ σκοπὸς τοῦ παραγεγονέναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡ ἀρχιερωσύνη ἦν. Chrys. very similarly, adding, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐλθών, οὐχ ἕτερον διαδεξάμενος· οὐ πρότερον παρεγένετο, καὶ τότε ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ ἅμα ἦλθε. But there is no need of this. It was not **εἰς τὸ εἶναι** ἀρχιερέα, but *as being* **ἀρχιερεύς**, that Christ παρεγένετο. There is no need for a comma after παραγενόμενος on the rendering above given) **as High Priest of the good things to come** (the question of the reading has much divided Commentators here. I have had no hesitation in retaining the rec., believing γενομένων to have been either a clerical error, or a correction in the sense given e. g. by Ebrard, who requires a contrast between the mere antitypical and foreshadowed goods of the O. T. and the substantial and fulfilled goods of the N. T. But no such contrast is here to be found. The contrast is between weak rites which could not, and the sacrifice of Christ which can, purify the conscience: the stress of our sentence is not at all on τὰ μέλλοντα or τὰ γενόμενα ἀγαθά, but on χριστός in the first degree, and on παραγενόμενος in the second. ἀρχιερεύς is the office common to both the subjects of comparison. **τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά** are in this case the blessed promises of the Christian covenant, different, in the very nature of the case, from *their* μέλλοντα ἀγαθά, but still, in formal expression, a term common to them and us: so that the expression ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν might in its scantiness of sense have been used of a Jewish high priest, just as it is in its fulness of completed sense used of Christ now. Herein I should differ both from Hofmann and Delitzsch, the former of whom (Schriftb. ii. 1. 292) maintains that the difference between the O. T. and the N. T. High Priest is that the one is an ἀρχιερεὺς ἀγαθῶν, which the other was not: and the latter, disputing this distinction, states the difference to be, that the one is an ἀρχ. τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, which the other was not. The fact being, that both might be described as ἀρχ. τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, but that Christ has

θῶν, [r] διὰ τῆς [s] μείζονος καὶ [t] τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, οὐ [u] χειροποιήτου, [v] τουτέστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς [w] κτίσεως, 12 οὐδὲ

r = Acts xiv. 22. 1 John v. 6.
s = Matt. xi. 11. ch. vi. 13 al. fr.
t = Rom. xii. 2. 1 Cor. xiii. 10. James i. 25.
u Acts vii. 48. xvii. 24. Eph. ii. 11. ver. 24 only. Isa. xvi. 12.
v ch. ii. 14 reff.
w = (see note) Rom. viii. 21.

by His revelation brought life and immortality to light; so that those words bear another and a more blessed meaning now than they could then: in fact, that, as brought out in ch. x. 1, which is a key-text to open this, the law had *σκιὰν τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*, whereas we have *αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων*. After what has been said, it is hardly necessary to add that I take **μέλλοντα** as meaning not, which were future '*respectu legis*,' but which *are now* future; the *κληρονομία ἄφθαρτος* of 1 Pet. i. 4, the *ἐλπιζόμενα* of our ch. xi. 1: see our Writer's usage in reff. The gen. after *ἀρχιερεύς* is, as Hofm. and Delitzsch well remark, not an attributive, but an objective one; the *μέλλοντα ἀγαθά* are the objects and ultimate regard of his High Priesthood), **through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this creation** (1. *How are these words to be construed?* 2. *To what tabernacle do they refer?* 1. They belong to *εἰσῆλθεν* below, not to *παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεύς* above, as Primasius, Luther, Schulz, al. For in that case, *οὐδέ* would be left without any preceding member of the negation to follow, or it must be considered as the sequence to *οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*, or to *οὐ χειροποιήτου*, either of which would be absurd. So likewise recently Hofmann, joining however the whole, down to *ἰδίου αἵματος*, with the subject *ἀρχιερεύς*. Of his whole view, I shall treat below. 2. The **διά** is *local*: as the Jewish high priest passed through the *πρώτη σκηνή* in entering into the earthly *ἅγια*, so our High Priest has passed through the *μείζων κ. τελειοτέρα σκηνή* to enter into the heavenly *ἅγια* (on the second *διά*, see below). But, this settled, *what is* this greater and more perfect tabernacle? The Fathers for the most part interpret it of *Christ's body* or *human nature*. So Chrys. (not however excluding the other interpretation, but maintaining that different things are typified by the same types: *ὁρᾷς πῶς καὶ σκηνὴν κ. καταπέτασμα κ. οὐρανὸν τὸ σῶμα καλεῖ; . . . τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν τοῦτο ποιεῖ; ἡμᾶς διδάξαι βουλόμενος, καθ' ἕτερον καὶ ἕτερον σημαινόμενον τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ὄντα. οἷόν τι λέγω, καταπέτασμα ὁ οὐρανός ἐστιν· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀποτειχίζει τὰ ἅγια καταπέτασμα, καὶ ἡ σὰρξ κρύπτουσα τὴν θεότητα· καὶ σκηνὴ ὁμοίως ἡ σάρξ, ἔχουσα τὴν θεότητα· καὶ σκηνὴ πάλιν ὁ οὐρανός· ἐκεῖ γάρ ἐστιν ἔνδον ὁ ἀρχιερεύς*), Thl. (similarly), Thdrt., Œc., Ambros. (on Psal. cxviii.), Primas., Clarius, Calvin, Beza, Est., Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Bengel, al. Ebrard takes it of *Christ's holy life*, and *τὰ ἅγια* of His exaltation; passing, in fact, from reality into symbol: Œcolampadius, Cajetan, Corn. a-Lap., Calov., Wittich, Wolf, al. of *the Church on earth*: Justiniani and Carpzov (relying on several passages of Philo, where the world is called the temple of God), *the whole world*: Hofmann, *the glorified Body of Christ*, which, and not the Body of His flesh, he maintains can alone be said to be *οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*, and in which dwells (Col. ii. 9) all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., and Stier, *the lower region of the heavens*, through which Christ passed in ascending to the throne of God: Tholuck, merely a superadded feature, having no representation in reality, but serving only to complete the idea of a heavenly sanctuary. Delitzsch keeps to his interpretation in ch. viii. 2 (which see discussed in note there) as against Hofmann. But here, as there, I believe that his and Hofmann's views run up into one: though perhaps here the weight is on his side, as it was there on Hofmann's. Hofm.'s reason for joining *διὰ τῆς μείζ. . . . ἰδίου αἵματος*, with *ἀρχιερεύς*, is, that unless it be so joined, the stress laid on *εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ* is split up and weakened by the negative and positive qualifications appended to *εἰσῆλθεν*. But the answer is plain, with Delitzsch, that nothing can be farther from the truth; these qualifications being in fact the very conditions, on which the completeness and finality of that entrance depended. Another of Hofm.'s objections may be as easily answered; viz. that if we join *διὰ . . . . δι'* both with *εἰσῆλθεν* we must understand the first *διά* local, the second instrumental. But as the preposition in Greek carries both meanings, so does it both in German (durch), and in English (through): and besides, both meanings are, in their inner import, one and the same. The *σκηνή* here, as in ch. viii. 2, is the *οὐρανοί* (ch. iv. 14, *διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς*) through which Christ passed not only locally, but conditionally, being the abode of blessed spirits and just men made perfect = His mystical Body (see on ch. viii. 2: and below, on the other epithets of this tabernacle), and *τὰ ἅγια* is the *ὁ οὐρανὸς αὐτός* (ver. 24, *εἰς-*

d ιδιου... ABDKL PN a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

[r] δι' αἵματος [xy] τράγων καὶ [xz] μόσχων, [r] διὰ δὲ τοῦ [a] ἰδίου αἵματος εἰςῆλθεν [b] ἐφάπαξ εἰς [c] τὰ ἅγια, [d] αἰωνίαν [e] λύτρω-

x ver. 19. Levit. xvi. 14, 15. (LXX, for τρ., χίμαρος, but τρ. Ald. & some mss.) y here, &c. (3ce) and ch. x. 4 only. Isa. xxxiv. 6. z as above (x). Luke xv. 23, 27, 30. Rev. iv. 7 only. Ezek. i. 10. a Acts xx. 28. ch. xiii. 12. iv. 10. b ch. vii. 27 reff. c ch. viii. 2. d ch. v. 9 reff. fem., 2 Thess. ii. 16 only. e Luke i. 68. ii. 38 only. Ps. cx. 9. (see note.)

12. ins εις τα αγια bef εφαπ., retaining same words below ℵ[1](ℵ-corr[1] disapproving). [aft τα αγ. ins των αγιων P.]

ῆλθεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν), the especial abode of the invisible and unapproachable God. As regards the epithets of this σκηνή, first it is distinguished by the art. τῆς, = nearly ἐκείνης τῆς, '*that tabernacle of which we know.*' Then it is called **μείζων**, in contrast with the small extent and import of that other, and **τελειοτέρα**, in contrast with its ineffectiveness and its exclusion from the divine presence: perhaps also with its merely symbolical, and its transitory nature. "The indeterminate οὐ χειροποιήτου, a word of St. Luke in similar connexion, Acts vii. 48; xvii. 24, is explained by the Writer himself by οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, and serves as an apposition to the preceding. That tabernacle is not built by hands of men, but by the Lord Himself, ch. viii. 2; it is of His own immediate placing, not belonging to this creation, not only not to this material creation which surrounds us, out of which we get our building materials, but altogether not to this first and present creation: it belongs to the age of the future, to the glorified world." Delitzsch. The rendering "*not of this building*," E. V., also Erasm., Luther, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, Kuinoel, al., is wrong, and misses the idea, giving in fact a tautological explanation for οὐ χειροποιήτου. As to the word **χειροποίητος**, it is classical, see Herod. ii. 140: Thuc. ii. 77: Pausan. Eliac. ii. 19: Polyb. i. 75. 4; iv. 64. 4; and other examples in Bleek), **nor yet** (**οὐδέ**, exclusive, but not necessarily climacterical; q. d. 'no, nor with any of the typical accompaniments of that other tabernacle.' It is neatly stated by Delitzsch, that οὔτε is the opposite of καί '*and*,' οὐδέ of καί '*also*') **through** (as a medium of preparation and approach. The instrumental sense very nearly approaches the local: so that there need be no scruple about the apparently different senses given to **διά** in the two clauses: see above) **blood of goats and calves** (the plurals are simply generic: for the portion of the ceremonies of the day of atonement, see ref. Levit.), **nay rather** (on this strongly contrasting **δέ**, see note ch. ii. 6) **through** (see above; through, as His medium of entrance: it was as a key opening the holiest to Him) **His own blood** (not δι' αἵματος ἰδίου, nor διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου, but, which is more emphatic than either after the former anarthrous αἵματος, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος—q. d. 'through that blood of His own.' St. Luke has used the very same expression in ref. Acts) **entered** (χριστός above is the emphatic subject of the whole sentence) **once for all** (see ref.) **into the holy places, and obtained** (on **εὑρίσκω** in this sense, see ch. iv. 16. The aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. itself εἰςῆλθεν. The redemption was not accomplished *when* He *entered*, but accomplished *by* His *entering*. And our only way of expressing this contemporaneity in English is by resolving the part. into another aorist with the copula, as in ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, and similar cases. Consult the note on ch. ii. 10, which is not, however, a strictly parallel case. Here as there, the contemporaneous *completion* of the two acts must be kept in view, and any such rendering as Ebrard's, "in bringing about," carefully avoided. The form of the word, **εὑράμενος**, is Alexandrine, found also in Philo, but not in Attic Greek: see Lobeck on Phryn. p. 139 f. The middle is of that force which Krüger calls dynamic, Sprachlehre § 52. 8. It imports the full casting of oneself into the action: thus in an ordinary case, τοὺς τὸν πόλεμον ποιοῦντας, Isocr., but Ἆγις οὐκ ἐκ παρέργου τὸν πόλεμον ἐποιεῖτο, Thucyd. So that εὑράμενος here gives an energy and full solemnity to the personal agency of our Redeemer in the work of our redemption, which εὑρών would not give) **eternal redemption for us** (**αἰωνίαν**, answering to ἐφάπαξ above: as Hofmann remarks, the λύτρωσις is the aim and end of the approach of our High Priest to God: if then this approach has once for all taken place, the λύτρωσις is therewith for ever accomplished. For the fem. form **αἰωνίαν**, see ref. 2 Thess. It occurs sometimes in the LXX: e. g. Num. xxv. 13: Isa. lxi. 4 al. **λύτρωσις** (reff.) is used elsewhere by St. Luke only: so also **λυτρώτης**, Acts vii. 35. **λυτροῦσθαι**, Luke xxiv. 21, is also used by St. Paul once, Titus ii. 14, and St. Peter, 1 Pet. i. 18. **ἀπολύτρωσις** is St. Paul's word, occurring also in Luke xxi. 28, and in our ver. 15, and ch. xi. 35. In both words, as applied to our final redemption at the coming of Christ, the idea of ransom is rather in the background,

σιν [f] εὑράμενος. 13 εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα [gg] τράγων καὶ [gh] ταύρων καὶ [ik] σποδὸς [il] δαμάλεως [im] ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς [n] κεκοινωμένους

f = ch. iv. 16 [Rom. iv. 1] al. Gen. xxvi. 12.
g ch. x. 4. Ps. xlix. 13. Isa. i. 11. h as above (g). Matt. xxii. 4. Acts xiv. 13 only. i Num. xix. 9 (ῥαντισμός). k Matt. xi. 21. Luke x. 13 only. l here only. m vv. 19, 21. ch. x. 22 only. Lev. vi. 27. 4 Kings ix. 33. Ps. l. 7 (9) only. (-τισμός, ch. xii. 24.) n = Matt. xv. 11, &c. ‖. Acts (x. 15. xi. 9) xxi. 28 only †.

13. rec transp τραγων and ταυρων, with KL[P] rel syr [æth arm] Ath$_1$ Cyr-jer$_1$ Cyr[-p$_2$ Did$_1$ Chr$_1$ Euthal-ms Damasc] Ambr$_1$: txt ABDℵ latt Syr coptt Thdrt Primas. κεκοιμημενους D[1][-gr].

and that of deliverance prevails over it: but in both, as applied to the redemption which Christ wrought by His death, the idea of price paid for redemption and redemption by that price, is kept prominent. This may be especially shewn by the two great texts Matt. xx. 28 (and ‖ Mark), ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθ. . . . ἦλθεν δοῦναι τ. ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, and 1 Tim. ii. 6, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. The price paid for our redemption is His *death* (ver. 15) as the sacrifice of Himself, Titus ii. 14: 1 Tim. ii. 5 f.,—His *blood* Eph. i. 7, as the sacrifice of His life, Matt. xx. 28: 1 Pet. i. 19. And here also it is His blood which is the λύτρον. Delitzsch, from whom the substance of the above is taken, goes on to shew, on the ground of the analogy between Christ and the O. T. high priests who took the blood in before God and sprinkled it on His mercy-seat, that it was God to whom this λύτρον was paid, and not, as many of the Fathers held, Satan. See his notes, in his Comm. pp. 386-7. On the matter itself,—the entrance of Christ into the holiest διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, I cannot do better than refer the student to the following pages of Delitzsch, where he has treated at length, and in a most interesting manner, the various hypotheses. I do not sum up the results here, because it is a subject of such peculiar solemnity, that the mind requires its treatment in full, in order to approach it reverently: and such full treatment would far exceed the limits of a general commentary. I have indicated some of the principal lines of hypothesis on ch. xii. 24, where the direct mention of the αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ makes it necessary).

13—X. 18.] *Enlargement upon, and substantiation of, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος*: on which then follows, x. 19 ff., the third or directly hortatory part of the Epistle. "For the blood of His self-offering purifies inwardly unto the living service of the living God (vv. 13, 14): His redeeming death is the inaugurating act of a new covenant and of the heavenly sanctuary (vv. 15—23): His entrance into the antitypical holiest place is the conclusion of his all-sufficing atonement for sin (vv. 24—26), after which only remains His re-appearance to complete the realization of Redemption (vv. 27, 28). In distinction from the legal offerings which were constantly repeated, He has, by his offering of Himself, performed the actual will of God which willed salvation (ch. x. 1—10): our Sanctification is now for ever accomplished, and the exalted Saviour reigns in expectation of ultimate victory (x. 11—14): and the promised new covenant has come in, resting on an eternal forgiveness of sins which requires no further offering (x. 15—18)." Delitzsch. 13, 14.] *Argument*, 'a minori ad majus,' *to shew the cleansing power of Christ's blood.* **For** (rendering a reason for αἰων. λύτρ. εὑράμενος) **if** (with indic.,—'as we know it does') **the blood** (τὸ αἷμα, compared with τὸ αἷμα below, because it is not the one blood compared with the other in its quality, but the shedding of the one blood compared with the shedding of the other: the articles then *distribute* the *subject* in each case) **of goats and bulls** (viz. the yearly offering on the day of atonement, Levit. xvi. ταύρων this time, both as more precise, males alone being offered, and as forming an alliteration with τράγων) **and ashes of an heifer** (see the whole ordinance, full of significance, in Num. xix. 1—22. σποδὸς has no art. because the ashes were to be laid up, and a portion used as wanted) **sprinkling** (= ῥαντιζομένη ἐπί. ῥαντίζειν is a Hellenistic form: ῥαίνειν is the pure Greek, and also the commoner form in the LXX (14 times: the other 3 only. See reff.): who however in Num. xix. call the water in which were ashes of the red heifer, ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ) **those who have been defiled** (D-lat., vulg., Luth., Calv., De Wette in his version, al. make this accus. depend on ἁγιάζει. But to this there are two objections: 1. it is much less likely that ῥαντίζουσα should be absolute, than that ἁγιάζει should: 2. on this hypothesis, those who were the subjects of the virtue of the blood of the goats and bulls would also be described as κεκοινωμένοι, which they were not in the same sense as those who were sprinkled with the water of separation containing the ashes of the heifer. This latter objection is to me decisive. The word κοινόω, in this usage of to make unclean, to defile, as the opposite of ἁγιάζω, as κοινός itself

[o] ἁγιάζει [p] πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς [q] καθαρότητα, 14 [r] πόσῳ [r] μᾶλλον τὸ [s] αἷμα τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὃς [t] διὰ [t] πνεύματος [u] αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν [v] προσήνεγκεν [w] ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ, [x] καθαριεῖ τὴν

o ch. ii. 11 reff. p = Acts iii. 10. ch. v. 14. vi. 11. q here only. Exod. xxiv. 10 A(-ριότης B) only. Ps. lxxxviii. 45 Symm. r Heb., here only. Matt. vii. 11 al. see ch. x. 29. s 1 John i. 7. Rev. i. 5. vii. 14. t see Rom. i. 4. 1 Tim. iii. 16. u of πν., here only. v vv. 7, 9. ch. v. 1 al. fr. w of Christ, 1 Pet. i. 19 only. (Jude 24. reff.) of sacrifices, Num. vi. 14. xix. 2 al. x 2 Cor. vii. 1. Eph. v. 26. Tit. ii. 14 al. Ezek. xxxvii. 23.

...καθα B. ADKLP ℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

14. for *αιωνιου*, *αγιου* D[1][P]ℵ[3] a b f h 67[2] latt coptt Cyr[1] Did[1] [Chr[1] Euthal-ms Damasc]: *αγιου αιωνιου* k: txt ABD[3]KLℵ[1] rel syrr arm Ath[1] [Did[1]] Thdrt.

over against ἅγιος, is Hellenistic, and first found in the N.T.: the LXX have for it *μιαίνω* and *βεβηλόω*, and for the person defiled, ἀκάθαρτος. In 1 Macc. i. 47, 62 only, is *κοινός* found in the sense of unclean) **sanctifieth to** (so as to bring about) **the purity** (not "purifying," as E. V.) **of the flesh** (it is evident, that the Writer speaks only of the Levitical rites in their matter-of-fact results as 'opera operata,' not of any divine grace which might accrue to the soul of the faithful Israelite from a spiritual partaking in them. The outward effect of the sacrifices of the day of atonement, as well as of the sprinkling of the ashes of the heifer, was, to render ceremonially pure before God, in the one case from the imputation of the defilement of sin on the whole people, in the other, from the defilement actually contracted by contact with death or uncleanness. These effects they had in themselves: what others they had, out of themselves, belonged not so much to them, as to that great Sacrifice which they represented), **how much more** (see the logical connexion at the end) **shall the blood of (the) Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered** HIMSELF (emphatic) **without fault to God** (first, *when* did He offer Himself? Clearly not, as Socinus, Schlichting, Grot., which last says, "Oblatio autem Christi hic intelligitur ea, quæ oblationi legali in adyto factæ respondet, ea autem est non oblatio in altari crucis facta, sed facta in adyto cœlesti:" with whom Bleek agrees. For, as Delitzsch rightly observes, when Christ is antitypically or by way of contrast compared with the *victims* of the O. T. sacrifices, as the ritual word ἄμωμον here shews that He is, then beyond question the offering on the cross is intended, which corresponds to the slaying the victim and offering him on the altar. Besides which, the "oblatio in adyto" was but the completion of the "oblatio in altari," and, when Christ's self-offering is spoken of generally, we are to take the whole from the beginning, not merely that which was the last act of it. This will guide us to the meaning of the somewhat difficult words **διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου**: for thus do we read, and not ἁγίου, which appears to have originated in a mistaken view of the words. The animals which were offered, had no will, no πνεῦμα of their own, which could concur with the act of sacrifice. Theirs was a transitory life, of no potency or virtue. They were offered διὰ νόμου rather than διά any consent, or agency, or counteragency, of their own. But Christ offered Himself, with His own consent assisting and empowering the sacrifice. And what was that consent? the consent of what? of the spirit of a man? such a consent as yours or mine, given in and through our finite spirit whose acts are bounded by its own allotted space in time and its own responsibilities? No: but the consenting act of His divine Personality—His πνεῦμα αἰώνιον, His Godhead, which from before time acquiesced in, and wrought with, the redemption-purpose of the Father. Thus we have πνεῦμα contrasted with σάρξ in speaking of our Lord, in several places: cf. Rom. i. 3, 4: 1 Tim. iii. 16: 1 Pet. iii. 18. This divine Personality it was, which in the Resurrection so completely ruled and absorbed His σάρξ: this, which causes Him to be spoken of by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 45 as a πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, and in 2 Cor. iii. 17 f. as absolutely τὸ πνεῦμα. Not however that any confusion hence arises in the distinction of the divine Persons: πνεῦμα αἰώνιον is not the Spirit of the Father dwelling in Christ, nor is it the Holy Spirit given without measure to Christ, but it is the divine Spirit of the Godhead which Christ Himself had and was in His inner Personality. And I conclude with Delitzsch as to the relevancy of such a clause here: the eternal spirit is absolute spirit, divine spirit, and thus self-conscious, laying down its own course purely of itself unbound by conditions, simply and entirely free: so that Christ's offering of Himself διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου is, as such, a moral act of absolute worth, as Baumg., Von Gerlach, Ebrard, Lünem., al. "Jam vero," says Seb. Schmidt, "cum hic Spiritus æternus adeoque infinitus sit, utique pondus meriti et satisfactionis, quod ab eodem spiritu est, æternum et infinitum est. Quod si æternum et infinitum sit, ne quidem infinita Dei justitia in eo aliquid desiderari potuit." The διά is beautifully

y ver. 9.
z 2 Cor. vii. 1. Ps. l. 2 (4).
a ch. vi. 1 (reff.).
b ch. vii. 25 reff.
c ch. viii. 5 reff.
d ch. iii. 12 reff.

[y] συνείδησιν ἡμῶν [z] ἀπὸ [a] νεκρῶν [a] ἔργων [b] εἰς τὸ [c] λατρεύειν [d] θεῷ [d] ζῶντι; [15] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο [e] διαθήκης [e] καινῆς [f] μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου, εἰς [g] ἀπολύτρωσιν

e ch. viii. 8 reff. f ch. viii. 6 reff. g Luke xxi. 28. Rom. iii. 24. 1 Cor. i. 30. Eph. i. 7, 14. iv. 30. Col. i. 14. ch. xi. 35 only. Dan. iv. 32 (LXX) only.

C εστιν.. ACDKL Pℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

rec υμων, with D[3]Lℵ rel am(with [fuld] tol F-lat) syr basm [æth arm(rieu) Ath_1-2-mss Did_1 Mac_1] Chr-3-mss(and montf) Damasc: txt AD[1]K[P] h vulg-ed D-lat Syr copt Ath_1 Cyr_1 [Euthal-ms] Thdrt. aft ζωντι ins και αληθινω A[P] 21[1]. 31. 66-marg copt Mac_1 Chr-$comm_2$ Thl.

paraphrased by Œcolampadius, "per ardentissimam caritatem a Spiritu ejus æterno profectam." See for the prep., in this connexion, Acts i. 2; xi. 28; xxi. 4. It is by virtue of—so that His divine Spirit was the agent in the προσφορά, penetrating and acting on the Humanity. **ἄμωμος**, as above observed, is (reff.) the regular word of the ritual in reference to the victims which must be without spot when offered. Therefore to understand it of the perfection of the glorified human nature of the ascended Saviour, as Schlichting and the Socinian interpreters, is clearly beside the meaning, and contrary to analogy. See many further details on this difficult passage in Bleek and Delitzsch), **purify our** (the question of reading, ἡμῶν or ὑμῶν, is one not easy to settle. At the word καθαριεῖ we unfortunately lose the evidence of B, the MS. terminating there, and being completed by a later hand. From all analogy it would seem that we must infer ἡμῶν to have been its reading here. It is true, as Bl. and Delitzsch assert, that ὑμῶν has a more lively and emphatic aspect: "habet aliquid inexpectatum," as Böhme: but I cannot bring myself for this purely subjective reason to desert the guidance of the best and oldest MSS., though their company is now weakened by the defect of its most important member) **conscience** (our English word *conscience* does not reach the fulness of συνείδησις, the *self-consciousness as regards God*, the inner consciousness of relation to Him. This is, by the blood of Christ, shed in the power of the divine Spirit, thoroughly purified, freed from the terror of guilt, cleared from alienation from Him and from all selfish regards and carnal pretences, and rendered living and real as He is living and real) **from dead works** (just as death was under the old law the fountain of ceremonial pollution, and any one by touching a dead body became unclean, so carnal works, having their origin in sin, with which death is bound up, pollute the conscience. They are like the touching of the dead body, rendering the man unclean in God's sight, as not springing from life in Him: inducing decay and corruption in the spirit. See on ch. vi. 1, and Chrys. there quoted. Here, the reference to the dead body can hardly be set aside, being more pointed than there, where I have rather advocated the general sense of νεκρός. The Writer does not here set forth *how* this blood of Christ acts in purifying the conscience: it is not his aim now to speak of *our* way of participation of its benefits, but merely of *its* cleansing power itself) **in order to the serving** (ministering to, which the unclean might not do in the ceremonial sanctuary, nor can the unclean do in heart and life) **the living God** (God in His spiritual reality and absolute holiness: not a God concealed by veils and signs, but approached in His verity by the sanctified soul)?

15.] See summary above at ver. 13. This pre-eminent spiritual virtue of His redeeming blood constitutes his fitness to be Mediator of the new covenant, the main blessing of which, forgiveness, extends even back over the insufficient former one, and ensures the inheritance to the called. **And on this account** (διὰ τοῦτο is not to be taken as Schlichting, Böhme, and Bleek, prospectively, responded to by the ὅπως below: for in this case we should have an entire break between the last verse and this. It is true, as Del. observes, that a new side of Christ's work is here introduced: but it is one which stands in the closest relation to that which has preceded. Rather should we refer διὰ τοῦτο backwards, and understand it, *on account of this virtue of His blood:* or if it seem better, extend its reference further back still, over vv. 11—14, *on account of the great work which He hath accomplished by his death:* = 'because these things are so') **is He mediator of a new covenant** (see ch. viii. 6 and note. There is a stress on **καινῆς**, but not so strong an one as Bl. and Del. suppose: Del. would explain,—therefore is the covenant, of which He is the mediator, a new one. But surely *this predicate* does not carry the logical weight of the sentence, but rather both the words, **διαθήκης καινῆς**, the latter of which is taken up and responded to by πρώτη below, and

τῶν [h] ἐπὶ τῇ [i] πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ [k] παραβάσεων, τὴν [lm] ἐπαγγελίαν [m] λάβωσιν οἱ [n] κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου [o] κληρονομίας. 16 [p] ὅπου γὰρ [qr] διαθήκη, θάνατον [s] ἀνάγκη [t] φέρεσθαι

h 2 Cor. ii. 14. vii. 4. Phil. i. 3. ver. 26 al.
i ch. viii. 7.
k ch. ii. 2 reff.
l ch. iv. 1 reff.
m ch. xi. 13. Acts ii. 33. see ch. vi. 15. xi. 33, 39.
n = Heb., here only. (see ch. iii. 1.) Rom. viii. 30. ix. 11. Gal. v. 8 al.
o Heb., ch. xi. 8 only. 1 Pet. i. 4 reff.
p = ch. x. 18. 1 Cor. iii. 3. James iii. 16.
q = here 3ce only? (Gal. iii. 15.) so διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην, Plato, Legg. 922 c. 923 E. (al. in Bleek.)
r ch. viii. 10 (reff.) x. 16. Acts iii. 25.
s = ver. 23. Rom. xiii. 5.
t = here only. (see note.)

the former by ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη in the next verse. For its meaning here, see below), in **order that,—death having taken place, for the propitiation of the transgressions under the first covenant,—they who have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance** (first, the object of the new covenant is an eternal *inheritance*,—cf. τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά, ver. 11, ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, ch. ii. 5: and therefore the idea of *inheritance* having once come in, gives to διαθήκη that shade of meaning which is deepened and insisted on below, viz. that of a TESTAMENTARY covenant or arrangement. Then, going backwards from κληρονομίας,—ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν, an expression (see reff.) used also by St. Luke, is to be taken in the sense of receiving the fulfilment of a promise, not merely of having the promise granted. Then, the κεκλημένοι are the κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι of ch. iii. 1: cf. also ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις of Phil. iii. 14: and reff. here. Calvin well remarks, "Loquitur de vocatis, ut Judæos, qui hujus vocationis erant participes, magis officiat." This end, of the called being put in possession of the promise of the eternal inheritance, is to be attained, θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων. Without this death, it could not be attained. The full reason of this, that death must take place first, is presently gone into: it is with the concluding words of this clause that we are at present concerned. These *transgressions under the first covenant* are in fact those of all mankind. Israel was a pattern of God's dealings with all: and His revelation of His will to Israel extended categorically to all mankind. Against this will, primævally revealed, revealed to the patriarchs, revealed in the law, our parents and the antediluvian earth, the sons of Noah and the postdiluvian earth, Israel itself as a people, had deeply and repeatedly transgressed: and before a new inheritance by testament could come in, there must be a propitiation of all these former transgressions. All the propitiatory sacrifices, so called, of the former covenant, were but imperfect and typical: but as this is to be a real inheritance, so there must be real and actual propitiation. Cf. the remarkable parallel, Acts xiii. 39, ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσέως δικαιωθῆναι, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται. See more below. This is fully and strikingly treated by Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 300: see also Delitzsch's note here.

It is right to mention that some versions and expositors take κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας together. Thus Syr., Faber Stap., Chr. F. Schmid, al., and recently, Tholuck and Ebrard (this latter, apparently, missing the sense of ἐπαγγελίαν λαβεῖν): which arrangement would perhaps be grammatically justifiable, but according neither to our Writer's usage, nor to the requirements of the sentence. The severing of a genitive in government from its governing noun is not uncommon in our Epistle, and frequently found in other governments also, in St. Luke: and, the stress being here on *inheritance*, as presently taken up in the next verse, it is not probable that it would be introduced merely in the most insignificant place possible, as a mere adjunct to the description of the *subject* of the sentence. So that on all grounds the other and more usually accepted construction is to be preferred. The ἐπί *with dat.* τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ, in the sense of '*under*,' '*during the time of*,' the first διαθ., easily gets its meaning from the primitive sense of close superposition. The things happening ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ, had it for their substratum, were superimposed on it, as it were. See ch. x. 28; and Winer, edn. 6, § 48. c).

16.] **For** (justification of θανάτου γενομένου, by an appeal to common usage) **where a testament is** (it is quite in vain to attempt to deny the testamentary sense of διαθήκη in this verse. Many have made the attempt: e. g. Codurcus, in a long excursus, which may be seen in Critici Sacri, vol. vii. part 2, fol. 1067 ff.: Whitby in loc., Seb. Schmidt, Michaelis, al., and recently Ebrard and Hofmann. As these recent expositors have written with the others before them, it may be well to give an account of their views of the passage. Ebrard understands it thus: "Wherever sinful man will enter into a covenant with the holy God, the man must first die,—must first atone for his guilt by death (or must put in a substitute for himself)." This he gives as the summary of his argumentation. But, as Hofmann asks, where

u ch. viii. 1. v ch. ii. 2 reff.

τοῦ [r] διαθεμένου· [17] [q] διαθήκη γὰρ [u] ἐπὶ νεκροῖς [v] βεβαία,

does he find one word of this in the general assertion of the Writer? The text speaks axiomatically of something which every one knows in common life. Ebrard interprets theologically: by a declaration which it requires a theologian to accept. The Writer speaks in the abstract—of all διαθῆκαι whatever: Ebrard interprets in the concrete—of one particular set of διαθῆκαι. It is true, Eb. attempts to anticipate this objection, by saying that from the context, every one would know what sort of διαθήκη was meant. But this does not meet it in the least degree. Our verse is a perfectly general axiom, extending over all διαθῆκαι, in whatsoever sense the word be taken. Hofmann on the other hand rejects (Schriftb. ii. 1. 302 ff.) both meanings, *testament* and *covenant*, and maintains that of *ordinance, disposition*, understanding that disposition to extend to the whole property. Then, he says (see also Weissagung u. Erfüllung, ii. 165), "This idea of necessity implies that he must die who makes such a disposition of his whole property: because, as long as he lives, he can be always adding to his property, so that this disposition (διαθήκη) cannot be meant to be used of the time while the disposer is alive." But this, though approaching nearer the true meaning, is just as futile as the other. Why may not a man yet living make such a disposition? And if it cannot be made till death, wherein does it in reality differ from a testament? It would be quite impossible to follow out the various argumentations by which the testamentary sense has been sought to be evaded. It will be far more profitable for us to endeavour to substantiate that which I believe to be the only admissible acceptation. And this I will do by starting from the word itself about which all the question is raised. διαθήκη, from διατιθέναι, '*disponere*,' διατίθεσθαι, '*disponere sibi*,' regards, in ordinary Greek usage, that disposition of a man's property which he makes in prospect of his death, and signifies, 1. *a will or testament*. So in Plato, Legg. xi. p. 926 B, ὃς ἂν διαθήκην γράφῃ, τὰ αὐτοῦ διατιθέμενος, and in reff.: in Demosth. 1136. 12, τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἂν γνησίων ὄντων παίδων ὁ πατὴρ διάθηται, ἐὰν ἀποθάνωσιν οἱ παῖδες πρὶν ἡβῆσαι, κυρίαν εἶναι, and al. On the other hand, the word is by no means tied to this its more usual meaning. The general one, of a *disposition* of any kind, is sometimes found applied to other circumstances than those at the close of life. So Aristoph. Av. 439, where Peisthetærus says, μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω 'γὼ μὲν οὔ, ἢν μὴ διαθῶνταί γ' οἵδε διαθήκην ἐμοί, . . . μήτε δάκνειν τούτους ἐμὲ κ.τ.λ.: where it evidently means a *covenant*, an *agreement*. And in this sense, either where there are two distinct parties, or where one only arranges or ordains a 'dispositio,' do we find the word most often used in the LXX and N. T. In the former sense, 2. of a *covenant*, with two agreeing parties, it is not so frequent as in the latter: but we find it Gen. xxi. 27, 32, διέθεντο ἀμφότεροι διαθήκην: in Job xl. 23 (xli. 4) of Leviathan, θήσεται δὲ μετὰ σοῦ διαθήκην: 2 Kings iii. 12: Josh. ix. 6, 11 al. fr. The other sense, 3. that of a *disposition* or *ordinance* made by God πρός τινα, or μετά τινος, is the most ordinary one in the LXX. To it may be referred almost all the passages where in a loose sense of the word we in English render '*covenant*:' e. g. Gen. vi. 18; ix. 9 &c.; xv. 18: and a hundred other places. In this latter sense it is that the word has come to be used absolutely and technically as in ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης, ἡ διαθήκη κυρίου, &c.: and in the quotation in our ch. viii. 8 ff. Now, having these three leading senses of the word before us, we are to enquire, which of them our Writer is likely to have intended when he wrote as a general axiom, ὅπου διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου. It is obvious that in no general axiomatic sense can it be predicated of a *covenant*, or of an *ordinance*. There may be particular instances where a death (setting aside for a moment τοῦ διαθεμένου) might have been the requisite ratification of a covenant, or result of an ordinance: but such particular cases are clearly not here in question. Only when we recur to sense (1), that of a *testament*, can it be true, that where a διαθήκη is, there must of necessity be death, and that, the death τοῦ διαθεμένου, of him who has made the testament. And if it be objected to this, that a testament may exist many years before the death of the testator, the answer is easy, that the Writer here defines his own meaning of ὅπου διαθήκη, when he says **διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία**: viz. that the document in question does not in reality become a διαθήκη, a *disposition*, till it is of force, till things are disposed by it. I believe then it will be found that we must at all hazards accept the meaning *testament* here, as being the only one which will in any way meet the plain requirements of the verse) **there is necessity that the death** (θάνατον is prefixed before

ἐπεὶ [w] μήποτε [x] ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ [r] διαθέμενος. 18 [y] ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος [z] ἐγκεκαίνισται. 19 λαλη-

e λαληθ.. ACDKL Pℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

w constr., here only. see Winer, § 65. 2. d. edn. 6. x = Gal. v. 6. James v. 16. y ch. ii. 17 reff. z ch. x. 20 only. Deut. xx. 5. 3 Kings viii. 36. (-νια, John x. 22. -νισμός, Num. vii. 84. -νισις, ib. 88 A [-νωσις B].)

17. for μηποτε, μη τοτε D[1]ℵ[3] Isid$_{expr}$.
18. rec ουδ', with [K(e sil) P]ℵ rel [Damasc]: txt ACDL a c h k o 17 [47 Chr Thdrt].—οδεν ουδεν η D[1]. aft πρωτη ins διαθηκη D[1](and lat).

ἀνάγκη, as carrying the whole weight of emphasis, and is for this reason also anarthrous) **of him who made it** (the *testator*, as E. V., but it is important to mark that it is διαθεμένου, not διατιθεμένου, as it ought to be on the interpretation of Ebr. al. In the meaning, Christ is the διαθέμενος: and this agrees wonderfully with St. Luke's manner of speaking in that text which is in fact the key-text to this: κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν, Luke xxii. 29. There the great and primary διαθέμενος is the Father, who is not here in question, as neither is His διαθήκη with His Son: but as regards *us*, the διαθέμενος is Christ; to whom alone, as human, the axiom, spoken of human relations, is applicable, and not to the divine Father. And when Ebrard insists on the former of these facts, and altogether omits noticing the second, saying that according to our interpretation God Himself must have died, we can only marvel at this fresh instance of the inconceivable rashness and carelessness which unfortunately characterize his spirited and clever commentary) **be implied** (it is not easy to express the exact sense of φέρεσθαι here. For we must remember, 1. that we have had θανάτου γενομένου in ver. 15, quite far enough off to prevent it being probable that φέρεσθαι is a mere rhetorical elegance to avoid repeating γενέσθαι, and inducing us to think that some meaning different from γενέσθαι is here intended: even could it be shewn that φέρεσθαι could bear to be rendered = γενέσθαι, which I am not aware that it has been: 2. that in looking for a sense for φέρεσθαι, we must be careful not to give too pregnant or emphatic an one, seeing that it holds a very insignificant and unemphatic place in the sentence. This being premised, I believe the most suitable sense will be found in such phrases as πάσας αἰτίας φέρειν, *to allege all grounds*, Demosth. p. 1328. 22; παραδείγματα φέρειν, *to produce examples*, Polyb. xvii. 13. 7; φέρειν τινὶ τοὺς ἀπολογισμούς, *to make one's apologies to*, id. i. 32. 4. And of these I would take '*alleged*,' '*carried in to the matter*,' in fact, '*implied*,' which seems the best word: he who speaks of διαθήκη, (ἅμα) φέρει, carries in to, involves in, that assertion, the death of the διαθέμενος. On the logical connexion, see below): **17.**] **for** (renders a fresh reason within the domain of the former γάρ, explaining the axiom of ver. 16) **a testament is of force** (βεβαία, see on ch. ii. 2, and Rom. iv. 16) **in the case of the dead** (ἐπί, over, the thing predicated being the substratum or condition of the subject. Doubtless in choosing the plural, and indeed the word itself, the Writer has in his mind the transition which he is about to make from the death of the New Testament to the typical deaths of the Old, which were of animals, between which and men, νεκρά, not ἀποθανόντα, would be the common term), **seeing that it** (a διαθήκη) **is never** (we should expect οὔποτε here, the assertion being absolute and of matter of fact: but it appears to be a habit of later writers after ἐπεί to use the subjective, not the objective negation. So Ælian xii. 63, ἐπεὶ μὴ πάνυ ἦν πλούσιος: Lucian, Hermot. 47, ἐπεὶ μηδενὸς ἡγεμόνος τοιούτου ἔς γε τὸ παρὸν εὐπορούμεν: Ptol. Geogr. viii., ἐπεὶ μηδὲν εἶχε τοιοῦτον . . . ἀντιπαραγράφειν. But we must not render μήποτε as = μήπω, which vulg., Faber Stap., Erasm., Luther, Calv., Böhme have done. Many expositors take it interrogatively: "*surely it is not?*" &c. So Œc., Thl., De Dieu, Bengel, Lachmann, and even Delitzsch: but quite unnecessarily, as the above usage is undoubted, and the question introduces an unnecessary harshness) **availing when** (ὅτε corresponding to μήποτε) **he that made it is alive.** **18.**] **Whence** (τουτέστι, διότι ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι τὸ θάνατον προηγεῖσθαι τῆς διαθήκης. Thl.) **neither has the first** (διαθήκη, testament) **been inaugurated** (perf., inasmuch as the rites &c. belonging to it were still subsisting. ἐγκαινίζω is an Alexandrine verb: used in the LXX for to *re-create* or make anew: also for to put forth as new, to *inaugurate*: see reff., and numerous citations in Trommius. Notice that the reference is, *here*, simply to the first encænia of the law when it was put forth as new: not to any subsequent renewal of sacrifices by death: this is presently alluded to, vv. 21 ff. Thl. gives for ἐγκεκαίνισται,—τουτέστι, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς συστάσεως κ. τῆς βεβαιώσεως ἔλαβεν) **without** (apart from, free from the exhibition of) **blood.** **19.**] **For** (explana-

θείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς [a] κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑπὸ Μωυσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν [b] μόσχων καὶ τῶν [b] τράγων μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ [c] ἐρίου [d] κοκκίνου καὶ [e] ὑσσώπου, αὐτό τε τὸ [f] βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν [g] ἐράντισεν, λέγων, 20 Τοῦτο τὸ [h] αἷμα τῆς [hi] διαθήκης [k] ἧς [il] ἐνετείλατο

ACDKL PℵR a b c d e f g h k l m no 17. 47

a Acts xxii. 12. ch. viii. 4. b Exod. xxiv. 6—8. ver. 12 reff. c Rev. i. 14 only. Deut. xxii. 11. d Matt. xxvii. 28. Rev. xvii. 3, 4. xviii. 12, 16 only. Exod. xxv. 4. Num. xix. 6. e John xix. 29 only. Exod. xii. 22 al. f = Luke iv. 17, 20. g ver. 13 reff. h ch. x. 29 reff. i Josh. xxiii. 16. Judg. ii. 20 al. k attr., ch. vi. 10 reff. l ch. xi. 22. w. πρός, here only. 1 Kings xx. 29. 2 Chron. xix. 9. Sir. xlv. 3. dat., Matt. iv. 6 ‖ L. (from Ps. xc. 11). xvii. 9 al.

19. aft πασης ins της D¹ Chr₁. rec om τον (bef νομον), with D³K[P]ℵ¹ rel Chr Damasc: ins ACD¹Lℵ³ g k 17 [47 Euthal-ms] Chr-ms Thdrt Thl. om υπο D¹[-gr]. rec om των (bef τραγων), with [P] rel Thdrt [Damasc]: ins ACD[ℵ¹] latt [Euthal-ms] Thdrt-ms.—om και των τραγων (*homœotel*) KLℵ³ k syrr Chr₁: transp μοσχων and τραγων D. rec ερραντισεν, with [P] rel: txt ACDKLℵ f o 17 [47 Euthal-ms].
20. for ενετειλατο, διεθετο C lect-1.

tion of the assertion in last verse) **when every commandment had been spoken according to the law** (these last words, κατὰ τὸν νόμον, belong not to ἐντολῆς, as vulg. ("lecto enim omni mandato legis"), Schlicht., Calov., Jac. Cappell., Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, Chr. F. Schmid, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, al., which would be more naturally τῆς κατὰ τ. ν. (as indeed Thl. gives it in his altern.: τουτέστι, καθὼς ὁ θεὸς ἐνομοθέτησεν ἵνα λαληθῶσιν εἰς τὰ ὦτα παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ· ἤ, πάσης ἐντολῆς τῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τουτέστι τῆς νομοθετηθείσης),—but to λαληθείσης, spoken according to the law, i. e. as the law directed, not varying from it in any point. The law was ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν, and these ἐντολαί were faithfully reported) **by Moses to all the people** (see Exod. xxiv. 3, καὶ διηγήσατο τῷ λαῷ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα. The παντί, not given in Exodus, may be inferred from ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαός, which follows in the same verse), **taking the blood** (the additional detail of Exod. xxiv. 5 is omitted, viz. that "he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord." It was of this blood that Moses took) **of the calves and goats** (the former only are mentioned in Exodus: שְׁלָמִים לַיהוָה פָּרִים. But this is only said of the peace-offerings. The *burnt-offerings* (see above) after the analogy of the rites on the day of atonement, might be presumed to be goats. Indeed the key to the additions made here to the text of Exodus is, that the account is filled up by subsequent usage. We may presume, that the solemn legal appointment of various ceremonial details was in fact only a divine sanction of practices already existing: sacrifice having been long in use, and that under the direction and approval of God Himself) **with water** (prescribed, in Num. xix. 6, 17, to be mixed with the ashes of the red heifer which were to be kept for purifying: cf. also Levit. xiv. 50 f.: see above), **and scarlet wool and hyssop** (see Levit. xiv. 49 ff.: by comparing which with Num. xix. as above, it may fairly be inferred, as our text here assures us was the fact, that these instruments were the ordinary ones in cleansing and sprinkling, even before their positive enactment as such by the law. The hyssop indeed we find thus prescribed, ref. Exod., in sprinkling the blood on the door-posts at the Passover. As to the manner of using, the stalk or bunch of hyssop was wrapt round with scarlet wool to make it absorb the blood, being tied with the same wool to a staff of cedar-wood to keep it stiff. On *hyssop* itself, there are various opinions, enumerated in Winer, Realw., "Ysop." The most approved makes it to be a plant growing on walls, 'hyssopus officinalis,' with small lancet-formed woolly leaves, about an inch long, a knotty stalk from 1 foot to 1½ high, with blue (sometimes white) flowers), **he sprinkled both the book itself** (nothing is said of this in Exod. xxiv. And hence some have endeavoured to take αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον with λαβών, not with ἐράντισεν. So the Coptic and Armen. versions: and so Grot., Wittich, Cramer, Bengel, Michaelis, Storr, al. But it is obvious, that the καί after βιβλίον renders this impossible. The book is of course that out of which he had just read the ordinances of God: τὸ βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης. If, as Stier supposes, Moses took the book (Exod. xxiv. 7) from off the altar, where it was lying when he sprinkled the altar with blood, then the book was sprinkled likewise: but nothing in the text of Exodus implies this) **and all the people** (LXX, λαβὼν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸ αἷμα, κατεσκέδασεν τοῦ λαοῦ. Of course the words πάντα τὸν λαόν are not to be taken to mean that he sprinkled every individual; but merely the whole mass, as they stood), **saying,** 20.] **This is the blood of the testament** (LXX, ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης. It has been suggested, first it

πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός. 21 [m] καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν [m] δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ [no] σκεύη τῆς [op] λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι [q] ὁμοίως [s] ἐράν-

m Heb., here only. Matt. xvi. 18. Luke ii. 36 al.
n Matt. xii. 29 ||. 2 Tim. ii. 20 al. Exod. xl. 8 (10).
o 1 Chron. ix. 28. see Num. iv. 12. 2 Chron. xxiv. 14.
p ch. viii. 6. Luke i. 23. 2 Cor. ix. 12. Phil. ii. 17, 30 only.
q Heb., here only.

21. rec ερραντισε, with D[3][P] rel: txt ACD[1]KLℵ f o 17 [47].

would appear by Böhme, that the change has been made by the Writer after the tenor of the N. T. inauguration of the testament by our Lord, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου*, Luke xxii. 20, the only Gospel in which *ἐστιν* fails) **which God** (LXX, *κύριος*: changed apparently to preserve more completely the O.T. character of the saying) **commanded** (LXX *διέθετο*, which would seem at first sight more appropriate to ver. 16. But *ἐντέλλεσθαι διαθήκην* is a common LXX expression elsewhere, see besides reff. Deut. iv. 13; xxix. 1: Ps. cx. 9: Jer. xi. 3) **in regard to you** (it is much disputed, how the logic of this passage can cohere: seeing that, how properly soever the latter *διαθήκη* may be spoken of and argued on as being a testament, the former one could have no such character, and consequently cannot be thus argued on. And the question is very variously answered according to the standing-point of different Commentators. Even such as Tholuck, Lünemann, and Bleek, question the applicability of the Writer's argument. But, I believe, wrongly. The matter seems to stand thus. The word *διαθήκη* has the double sense of a covenant and a testament. Both these senses may be applied to both *διαθῆκαι*: to the latter more properly belongs the testamentary sense, but to the former also in as far as it was typical of and foreshadowed the other. In the latter, all is clear. Christ, the heir of all things, has bequeathed to us His people an everlasting inheritance; has died, sealing the testament with His blood. In the former all this is formally, though inadequately represented. The *κληρονομία*, faintly shadowed forth by temporal possessions, had yet a recognized blessed meaning far beyond those possessions: the testator was imperfectly, but still was formally represented by the animals slain in sacrifice: *there* was a death, *there* was a sprinkling of and sealing by blood: and surely it requires no more stretch of concession to acknowledge the victim in sacrifice to represent the Lamb of God in his sonship and his heritorship, than it does in his innocence and propitiatory power. The one idea is just as poorly and inadequately set forth by it as the other. But in both cases there is an inheritance, and in both it is the same. In both it is bequeathed: in the latter actually by One who has come in person and died: in the former, only typically, by the same One ceremonially present. So that, if our *ὅθεν* in ver. 18 were to be filled up, it would be, 'Whence, i. e. since the former covenant also had its testamentary side, and thus was analogous to as well as typical of the latter.' The charge brought against the Writer on account of his transition of meaning in *διαθήκη*, is equally without foundation. He is thinking in Greek. In Greek, *διαθήκη* has these two meanings: not divided off from one another by any such line of demarcation as when expressed by two separate words, but both lying under one and the same word. What more common, or more ordinarily accepted, than to educe out of some one word its various shades of meaning, and argue on each separately as regards the matter in hand? Take the very word 'Testament' as an example. In our common parlance it now means a *book:* the *Old Testament*, the book of the former covenant, the *New Testament*, the book of the latter. But we do not therefore sink the other and deeper meaning; nay we rather insist on it, that it may not become lost in that other and more familiar one. I cannot see how the Writer's method of procedure here differs essentially from this). 21.] **And moreover he in like manner sprinkled with the blood the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry** (this cannot be spoken of the same occasion as that referred to in the previous verses: for at that time the tabernacle did not exist. Nor again can it be said of any practice of sprinkling with blood which existed throughout the legal ordinances: for the aorist shews the reference to be to some one act, and the subject of the verb is, as before, Moses. This being so, we must look beyond the ordinances of the law itself for the fact here detailed. For all that we have in the law respecting the dedication of the tabernacle and its vessels is in Exod. xl. 9, 10, where Moses is commanded to take the anointing oil, and to anoint the tabernacle and all that is therein, and to hallow it, and all the vessels thereof. So that our Writer is probably referring to some traditional account, which added to this anointing with oil, the sprinkling with blood. And this is not merely a hypothesis. For Josephus,

τισεν, [22] καὶ [r] σχεδὸν [s] ἐν αἵματι πάντα [t] καθαρίζεται [u] κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς [v] αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται [w] ἄφεσις. [23] [x] ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν [y] ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν

ACDKL P‍ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

r Acts xiii. 44. xix. 26 only †. 2 Macc. v. 2 only.
s = Matt. xii. 27, 28. Mark xiv. 1 al.
t ver. 14.
u ch. viii. 4. ver. 19. Acts xxii. 12 al.
v here only †. see 3 Kings xviii. 28.
w absol., = Mark iii. 29 (Luke iv. 19 bis) only. (ch. x. 18 al.)
x ver. 16.
y ch. iv. 11 reff. viii. 5.

Antt. iii. 8. 6, gives the following remarkable account, agreeing with ours almost verbatim: Μωυσῆς δὲ . . . . ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν τεθυμένων τήν τε στολὴν τοῦ Ἀαρῶνος καὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς παισὶν ἔῤῥαινεν, ... ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον αὐτούς τε καὶ τὰς στολὰς ἐθεράπευε, τήν τε σκηνὴν καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν σκεύη ἐλαίῳ τε προθυμιωμένῳ καθὼς εἶπον, καὶ τῷ αἵματι τῶν ταύρων καὶ κριῶν σφαγέντων καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἑνὸς κατὰ γένος. In Levit. viii. 30, from which the account of anointing Aaron and his sons is taken, distinct mention is made of sprinkling on them, and on their garments, the blood which was on the altar. It was a natural addition, to extend that sprinkling to the tabernacle and its vessels: especially as (Levit. ver. 15) the altar was already to be touched with the blood. Philo, Vita Mos. iii. 18, vol. ii. p. 158, cited by Carpzov and others as asserting the same as our text, does not do so, as Bleek has pointed out. He merely exactly reproduces the directions of Levit. viii. 10, 30),

22.] **and almost** (one may say that) (the σχεδόν belongs, not to the **πάντα**, nor to the **ἐν αἵματι** (Bengel, Böhme), nor to the **καθαρίζεται** (as Chrys., Œc., Thl., διὰ τί τὸ σχεδὸν προσέθηκε; διότι ἐκεῖνα οὐκ ἦν καθαρισμὸς τέλειος), but to the whole assertion, **ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται, καὶ χωρὶς αἱμ. κ.τ.λ.** In the two other places where **σχεδόν** is used in the N. T. (reff.: both, observe, in St. Luke), it is closely joined with πᾶς) **in blood all things are purified** (there is a combination throughout of the ideas of the inheritance by testament, whereof the death is a condition, and the purification by covenant, whereof the death is the efficient cause. The combination is not a rhetorical figure in the mind of the Writer, but a deep truth in the verity of God. The same Death which purifies us from guilt, makes us partakers of the kingdom of glory: the same Blood which cleanses us from sin, seals the testament of our inheritance. The fact that *almost* in all cases the law purified by blood, provides for such exceptions as Exod. xix. 10: Levit. xv. 5 ff.; xvi. 26, 28; xxii. 6: Num. xxxi. 22—24) **according to the law** (i. e. receive legal purification), **and** (σχεδόν still rules the sentence: see above) **apart from shedding of blood** (**αἱματεκχυσία** seems to be a word coined by the sacred Writer to express his meaning. There has been a question, whether it imports the shedding of blood in the slaughter of the victims, or the pouring out of the blood at the foot of the altar, so often enjoined in the ordinances of legal sacrifice. On this question I give the substance of Delitzsch's remarks. "For the second of these meanings it may be alleged, 1. that the mere *shedding* of blood (שְׁפִיכָה) is an expression in the O. T. ritual by no means confined to sacrificial rites properly so called, in which the catching of the blood by the priest is the first step: 2. that ἐκχέειν τὸ αἷμα (παρὰ or ἐπὶ τὴν βάσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) is the ordinary LXX expression for the usual שְׁפִיכָה (pouring out of the blood) in sin-offerings, while for the usual זְרִיקָה (sprinkling) in expiatory, peace, and whole burnt-offerings we have usually προσχέειν τὸ αἷμα (ἐπὶ or πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον),—once περιχέειν, 2 Chron. xxix. 22, once at least ἐκχέειν, 4 Kings xvi. 15 Ed-vat. (προσχ. AB), and once προσεκχέειν, Exod. xxix. 16 Ald. (προσχ. AB) . . . . But still it is to me more probable that the Writer here has the *shedding of blood* in mind. It would not by any means follow, that he treats this blood-shedding as a propitiation. He does not directly call it the *medium* of forgiveness, he says only, that apart from it there was no remission, that it is the indispensable means to obtain the expiatory דַּם הַנֶּפֶשׁ, life's blood. . . . . That however which determines me to refer the αἱματεκχυσία to the *shedding* of blood, is not entirely the usage, as Bl., but the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον of the institution of the Lord's Supper in Luke xxii. 20 (cf. xi. 50),—at all events the close parallel in word and in thought to that. It is hardly probable that the Writer would mean an ἐκχέειν (-χύνειν) αἷμα of which that so called on Christ's part is not the antitype; not to say that since ver. 13, αἷμα and θάνατος have been ideas most closely connected." See this followed out much further in Delitzsch's note) **there cometh not** (taketh not place) **remission** (viz. ἁμαρτιῶν: an expression occurring eight times in St. Luke and the Acts to once in St. Matt. and twice in St. Mark. As to the fact, Levit. xvii. 11 sufficiently proves it: and the Rabbis deduced from that pas-

τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις [t] *καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ* [s] *ἐπουράνια* s ch. iii. 1 reff.

23. *καθαριζεται* D[1] 67[2] copt.

sage an axiom almost verbatim the same as our text: אֵין כַּפָּרָה אֶלָּא בְּדָם, "non est expiatio nisi per sanguinem." The case of the poor man, who cannot afford the animal victim, Levit. v. 11—13, which seems to present an exception and to justify the application of the *σχεδόν* to this clause, is not counted as one by Delitzsch, but as merely a negative expression of the need of reconciliation. But I do not see how this can be said: see ver. 13 there). **23.**] **There (was)** (more probably than '*is*,' seeing that he was before speaking, not of the renewed cleansing year by year, but of the solemn inauguration: and much more, now that he is coming to speak of the heavenly sanctuary, must he be asserting a necessity not of continually renewed cleansing, but of a past one, once for all) **necessity therefore** (this first inference follows from the facts just mentioned: and is introduced only to lead the way to the second, *αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, which itself is a conclusion from the analogy between type and antitype, and is the converse of the 'a fortiori' proposition of vv. 13, 14) **that the delineations** not, "*patterns*:" at least not in the present acceptation of that word. The heavenly things themselves would be the patterns, or antitypes. See on ch. viii. 5) **of the things in the heavens** (i. e. of the heavenly tabernacle with its contents: see below) **should be purified** (for the *ἐγκαινίζειν* was in fact not only an inauguration, but a purification likewise: and the proposition of ver. 22,—'wherever there is *ἄφεσις*, there is *αἱματεκχυσία*,'—will bear converting,—wherever there is a sprinkling with blood, there is remission, and consequently, purification) **with these** (i. e. not the various purifications mentioned up to this time, the ashes of the red heifer included, as Lünem., al.; for these last were never used to purify the tabernacle or its vessels: nor again, "blood and the like," e. g. the oil which was used with it, as De Wette, al.; for this has not been mentioned: nor, "talibus, nempe rebus Leviticis," as Böhme, which is far too vague. It is the blood, and that only, which is meant: the plural being used most probably to indicate the animals slain, the *τράγοι κ. μόσχοι*), **but the heavenly things themselves** (i. e. heaven and the things therein: cf. *εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν* in the next verse, of which Bleek well remarks, that the junction to this by *γάρ* can only then be valid when those words refer to the same as our *αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια*. But it has appeared difficult to Commentators to understand, how heaven itself should need this cleansing. Consequently various expedients have been adopted: and various meanings given, either to *τὰ ἐπουράνια* or to the verb. Luther, Calv., Beza, Grot., Le Clerc, Ebrard, Lünem., al. (not Bleek, as Ebr.) would understand *καθαρίζεσθαι* to be applied only by zeugma to the second member of our sentence, and would get out of it the idea *ἐγκαινίζεσθαι*, or "aditum pati," or something of the kind. But to this we may answer, with Delitzsch, that every kind of inauguration, or patefaction, passed upon the heavenly things themselves by means of *blood*, must mean an inauguration or patefaction by means of propitiatory purification: so that the difficulty remains where it was. Thos. Aquinas ("Mundantur cœlestia, quatenus homines mundantur a peccatis"), Bengel ("i. e. usus redditus sanctus respectu nostri"), Tholuck, al. understand it of our being purified to inherit or enter heaven: which Delitzsch properly calls, after the difference which has been already in the text indicated between the purification of person and of the tabernacle, a precarious 'quid pro quo.' Still less can we accept the interpretations given in the ancient expositors, e. g. Chrys. (*αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια, τουτέστι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν, τοὺς ἐκεῖ κεκλημένους*), Œc. (*τουτέστι, τὰ τῆς νέας* (*διαθήκης*)), Thdrt. (*οὐράνια δὲ τὰ πνευματικὰ κέκληκεν, οἷς ἡ ἐκκλησία καθαίρεται*), Thl. (*τουτέστι, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ ἡμέτερα*): so also Primasius, Aymo, Psuedo-Anselm. See this view well met in Justiniani. More literally, some have interpreted it with a view to the expulsion of Satan from heaven spoken of Luke x. 18: John xii. 31, and especially Rev. xii. 7—9: see also our ch. ii. 14. So Akersloot, and Bleek. But this does not meet the requirements of the case. There would thus be no cleansing, as far as the relations of God and men are concerned: none, to which the propitiatory effect of blood would in any way apply. We must therefore rest in the plain and literal sense: that *the heaven itself needed, and obtained, purification* by the atoning blood of Christ. And if we enquire how this could be, we may find an answer in reflecting on the consequence of man's sin on the mind and aspect of God towards him. That unclouded benignity wherewith the Creator contemplated his creation, Gen. i. 31, had become overcast by the divine anger on account of sin, but was again restored by Him in whom the Father *εὐδόκησεν*, the

a ch. i. 4 reff. b ch. xii. 24. c = ch. i. 4. ii. 7, 9. iii. 3 al. d ver. 11 reff. e = ch. viii. 2 reff.

ab κρείττοσιν θυσίαις bc παρὰ ταύτας. 24 οὐ γὰρ εἰς d χειροποίητα εἰσῆλθεν e ἅγια χριστός, f ἀντίτυπα τῶν g ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, νῦν h ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ i προς-

ACDKL Pℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

f 1 Pet. iii. 21 only†. g ch. viii. 2 reff. h = Matt. xxvii. 53. John xiv. 21, 22. (Acts xxiii. 15 al[4]. ch. xi. 14) only. Exod. xxxiii. 13. = Matt. xviii. 10. Luke i. 76. Acts iii. 19. 2 Thess. i. 9. 1 Pet. iii. 12, from Ps. xxxiii. 16.

24. rec αγια bef εισηλθεν, with CDKL rel [Nyss$_1$ Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt A[P]ℵ 17 [Euthal-ms], προσηλθεν αγια m. rec ins ο bef χριστος, with C^{3}D$^{2\cdot3}$KL[P] rel Ath$_1$ Ps-Ath$_1$ [Nyss$_1$] Chr Thdrt Damasc: om AC^{1}D^{1}ℵ 17 [arm Euthal-ms Cyr-p$_1$].

darkness being by His blood turned into light, the frown into an eternal smile. So Delitzsch beautifully: "If I see aright, the meaning of the Writer is, in its ground thought, this: the supernal holiest place, i.e., as ver. 24 shews, αὐτὸς ὁ οὐρανός, the uncreated eternal heaven of God, although in itself untroubled light, yet needed a καθαρίζεσθαι in so far as the light of Love towards man was, so to speak, outflared and obscured by the fire of wrath against sinful man; and the heavenly tabernacle, i.e. the place of God's revealing of His majesty and grace for angels and men, needed a καθαρίζεσθαι, in so far as men had rendered this place, which was destined for them from the beginning, unapproachable by reason of their sin, and so it must be changed into an approachable place of manifestation of a God gracious to men") **with sacrifices** (categoric plural of an abstract proposition: not therefore implying that the sacrifice was repeated: applicable in its reality, only to the one Sacrifice of the body of Christ once for all, and most emphatically designating that *as a sacrifice*) **better than** (see on ch. i. 4) **these.**

24.] He now reasserts, under the fuller light which has since been cast upon it, that which was enounced in vv. 11, 12, and by it shews at what the word ἐπουράνια above pointed. In fact, as Delitzsch observes, the proposition of vv. 11, 12, has been in course of elucidation ever since: in vv. 13, 14 he explained διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, in vv. 15—23 the ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, and now the εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια. **For** (resumption of τὰ ἐπουράνια above) **not into holy places made with hands** (such as those into which the Jewish high priests entered: see above, ver. 11: and the two expressions Acts vii. 48; xvii. 24) **did Christ enter, counterfeits of the true (holy places)** (ἀντίτυπος, correspondent to the τύπος; either, as in this case, *copies from* a pattern, viz. the τύπος shewn in the mount, however understood, ch. viii. 5, also Rom. v. 14, ὅς (Ἀδάμ) ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος,—or the *reality corresponding to* a previously shewn figure (τύπος), as baptism in ref. 1 Pet., where Baptism is the ἀντίτυπον to the flood of Noah: and which latter is our more usual English sense of antitype. The ancients mostly take ἀντίτυπα here as = τύπους. So Chrys., Thl. (τουτέστι, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦσαν τύποι), not Œc., Jac. Cappellus, Schlicht., al. A copious collection of the senses and examples of ἀντίτυπος may be found in Suicer, sub voce. The Sacraments were often designated by this epithet, as representing to us Christ: and indeed Baptism in both the senses here given: thus Cæsarius, Quæst. Ult. p. 208 (cited by Suicer, but not to be found in Edn. Migne), calls Baptism ἀντίτυπον of Circumcision; while Cyril-jerus., Catech. xx. 6, p. 313, calls it τῶν τοῦ χριστοῦ παθημάτων ἀντίτυπον. Several of the Fathers speak of the Eucharistic elements as ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ. The *true*, genuine *holy places* are those in heaven, where God's presence is manifested. See below), **but into the heaven itself** (αὐτὸς ὁ οὐρανός,—none of the οὐρανοί, all of which the Lord διελήλυθεν, ch. iv. 14,—but the very holiest place, where God peculiarly reveals Himself, and which is uncreated. Delitzsch quotes from Seb. Schmidt, "Cœlum in quod Christus ingressus est, non est ipsum cœlum creatum, quodcunque fuerit, sed est cœlum in quo Deus est etiam quando cœlum creatum nullum est,—ipsa gloria divina." Hence what follows), **now** (in the present dispensation: almost = henceforth. It is an anticipation of the οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις κ.τ.λ. of the next verse) **to be manifested** (first, as to the *tense*. Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 368, says that the aorist forbids the enduring "henceforth" sense of νῦν. But there can be no doubt that he is wrong. The infinitive of *purpose* is often expressed in the aorist when duration is distinctly implied, but, I believe, only in those cases where the commencement of the fulfilment of the purpose is contemporaneous with the act narrated whereby the purpose is to be served: so εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι σὺν αὐτοῖς, Luke xxiv. 29: ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν, Matt. xxiv. 45,—in these cases the μένειν and the διδόναι, as here the ἐμφανίζεσθαι, beginning with the act related. It is obvious that these remarks

ὤπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· 25 οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις [k] προσφέρῃ ἑαυτόν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ [e] ἅγια [lm] κατ' [m] ἐνιαυτὸν [n] ἐν αἵματι [o] ἀλλοτρίῳ, 26 [p] ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις [q] παθεῖν [r] ἀπὸ [r] καταβολῆς [r] κόσμου· νυνὶ δὲ [s] ἅπαξ

k ver. 14. l = ch. vii. 27. m ch. x. 1, 3 only. 3 Kings v. 11 al. n ver. 22. ch. x. 19. 1 John v. 6. o ch. xi. 9 reff. p = ver. 17. q = (ch. ii. 18.) Luke xxii. 15. xxiv. 46. Acts i. 3 al. (Paul, never.) r ch. iv. 3 reff. s ch. vi. 4 reff.

υμων C 17.
25. ουδε C a[: ου γαρ P]. aft αγια ins των αγιων ℵ[3] k m [sah æth arm Chr$_1$].
26. for πολλακις, πολλα D[1][-gr]. rec νυν, with DK[(L?)] rel [Chr$_1$ Thdrt

apply only to cases where an enduring course of action is described: in other cases the aorist would be accounted for in other ways. Next, as to the peculiar propriety of the word ἐμφανισθῆναι. It will be seen by reff., that it is one found mostly in St. Luke (Acts). It is there principally in the sense of *making manifest*, giving information: in ref. Matt. it is used of the bodies of the saints appearing to many: and in reff. John, of Jesus manifesting himself to his people. But the key-text to the understanding of it here is ref. Exod. ὀφθῆναι, not ἐμφανισθῆναι, is the word commonly used for the divine appearances: but Moses desired to advance beyond the mere ὄψις of God, and prayed ἐμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτόν. This, which might not be granted to Moses (nor to any man, cf. Levit. xvi. 13)—this open sight of God, is that which takes place between the Father and the Son. "None knoweth the Son but the Father." There is no veil hiding the Father's face from the Son: so completely does this ἐμφανισμός take place, that he is the perfect image of the Father: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father:" "No man knoweth the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." The Commentators refer to a treatise of Deyling's, "Jesu Christi ἐμφανισμός in conspectu Dei," Lips. 1722, which I have not seen) **to** (before) **the face of God** (see Rev. xxii. 4, where it is said that the servants of God shall see τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. Commonly (see reff.) it is τὸ πρόσωπον (τοῦ) κυρίου. See Stier here) **for us** (this is the intent of His entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, to appear and to plead for us: see ch. vii. 25. "He brings before the face of God no offering which has exhausted itself and, as only sufficing for a time, needs renewal; but He himself is in person our offering, and by virtue of the eternal Spirit, i. e. of the imperishable life of His person, now for ever freed from death, our eternally present offering before God." Delitzsch): **25—28.**] In ver. 24, His having entered into a mere typical sanctuary was denied: now it is denied, that His sacrifice needs, as those others did, to be repeated continually. **25.**] **nor yet** (Œc. adds, ἀπὸ κοινοῦ ληπτέον,—εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν) **that He may** (i. e. with this intent, to) **oftentimes offer Himself** (before God in the holiest place: continue, as those high priests, year by year coming in before the face of God in His sanctuary. This προσφέρειν ἑαυτόν is not to be understood of Christ's *death*, nor confounded, as Owen, Thol., De Wette, Ebrard, Lünem., and many others have done, with παθεῖν below: see there), **just as** (in a manner corresponding to, that which follows. ὥσπερ, as ὅσπερ, ὅσοσπερ, and other words lengthened by περ (περί), implies a thorough similitude as far as the thing compared goes: Hartung (i. 340) illustrates such words by the obsolete German adverbs allda, allhier, allwo: cf. Judg. ix. 53, "and allto brake his skull") **the** (Jewish) **high priest enters into the holy** (holiest) **place year by year with** (ἐν, not instrumental, but elemental: he enters, furnished with, as it were clad with, that which follows. We use our 'in' of even the lesser articles of personal wear in a similar sense: 'a man in spectacles') **blood of others** (i. e. "not his own," as Syr., which is an important point of contrast with Christ: see this brought in in the argumentation below): **26.**] **since** (in that case) **it were necessary** (no ἄν, which we should naturally expect: but the indicative is in fact dependent on and included in the hypothesis just made: "posito, eum ita cœlum intrasse, ut sæpius seipsum offerret, necesse erat..:" see 1 Cor. v. 10; vii. 14: Rom. xi. 6: Winer, edn. 6, § 41, *a*. 2) **that He should oftentimes suffer** (not, "*have suffered*" as E. V.; by ἔδει we are already carried back to a time antecedent to the supposed repeated acts indicated by παθεῖν, and therefore do not need another carrying back in time. Notice, as against the Commentators mentioned above under προσφέρειν ἑαυτόν, and others, that this παθεῖν is here not equivalent to that προσφέρειν, but is emphatically placed as a new necessity, involved in that; the πολλάκις being common to both: the πολλάκις προσφέρειν necessitated the πολλάκις παθεῖν. If Christ's view in entering

[t] ἐπὶ [u] συντελείᾳ τῶν [v] αἰώνων εἰς [w] ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ [x] πεφανέρωται. [27] καὶ [y] καθ᾽ ὅσον [z] ἀπό-

ACDKL PℵMabc defgh klmn o 17. 47

t = ver. 15 reff. u elsw. in N. T. alw. w. αἰῶνος, Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20 only. Deut. xi. 12. Dan. xii. 4, 13. v plur., ch. i. 2. xi. 3. w ch. vii. 18 only †. x = 1 Pet. i. 20. 1 John i. 2. iii. 5, 8. (see note.) y ch. iii. 3. vii. 20 only. z Luke xix. 20. Col. i. 5. 2 Tim. iv. 8 only. Gen. xlix. 10. Job xxxviii. 23. 2 Macc. xii. 45 only.

Damasc]: txt ACℵ[P m 47] Orig$_1$ Chr$_1$ [Euthal-ms]. ins *της* bef *αμαρτιας* A[P]ℵ 17 [coptt. *αμαρτιων* D^1-gr Aug$_1$ (Orig$_1$)].

heaven was, to offer, present, himself often to God, then, as a condition of that frequent presentation, there would be an antecedent necessity for Him to *suffer* often: because that self-presentation is in fact the bringing in before God of the Blood of that his suffering: and if the one was to be renewed, so must the other be likewise. So that the meaning is not, that Christ must again and again have descended on earth and died. To such a descent there is no allusion, as there is none to a renewed entrance into the *ἅγια* in heaven. That entrance Christ has effected once for all: this lies, as a 'fait accompli,' at the ground of the hypothesis. But the rejected hypothesis is, that *once being in* the celestial *ἅγια*, Christ intended to renew often his oblation of Himself. And in that case, says our Writer, it would be necessary that he should often suffer, often die: because each such oblation necessitated as its condition a corresponding *παθεῖν*. When, as in the case of the Jewish high priests, the *αἷμα* was *ἀλλότριον*, such repetition was possible (see Levit. xvi. 14, 15): but not so, when the blood was *τὸ ἴδιον*. Thus, in the main, Delitzsch; and Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 311. Cf. also Thl., *ἐπεί, εἰ ἔμελλε, φησίν, πολλάκις προσενεγκεῖν, ἔδει αὐτὸν καὶ πολλάκις ἀποθανεῖν, διὰ τὸ τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα ὀφείλειν προσάγειν*) **since the foundation of the world** (why this addition? Not, as often understood, e. g. by Bengel ("pro peccatis ab initio mundi commissis"), Böhme, Thol., Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., so as to bring under the merits of the Suffering, all the sins of mankind past as well as future,—which thought, arising from the erroneous view of a frequently-repeated *entrance* into heaven being supposed, has nothing whatever to do with the argument: but, inasmuch as the theatre of Christ's sufferings is of necessity this present world, pointing out that those supposed repeated sufferings must necessarily in that case take place within the temporal limits indicated by *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*: that such sufferings would be spread over the space of time from the *καταβολὴ κόσμου* till He entered into the presence of God, each oblation of Himself there being the sequel of, and conditioned by, one such *παθεῖν* since the world has been. I may mention, that no parenthesis is here admissible. The words *ἐπεὶ . . . . κόσμου* are strictly and indispensably a link in the argument): **now, however** (*νυνί*, not temporal, but = 'ut res se habent'), **once** (for all, without need of renewal) **at** (as close upon, put in immediate contiguity with, 'sub finem mundi:' see Winer, edn. 6, § 48, c: superimposed, as an event, on its period as a substratum: see above on ver. 15) **the end of the ages of time** (i. e. when the whole period above indicated by *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* is gathered up and brought to an end. Between the first and second coming of Christ, the N. T. Scriptures know of no intermediate interposition of the divine dealings with men: in Him we are *τέλειοι*, and at His appearing, our *αἰῶνες* had their *συντέλεια*. All these centuries which have been since, are merely the lengthening out of the time in the mercy of God. The first Christians universally spoke of the second coming of the Lord as close at hand, as indeed it ever was and is: the *σιτιστά* are *τεθυμένα*, and all is ready: but the long-suffering of God waits while the guests are being gathered in: or, in the other view of His coming, while the ark is a preparing) **hath He been manifested** (viz. at His first coming in our flesh: the *φανέρωσις ἐν σαρκί*, spoken of 1 Tim. iii. 16: 1 Pet. i. 20. On the other meaning given, see below) **for the putting away of sin** (on *ἀθέτησις* see ch. vii. 18 note: putting away, i. e. abrogation, "quæ fit, quum peccato omnis vis et potestas adimitur. Quod dupliciter factum est: tum quatenus nullam vim habet ad homines condemnandos: tum quatenus vim non habet ad eosdem sub jugo suo retinendos. Utrumque enim ut fieret, Christus apparuit: tum ut homines a peccatorum reatu et pœnis, tum ut eosdem ab ipsis peccatis liberaret." Schlichting) **by means of His sacrifice** (i. e. in the sense, 'the sacrifice of Himself,' but not here so expressed: had the Writer intended *αὐτοῦ* to express *ἑαυτοῦ*, he would have so written it, as in ver. 25.

By very many expositors, the construction of this verse is differently taken. Some understand *πεφανέρωται* of His appearance before God—the *ἐμφανισμός* above mentioned. So Jac. Cappellus, Grot., Heinrichs, Schulz, al. But this

κειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις [a] ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο [a] κρίσις, 28 οὕτως καὶ ὁ χριστὸς [a] ἅπαξ [b] προσενεχθεὶς [c] εἰς

a = ch. x. 27 al. fr.
b ver. 14.
c constr., ch. vii. 25 reff.

28. rec om καὶ, with b: ins ACDKL[P]ℵ rel latt syrr coptt [æth arm Chr Euthal-ms

cannot be for a moment maintained. The analogy of the reff. is wholly against it, and so is the ἐκ δευτέρου ὀφθήσεται below: not to mention that had it been so, we should certainly have had ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, or some such qualification, added. But more, keeping the right sense of πεφανέρωται, join διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ with it. So a gloss in Œc.: διὰ τῆς θυσίας πεφανέρωται, τουτέστιν, μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: so Böhme, Tholuck, al. But none of the passages whereby this is defended, is applicable: neither vv. 12, 14 (διά), nor Rom. ii. 27: 1 John v. 6: and for this reason, that θυσία, as Delitzsch observes, is not a continuing state, nor an accompanying circumstance, but an *act*, by which ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας, the scope of the whole, is brought about). **27, 28.**] It is shewn by a comparison with our human lot in general, of which Christ, Himself man, is partaker, that this often suffering (dying) and often offering Himself, has no place: that as in our case, we die once only, and after that comes the judgment, for us who are to be judged, so for Him there was one death from sin, and after that no repetition of it, but the judgment, for Him who is to judge. But in this latter member of the comparison, the bright and saving side only is put forward (see below): it is not said he shall appear *to judge the world*, but He shall appear ***without sin*** (and therefore with no more purpose to expiate sin) ***to them that wait for Him, unto salvation:*** these last words carrying with them a hortatory force, that the readers might thus wait for Him. **27.**] **And inasmuch as** (not = καθώς, but bearing with it not only a comparative, but also a ratiocinative force, seeing that Christ is not only a *fit object of comparison* with man, but *is* man) **it is appointed** (ἀπόκειται properly of things laid aside for future use: hence, of those things which are laid up as our appointed lot by a higher Power: so Plato, Locr. p. 104 D, κολάσεις ἀπαραίτητοι ἀπόκεινται δυσδαίμοσι νερτέροις: Dion. Hal. v. 8, ὅσα τοῖς κακούργοις ἀπόκειται παθεῖν: see reff., and many other examples in Bleek) **to men** (all men: **τοῖς** generic) **once** (and no more) **to die** (see numerous illustrations of the sentiment from the classical authors in Wetstein), **and after that, judgment** (not necessarily here to be taken on its unfavourable side: the word is perfectly general, and anarthrous: nor is there, as Böhme imagined, any opposition between τοῖς ἀνθρώποις here and τοῖς ἀπεκδεχομένοις αὐτόν below. Such opposition indeed would mar the whole context, which has a totally different object, and deals with the general and inevitable fate of all men indiscriminately. Nor again must the question, whether judgment is spoken of as immediately to follow death, or after an interval, be imported into the consideration of the text. The indefinite μετὰ τοῦτο does not admit of any such question being raised. *Next* to death, with no more like events between, comes judgment: this is the fact contemplated—the appointed destiny of man, according to which that of the man Christ Jesus also, as far as it is applicable to Him, is apportioned): **28.**] **so also the Christ** (not χριστός, anarthrous, which would seem to point to some one contrasted with, or at all events merely compared with, οἱ ἄνθρωποι: but ὁ χριστός, that man who was God's Christ—*the Christ*, it being plain and palpable to all that ὁ χριστός belongs to the category οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Cf. the anarthrous χριστός in ver. 24, where the case is different) **once** (for all) **having been offered** (not = 'having offered himself:' for it might well have been προσενέγκας ἑαυτόν. The form and the meaning are both passive; and the reason of this is I believe to be found in the fact that it is in this verse not so much the agency, as the destiny of Christ, that is spoken of; that which, though the expression itself is avoided with regard to Him, ἀπόκειται for Him as for us. And this consideration removes from us all necessity of supplying an agent for this προσενεχθείς, as ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ (Chrys.) or ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (al.), which as Delitzsch remarks would not be correct; Christ might be δοθείς or παραδοθείς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, but not προσενεχθείς. Nor would ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων express the right agency; for it was no conscious act of mankind, willing its sin to be atoned for, that offered up Christ: but if an agent must be supplied, it would be = διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου as in ver. 14,—the divine submission of our Lord subjecting Himself to the external force which was exerted against Him,—that force being in some sort the agent, but not without His own will co-operating. It is hardly necessary to mention, that the very terms of the context here necessitate the understanding this προσενεχθῆναι of the death of Christ,—not as in ver. 25, where the context, as

τὸ [d] πολλῶν [e] ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας [f] ἐκ δευτέρου [g] χωρὶς [g] ἁμαρτίας [h] ὀφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν [i] ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

d ch. ii. 10 reff. e ch. vii. 27. = 1 Pet. ii. 24. Isa. liii. 12. f Matt. xxvi. 42. John ix. 24. Acts x. 15. xi. 9. Josh. v. 2. g ch. iv. 15. h = Acts xiii. 31. xxvi. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 5, &c. i Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25. 1 Cor. i. 7. Gal. v. 5. Phil. iii. 20. 1 Pet. iii. 20 only †.

Thdrt Damasc]. απεκδεχομενοι C[1]: εκδεχομενοις D[1]. aft απεκδεχ. ins δια πιστεως m o(omg εις) arm; aft εις σωτηριαν A[P 47] hal flor syr [Euthal-ms] Damasc-comm.

there insisted, confines it to His offering of Himself to God in the heavenly sanctuary) **to bear the sins of many** (a plain allusion to ref. Isa., αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν: and here, as there, importing the "*bearing*," "*carrying on Himself*," Heb. נָשָׂא, cf. also in Levit. xxiv. 15, "Whosoever curseth his God shall *bear* (λήψεται LXX) his sin:" Num. v. 31, "the woman shall *bear* (λήψεται) her iniquity:" xiv. 34, "each day for a year shall ye bear (λήψεσθε) your iniquities, even forty years." And so in id. ver. 33, "shall bear your whoredoms," where the LXX have ἀνοίσουσιν. The Heb. word *may* also have the sense of *auferre*, which many (e. g. Luth., Schlicht., Grot., Limb., Bl., Lünem., Hofm.) have wished to give it here: but not so ἀνενέγκαι. The sense given by Syr., "sacrificed ("immolavit") the sins of many," and defended also by Chrys., Œc., Thl., would introduce a new and irrelevant idea, and cannot be maintained; so Michaelis also, taking however ἁμαρτία for a sin-offering, which it never means. Besides which, it is here πολλῶν ἁμαρτίας, which would at all events preclude that meaning. On πολλῶν, and its supposed contrast to πάντων (Chrys., διὰ τί πολλῶν εἶπε, καὶ μὴ πάντων; ἐπειδὴ μὴ πάντες ἐπίστευσαν: so Œc., Thl., and Thdrt., drawing from it the inference that Christ only διέλυσε the sin of believers), see above, ch. ii. 10, and Schlichting's true distinction, "Multi non opponuntur h. l. omnibus, sed tantum paucis." πολλῶν is, as Del. says, the qualitative designation of πάντων: *all men* are *many* in number. There is reference in it to ἅπαξ: He was offered, One, for all ("Multos uni opponit," Calv.): and once for all), **shall appear** (ὀφθήσεται, the usual verb of the appearances of Christ after his resurrection) **a second time** (reff.) **without** (separate from) **sin** (in order to understand this, we must remember what it is that the Writer is proving: viz. that Christ's death, the repetition of which would be the condition of a repeated offering of Himself in heaven to God, admits of no such repetition. It was a death in which He bore the sins of many—but He shall appear the second time χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, with no sin upon Him, and consequently the whole work of atonement done and accomplished by that first offering. So that there is no need of any far-fetched explanation, either of ἁμαρτίας, or of χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. We need not say with Storr, that it is without *an offering for* sin: nor with Klee, that it is without *punishment of* sin; nor with Bleek, without *meeting with* sin (so Thdrt., οὐκέτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας κρατούσης, ἀντὶ τοῦ χώραν οὐκέτι ἐχούσης κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἁμαρτίας: and an explanation mentioned by Œc., ἐκ δευτέρου ἐρχόμενος οὐχ ἥξει πάλιν διὰ τὰς ὑμῶν ἁμαρτίας ὀφείλων ἀποθανεῖν): nor with Ebr., that He will have no more *concern with* sin: nor, with De Wette, without *contact with* sin: nor, with Lünem., free from all *reference to* sin. As distinguished from all these, we take, with Delitzsch and Hofmann, the simple sense of the words, and apply it to the argument in hand. At His first appearance in the world He came *with sin*, not *in* him, but *on* him: He was *made to be* ἁμαρτία: but this sin has been once for all taken away by his bearing it as our Sacrifice: and at his second appearance He shall appear *without*, having done with, separate from, *sin*. Theodore of Mopsuestia, though he has not exactly and clearly struck the right note, is yet very near it, when he says, νῦν, φησίν, ὀφθείς, ὅτε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν κρατεῖν συνέβαινεν, ἀναγκαίως τὸν διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν κρατοῦντα θάνατον ἐδέξατο, τότε δὲ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὡς εἰκὸς λελυμένης, ἀνάγκη καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπαθῶς ὀφθῆναι· τὸ γὰρ χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι μὴ κρατούσης ἔτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξω παντὸς ἀνθρωπίνου πάθους ὀφθήσεται τότε) **to them that wait for Him** (see reff.)—**unto** (to bring in: for the purpose of) **salvation** (these last words belong to ὀφθήσεται, not, as Primas., Faber Stap., Camer., Wolf, al., to τοῖς ἀπεκδεχομένοις. This latter notion has led to the curious insertion of the words διὰ πίστεως in A al. The object of Christ's second appearance shall be, to bring in salvation: this is the bright and Christian side of His appearing, the side which we, who ought to be ἀπεκδεχόμενοι αὐτόν, should ever look upon. As Chrys. beautifully says, πῶς ὀφθήσεται; κολάζων, φησίν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἶπε τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ τὸ φαιδρόν).

Frag. Mosq. των μελλοντων.. ACDKL P ℵ Frag. Mosq. a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

X. 1 [k] Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν [l] μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν [m] εἰκόνα τῶν [n] πραγμάτων, [o] κατ' [o] ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις [p] αἷς [q] προσφέρουσιν [r] εἰς τὸ [r] δι-

k ch. viii. 5. Col. ii. 17.
l ch. ix. 11. see ch. ii. 5. vi. 5. Rom. v. 14.
m = 2 Cor. iv. 4. Col. i. 15. Gen. v. 1. (see note.)
n = ch. vi. 18. xi. 1.
o ch. ix. 26 reff.
p attr., ch. vi. 10 reff.
q ch. v. 1 reff.
r ch. vii. 3 reff.

Chap. X. 1. aft θυσιαις ins αυτων [P]ℵ. rec (for αις) ας, with CD[3]K[P]ℵ rel

Chap. X. 1—18.] Solemn conclusion of the argument: 1. *Christ's voluntary self-offering, as contrasted with the yearly offerings of victims under the law, is the carrying out of God's real will* (vv. 1—10): 2. *Christ's priestly service, in contrast to the daily repeated service of the priests of the law, is for ever perfected by one High-priestly act, which has issued in His Kingly exaltation and waiting till His foes be subdued under Him* (vv. 11—14): 3. *Christ's finished work is the inauguration of that new covenant before referred to, in which, the law being written on the heart, and sin put away and forgotten, there is no more need for sin-offering* (vv. 15—18). And so, as Delitzsch observes, in this passage the leading thoughts of the whole argument are brought together in one grand finale, just as in the finale of a piece of music all the hitherto scattered elements are united in an effective whole. 1—10.] See above.

1.] **For** (γάρ connects with the whole passage ch. ix. 24—28: hitherto has been shewn the impossibility of Christ's offering being repeated as were those of the law: now is to be shewn its absolute perfection as compared with those of the law) **the law, having** (as it has; the participle has a ratiocinative force, which passes on upon what follows) **a shadow** (or, 'the shadow,' which in sense would be much the same. The putting forward of the word to the beginning of the sentence would render it anarthrous. I prefer, however, 'a shadow,' because of the meaning of σκιάν, presently to be treated of: see below) **of the good things to come** (viz. the same good things of which, in ch. ix. 11, Christ is said to be the High Priest,—which belong to the μέλλων αἰών of ch. vi. 5, whose δυνάμεις are working in the present dispensation,—and to the *completion* of the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα of ch. ii. 5: the good things which are still future to us as they were to those under the law, but are now made sure to us in and by Christ), **not the very image of the things** (every representation of μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν must be an εἰκών, whether it be in words, or in types, or in any other method of representation. The full description and entire revelation of the things thus designated will be αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκὼν τῶν πραγμάτων: which we possess in the gospel covenant: the very setting-forth and form of the heavenly realities themselves. So that the gen. πραγμάτων is the 'genitivus substantiæ,' as in Col. iii. 10, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον . . κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, and Rom. viii. 29, συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ,—ὁ κτίσας in the one and ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ in the other, being and furnishing the εἰκών. But the law had no such εἰκών constructed out of the heavenly realities themselves, "ipsas res, certa sua forma et effigie præditas," as Stier: it had merely σκιάν, merely a rough sketch or outline: so Chrys., not however to my mind entirely apprehending the identity of the εἰκών with the πράγματα which furnish it,—σκιὰν . . . . . τουτέστιν οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ἕως μὲν γὰρ ἂν ὡς ἐν γραφῇ περιάγῃ τις τὰ χρώματα, σκιά τις ἐστίν· ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἄνθος ἐπαλείψῃ τις καὶ ἐπιχρίσῃ τὰ χρώματα, τότε εἰκὼν γίνεται. See also Thdrt. and Œc.), **year by year with the same sacrifices** (most Commentators assume some inversion of arrangement in constructing the words κατ' ἐνιαυτόν: some (Calvin, Erasm. Schmid, Wolf, Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, Stuart, al.) joining them with αἷς προσφέρουσιν, others (Lünem., al.) with ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, others (Carpzov, al.) with τοὺς προσερχομένους. But there is no need to disturb the plain order of the sentence, in which κατ' ἐνιαυτόν belongs to all that follows, viz. to the verb, οὐδέποτε δύναται, with its instrumental clause, ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις αἷς κ.τ.λ. And so Ebrard, Hofmann, and Delitzsch. "This," says Del., "is more accordant with the sense of the Writer: for he does not say, that the law by means of the offerings which were always the same year by year never was able to perfect, &c.,—but that the law, year by year, by the repetition of the same offerings, testified its inability to perfect, &c., viz. on the day of atonement, on which the same expiatory offerings were always repeated, being necessary, notwithstanding the many offerings brought throughout the year, and after which the same round of offerings again began anew." It will be evident that **ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις** must refer, not to the daily offering, but to those of propitiation on the great day of atonement) **which they** (the ministering priests, not οἱ προσερχό-

s ch. ii. 10 reff. t constr., Luke v. 4. Acts v. 42. vi. 13. Eph. i. 16 al. Gen. xi. 8. u ch. ix. 9 reff. constr., 1 Pet. ii. 19. διὰ τ. συνείδησιν τοῦ μύσους εἰς μανίαν περιέστη, Diod. Sic. iv. 65. v absol., ch. ix. 9. Phil. iii. 3. w ch. vi. 4 reff. x ch. ix. 14 reff. y (=) 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25 ‖ L. only. Lev. xxiv. 7. Num. x. 10.

ηνεκὲς οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους [s] τελειῶσαι. 2 ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν [t] ἐπαύσαντο [q] προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι [u] συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς [v] λατρεύοντας [w] ἅπαξ [x] κεκαθαρισμένους; 3 ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς [y] ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν

ACDKL Pℵ Frag. Mosq. a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

[Chr, Damasc]: om A 17 [47 syrr arm]: txt D[1](L?) Frag-mosq k D-lat Chr-ms [Euthal-ms(appy)] Thdrt. (ins αι bef ουδεποτε A[2] [syr arm].) δυνανται ACD[2] [P]ℵ a[2] b[1] d f l[1] m n o 17 [47] (Syr) Chr-2-mss [Euthal-ms] Damasc (Thdrt Thl): om k. for τελειωσαι, καθαρισαι D[1](and lat).

2. elz om ουκ, with Frag-mosq[1] a c vulg-ed(with [demid] hal harl[2] F-lat) syrr Primas: ins ACDKL[P]ℵ rel Frag-mosq[2](appy) am(with fuld harl[1] [tol]) copt arm Chr [Euthal-ms Thdrt] Damasc Thl Œc. om ετι D[1](and lat) Chr$_1$: ετι bef εχειν a. aft τους ins δε D[1][-gr]. rec κεκαθαρμενους, with L rel Chr Thdrt Damasc Thl Œc: txt DK[P]ℵ m 17, κεκαθερισμενους AC.

3. αυτοις Frag-mosq.

μενοι, as Hofmann ii. 1. 314, which would be against all the terminology of the Epistle, in which προσφέρειν is without exception confined to priests. We have the same distinction as regards the προσερχόμενοι in ch. vii. 25) **offer continually** (Hofmann would join this with what follows, alleging that εἰς τὸ διηνεκές does not mean continu*ally* but continu*ously*. And so Lachmann punctuates. But against such a construction I conceive it to be decisive, that thus αἷς προσφέρουσιν would be in the last degree flat and unmeaning, and that the verb δύναται would have two qualifying adverbial predicates, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές and οὐδέποτε. I do not imagine that any one accustomed to the style of our Epistle would tolerate such a sentence. And with regard to εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, granting the meaning to be *continuously*, why may not that meaning be applicable here? Hofmann says that it is not applicable to a continually repeated act, but only to a continuously enduring agency. But why should not the offering of these sacrifices be looked upon as continuous, being unbroken from year to year? When I say, 'The celebration of the day of atonement continued unbroken till the destruction of Jerusalem,' I use the same method of expression, and might express my meaning in Greek by διηνεκὴς ἦν, ἕως) **never** (not even at any time) **is able to perfect** (see on ref., where I have entered into the meanings of τελειοῦν in our Epistle) **those who draw near** (to God, by means of them. Tholuck well remarks that this threefold κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, graphically sets forth the ever recurring cycle of the yearly sacrifices for sin). 2.] **For** (if it were so, if the law were able to perfect the worshippers) **would they** (αἱ αὐταὶ θυσίαι) **not have ceased being offered, on account of the worshippers** (the servers in the service of the tabernacle, used here in a wide sense, including priests and people) **having no longer any conscience of sins** (for construction, see reff.: = guilt of sin on the conscience, consciousness of the guilt of sin), **if once** (for all) **purified?** That this sentence is to be read ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄν, and as a question, is pretty universally agreed. Some, as Thdrt. (apparently: διὰ τοῦτο τέλος ἐκεῖνα λαμβάνει), D-lat. ("nam nec cessassent offerri"), Beza (edd. 1, 2, "alioqui non desiissent offerri"), Whitby, Valcknaer, read οὐκ, and yet no question; understanding, "for then they would not have ceased to be offered," viz. on the coming in of the N. T. dispensation. But this is surely hardly worth refutation. The rec. not reading οὐκ, might indeed be well thus rendered, "for in that case they would have ceased to be offered." But then ἀλλά comes in awkwardly, which, when as here without any emphasis, more naturally follows a negative sentence. The taking our verse interrogatively is as old as Œc.: ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἀνάγνωθι. So also Thl. 3.] Which cessation is far from being the case, as is the having no more conscience of sin:—**But** (on the contrary: ἀλλά opposes the whole question of ver. 2, in both its clauses) **in them** (the sacrifices: not in the fact of their being offered, but in the course of their being offered on the day of atonement, see below) **there is a recollection** ('recalling to mind;' the usual meaning of ἀνάμνησις: better than "public mention," as vulg., "commemoratio," Calv., Bengel, al.: so also Schlichting, Grot., Jac. Cappell., al., thinking on the solemn confession of the sins of Israel made by the high priest, Levit. xvi. 20 f. But the other is simpler, and suits the context better. Where sins are continually called to mind, there clearly

[o] κατ' [o] ἐνιαυτόν, [4] [z] ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα [a] ταύρων καὶ [a] τράγων [b] ἀφαιρεῖν [b] ἁμαρτίας. [5] διὸ [c] εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν [c] κόσμον λέγει [d] Θυσίαν καὶ [e] προσφορὰν οὐκ [f] ἠθέλησας, σῶμα

z ch. vi. 4 reff. a ch. ix. 13. b Rom. xi. 27, from Isa. xxvii. 9. Sir. xlvii. 11. (Jer. xi. 15.) c ch. i. 6. John i. 9. xii. 46. 1 Tim. i. 15. d Psa. xxxix. 6. e vv. 8, &c. ch. v. 1, 3. Acts xxi. 26. xxiv. 17. Eph. v. 2 only. l. c. Sir. xiv. 11. f constr., Matt. ix. 13 & xii. 7, from Hos. vi. 7. Ps. l. 16 (18).

at end ins γιγνεται D[1](and lat) o vulg [F-lat arm(Tischdf)].

4. [transp ταυρ. and τραγ. ℵ m basm arm-zoh.] αφελειν L 73. 106-8 B[r] Chr-ms: so ℵ[1](appy) but corrd eadem manu.

the conscience is not clear from them. Several passages occur in Philo closely resembling this: e. g. De Plant. Noë, 25, vol. i. p. 345, *βωμοῖς γὰρ ἀπύροις περὶ οὓς ἀρεταὶ χορεύουσι γέγηθεν ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' οὐ πολλῷ πυρὶ φλέγουσιν, ὅπερ αἱ τῶν ἀνιέρων ἄθυτοι θυσίαι συνανέφλεξαν, ὑπομιμνήσκουσαι τὰς ἑκάστων ἀγνοίας τε καὶ διαμαρτίας. καὶ γὰρ εἶπέ που Μωυσῆς* (Num. v. 15, *θυσία μνημοσύνου ἀναμιμνήσκουσα ἁμαρτίαν*) *θυσίαν ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν ἁμαρτίαν*: De Victim. 7, vol. ii. p. 244, *εὐήθες γάρ, τὰς θυσίας μὴ λήθην ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν αὐτῶν κατασκευάζειν*: and Vita Mos. iii. 10, p. 151, *εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀγνώμων καὶ ἄδικος, ἄθυτοι θυσίαι, καὶ ἀνίεροι ἱερουργίαι, καὶ εὐχαὶ παλίμφημοι, παντελῆ φθορὰι ἐνδεχόμεναι. καὶ γὰρ ὁπότε γίνεσθαι δοκοῦσιν, οὐ λύσιν ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν ἀργάζονται*) **of sins year by year:** 4.] **And** that on account of inherent defect in the sacrifices themselves: **for it is impossible, that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin** (the Writer by no means denies the typical virtue of the O. T. sacrifices, but asserts that which the schoolmen explained by saying that they wrought remission of sin not 'propria virtute,' but 'per accidens,' viz. by means of the grace of the true Propitiation which was to come, and of faith directed to it. And thus only is it said, Levit. xvii. 11, that the blood upon the altar makes an atonement for the soul: it was shed, as Ebrard well observes, not as the instrument of complete vicarious propitiation, but as an exhibition of the postulate of vicarious propitiation). 5—10.] *Christ's voluntary self-offering shewn to be the perfect fulfilment of the will of God.*

5.] **Wherefore** (seeing that the animal sacrifices of the O. T. had no power to take away sin, and that for that end a nobler sacrifice was wanting) **coming into the world he saith** (first, on the citation from Ps. xl. That Psalm, which is inscribed "A Psalm of David," seems to be a general retrospect, in some time of trouble, of God's former mercies to him, and of his own course of loving obedience as distinguished from mere expression of outward thankfulness by sacrifice and offering. Thus understood, there will be no difficulty in the direct application of its words to Him, of whose sufferings and of whose obedience all human experiences in suffering and obeying are but a faint resemblance. I have entered on this subject in speaking of the Messianic citation in ch. ii., and need not lay down again the principles there contended for, further than to say, that the more any son of man approaches, in position, or office, or individual spiritual experience, the incarnate Son of God, the more directly may his holy breathings in the power of Christ's Spirit be taken as the utterances of Christ Himself. And of all men, the prophet-king of Israel thus resembled and out-shadowed Him the most. The Psalm itself seems to belong to the time of David's persecution by Saul; and the sentiment of this portion of it is, as Delitzsch observes, an echo of Samuel's saying to Saul in 1 Sam. xv. 22, "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord?" Next, what is **εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον**? It expresses, I believe, the whole time during which the Lord, being ripened in human resolution, was in intent devoting himself to the doing of his Father's will: the time of which that youthful question "Wist ye not that I must be *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου*?" was one of the opening announcements. See also Isa. vii. 16. To refer these words thus to his maturing purpose, seems far better than to understand them as Erasmus, "veluti mundum ingressurus," from the O. T. point of time:—or as Grot., with whom are Bleek and De W., "cum e vita privata egrediens nomine Dei agere cœpit cum populo," for that would more naturally require *εἰσελθών*, besides being liable to the objection, that it is not of Christ's declaration before the world, but of his purpose as regards the Father, that our text treats:—or as Lünem., "in intent to enter into the world," by becoming man: or "*nascendo*," as Böhme, and similarly Hofmann: for thus it could hardly be said, *σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι*), **Sacrifice** (of slain animals) **and offering** (of any kind: see reff.) **thou**

δὲ [g] κατηρτίσω μοι· 6 [h] ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ [i] περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ [k] ηὐδόκησας· 7 τότε εἶπον Ἰδοὺ ἥκω (ἐν [lm] κεφαλίδι [m] βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ) [n] τοῦ [o] ποιῆσαι, [p] ὁ θεός, τὸ

g = ch. xi. 3. Rom. ix. 22. (see Matt. iv. 21. ch. xiii. 21.) Ps. lxxiii. 16.
h Mark xii. 33 only. (pl., l. c. A, ὁλοκαύτωμα B.ℵ) Exod. x. 25.
i = Rom. viii. 3. and ellips., Num. viii. 8. Lev. v. 11. vii. 27 (37).
k constr., = Matt. xii. 18. Gen. xxxiii. 10. Job xiv. 6. Lev. xxvi. 34, 41 al.
l here only. Ezra vi. 2.
m Ezek. ii. 9. iii. 1, 2, 3.
n constr., Matt. xiii. 3. Acts xviii. 10. xxvi. 18. Gal. iii. 10 al. Winer, edn. 6, § 44. 4.
o Matt. vii. 21. John vii. 17. ver. 36. ch. xiii. 21 al.
p voc., ch. i. 8 reff.

6. ολοκαυτωμα D. (ηυδοκησας, so ACD[1][P] Frag-mosq m o[: also AD[1]P m in ver 8].)
7. aft ιδου ins εγω D[1][-gr] Syr: *ego ecce* D-lat. om ηκω ℵ[1](ins ℵ-corr[1]). [aft γεγρ. ins γαρ D[1].]

wouldest not (similar declarations are found frequently in the O. T., and mostly in the Prophets: see Ps. l. 7—15; li. 16 f.: Isa. i. 11: Jer. vi. 20; vii. 21—23: Hosea vi. 6: Amos v. 21 ff.: Micah vi. 6—8), **but a body didst thou prepare for me** (אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִּי, "*mine ears hast thou opened,*" "fodisti," "concavas reddidisti," i. e. to hear and obey Thee. The idea of there being any allusion to the custom of boring through the ear of a slave who voluntarily remained subject to his master, Exod. xxi. 6 and Deut. xv. 17, seems to be a mistake. Neither the verb כָּרָה, nor the plural substantive אָזְנַיִם, will bear it without forcing: in Exod. l. c., the subst. is singular, and the verb is רָצַע. See Bleek, vol. ii. p. 633, note. The difficulty is, how such a clause can be rendered by σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι, as it is in the LXX. Some (e. g. Bleek, Lünem., after Usher de LXX Int. Vers. p. 85 sq., Semler, Michaelis, Ernesti, al.) have supposed a *misreading*, owing to the last letter of the foregoing word ἠθέλησαΣ preceding ΩΤΙΑ, the ΤΙ being mistaken for Μ. The reading ὠτία is now found only in one ms. of the LXX (Holmes, 39), ὦτα in two (Holmes, 142, 156): it is the rendering of Theodotion, of the Quinta and Sexta in Origen, of Jerome ("aures autem perfecisti mihi"), of Eusebius (comm. in loc. Bleek, ii. p. 631, note, τὰ ὦτά μου καὶ τὴν ὑπακοὴν τῶν σῶν λογίων κατηρτίσω), of the Psalterium San-Germanense (in Sabatier: "aures perfecisti mihi"), and Irenæus (Interp. iv. 17. 1, p. 248), which two last Delitzsch suspects, but apparently without ground, of being corrections from the vulgate. Over against this hypothesis, of the present LXX text having sprung from a misreading, we may set the idea that the LXX have *chosen this expression σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι by which to render the Hebrew*, as being more intelligible to the reader. This is the hypothesis adopted by Delitzsch, and that which was maintained with slight variation by Jac. Cappellus ("quia rem, ut alias sæpe, spectarunt magis quam verba"), Wolf (whose note gives all the literature of the passage at his own time. His view is that the σῶμα of our Lord was the μορφὴ δούλου, and thus answers to the "perfossio auris"), Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, al. Others again suppose that the Writer of this Epistle has altered the expression to suit better the prophetical purpose. So an old Scholiast in the Lond. edn. of the LXX, 1653: τὸ ὠτία δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος εἰς τὸ σῶμα μεταβαλὼν εἴρηκεν, οὐκ ἀγνοῶν τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον σκοπὸν τούτῳ χρησάμενος. I would leave the difficulty an unsolved one, not being satisfied by either of the above views, and having no other to propound. As Christian believers, our course is plain. How the word σῶμα came into the LXX, we cannot say: but being there, it is now sanctioned for us by the citation here: not as the, or even a proper rendering of the Hebrew, but as a prophetic utterance, equivalent to and representing that other): 6.] **whole burnt-offerings** (ὁλοκαύτωμα, a subst. from the Alexandrine form ὁλοκαυτόω (-τέω. in Xenoph. Cyr. viii. 3. 11: Anab. vii. 8. 3 al.), is the ordinary LXX rendering for the Heb. עוֹלָה, an offering of a whole animal to be burnt on the altar. See Winer, Realw. art. Brandopfer) **and (sacrifices) for sin** (in the LXX also we have the same ellipsis: see reff.) **thou didst not approve** (it is probable that our Writer had εὐδοκήσας in his ms. of the LXX. He repeats it again below; and Cyr.-alex., even where he expressly cites the Psalm, has it. Possibly it may have come in here from the similarity to Ps. l. 16 (18), ὁλοκαυτώματα οὐκ εὐδοκήσεις: it is also possible, as Bl. suggests, that our Writer may have used the word, as a stronger one than ᾔτησας or ἐζήτησας, with reference to that well-known passage. The construction of εὐδοκέω with an accus. is not unfrequent in the LXX and Hellenistic Greek: see reff. εὐδοκεῖν τινι or ἔν τινι is more usual: Polyb. uses both): 7.] **then I said** (viz. when Thou hadst prepared a body for me), **Behold, I am come, in the volume of the book it is written concerning me, to do, O God, thy will** (the connexion and construction are some-

..θελημα σου.
Frag. Mosq. ACDKL PℵA b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

[o] θέλημά σου. [8] [q] ἀνώτερον λέγων [r] ὅτι θυσίας καὶ [e] προσφορὰς καὶ [h] ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ [i] περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ [f] ἠθέλησας οὐδὲ [k] εὐδόκησας, [s] αἵτινες [t] κατὰ [τὸν] νόμον [u] προσφέρονται, [9] τότε εἴρηκεν Ἰδοὺ ἥκω [n] τοῦ [o] ποιῆσαι τὸ [o] θέλημά σου. [v] ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον [w] στήσῃ. [10] [x] ἐν ᾧ θελήματι [xy] ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν διὰ τῆς [z] προσφορᾶς

q = here (Luke xiv. 10) only †. r ch. vii. 17 reff. s = ch. viii. 5 reff. t ch. ix. 19. Acts xxii. 12 al. u ch. v. 1 reff. v = here only. (elsw., chiefly 'to kill,' as Matt. ii. 16. Luke xxii. 2. xxiii. 32. Acts ii. 23 al.) τοὺς μὲν ἀναιρεῖν τῶν νόμων, τοὺς δὲ καταλείπειν, Æsch. in Ctes. p. 62. 30. w = Rom. iii. 31. Gen. vi. 18. xxvi. 3. 1 Macc. x. 54. x Rom. xv. 16. John xvii. 17, 19. 1 Cor. i. 2. ver. 29. Isa. x. 17. y ch. ii. 11. z ver. 5 reff.

8. rec *θυσιαν κ. προσφοραν*, with D[3]KLℵ[3] rel syr [æth Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]: txt ACD[1][P]ℵ[1] 17 latt Syr coptt [arm] Cyr[1] [Orig-int[1]. *αμαρτιων* D. (A def.)] om *τον* ACℵ m 17 [47 Euthal-ms] Chr Cyr[1] Thdrt: ins (*the usage of this Epistle*) DKL[P] rel Damasc [Thl Œc].

9. rec aft *ποιησαι* ins *ο θεος*, with Lℵ[3] rel vulg Syr syr-w-ast [Chr[1] Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]: aft *το θελημα σου* b [arm Damasc]: om ACDK[P]ℵ[1] 17 [harl] coptt æth Chr[1] [Cyr[1]].

10. Steph aft *εσμεν* ins *οι* (*mistake arising from the termn σμενοι of precedg word*),

what differently given from those in the LXX. There it stands, *τότε εἶπον Ἰδοὺ ἥκω, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ, τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, ὁ θεός μου, ἠβουλήθην, καὶ τὸν νόμον σου ἐν μέσῳ τῆς καρδίας μου*: where *τοῦ ποιῆσαι* depends on *ἠβουλήθην*. And so in the Hebrew: see E. V. As our text stands, *τοῦ ποιῆσαι* depends on *ἥκω*, and *ἐν κεφ. τ. βιβ. γέγρ. περὶ ἐμοῦ* is parenthetical: see ver. 9. *κεφαλίς* is the LXX rendering of מְגִלָּה, a roll, or volume, as also in reff. Suid., *κεφαλὶς βιβλίου, ὅπερ τινὲς εἴλημά φασι. κεφαλίς* appears to have got this meaning from signifying the heads or knobs which terminated the cylinder on which the mss. were rolled, and which were called in Latin *umbilici*. On *ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου*, Thl. says, *θέλημα δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς τὸ τὸν υἱὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου τυθῆναι κ. δικαιωθῆναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οὐκ ἐν θυσίαις ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*: and Chrys., *τοῦ ἐμαυτόν φησιν ἐκδοῦναι, τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ θέλημα*). 8.] The Writer now proceeds to expound the prophecy; and in so doing, cites it again, but in a freer form, and one accommodated to the explanation which he gives. **Saying** (as he does) **above** (the present participle is used, not *εἰπών*, because it is not the temporal sequence of the sayings, so much as their logical coherence, that is in the Writer's thoughts. Similarly we say, "Holding as I do that, &c., I have ever maintained, &c." The speaker is our Lord: cf. above, ver. 5, *εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει*), **that** (mere particle of recitation: cf. reff.) **sacrifices and offerings, and whole burnt-offerings, and sacrifices concerning sin thou wouldest not, nor yet didst approve** (observe that the two distinct clauses of the previous citation are now combined, for the sake of throwing into contrast the rejection of legal sacrifices and the acceptable self-sacrifice of the Son of God), **of such sort as** (*αἵτινες* does not, like the simple relative *αἵ*, identify, but classifies, the antecedent) **are** (habitually) **offered according to** (in pursuance of the commands of) **the** (whether the article is or is not retained, the English rendering will be the same; the *νόμος* according to which they were offered being not any general one, but the particular ordinance of Moses. If we say 'according to law,' we mean the same, but transfer ourselves to the standing-point of a Jew, with whom 'the law' was 'law') **law,**— 9.] **then** (more logical than chronological; but used probably in allusion to that *τότε* above, in the passage itself), **hath he said, Behold I am come to do thy will. He** (Christ again) **taketh away** (for *ἀναιρεῖν*, 'tollere,' see reff. and add Xen. Cyr. i. 1. 1, *ὅσαι μοναρχίαι ὅσαι τε ὀλιγαρχίαι ἀνῄρηνται ἤδη ὑπὸ δήμων*: Demosth. p. 246. 4, *τὰ τῶν προγόνων καλὰ κ. δίκαια ἀναιρεῖν*) **the first, that he may set up** (establish, see reff.) **the second** (*ποῖόν ἐστι τὸ πρῶτον; αἱ θυσίαι. ποῖον τὸ δεύτερον; τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός*. Thl. It is a mistake to understand with Peirce, *θέλημα* after *πρῶτον* and *δεύτερον*: the contrast is between that which God wills not, and that which He wills. This is very plain both on other grounds, and on account of the *ἐν ᾧ θελήματι* in the next verse). 10.] **In** (the course of, the fulfilment of: not properly "by," which belongs more to the *διά* below) **which will** (viz. the will and purpose of God towards us by Christ: the will which He came to fulfil. There is no real difference, or alternative to be chosen, as Ebrard maintains, between the will of God to redeem us by the sufferings

a ch. vii. 27 reff. b 1 Chron. xxiii. 30. Ps. cxxxiii. 1. see Deut x. 8. xviii. 7 Judg. xx. 28. c ch. vii. 27 reff. d Acts xiii. 2. Rom. xv. 27 only. Num. xviii. 2.

τοῦ σωματος Ιησοῦ χριστοῦ [a] ἐφάπαξ. [11] καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἀρχιερεὺς [b] ἕστηκεν [c] καθ᾽ ἡμέραν [d] λειτουργῶν, καὶ τὰς

ACDKL Pℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

with D[3]KL rel Damasc Thl Œc: om ACD[1][P]ℵ a[1] k 17 [47 Euthal-ms Cyr_1] Chr_2 Thdrt. for *σωματος*, *αιματος* D[1](and lat). rec ins *του* bef *ιησου*: om ACD KL[P]ℵ rel [Chr Euthal-ms Cyr_1 Thdrt Damasc Œc].

11. rec (for *αρχ.*) *ιερευς*, with DKLℵ rel copt Chr_2 [Euthal-ms] Thdrt(appy) Damasc; *sacerdos* latt(but in viii. 3, where *αρχ.* does not vary, D-lat has *sacerdos* though vulg reads *pontifex* there and in ix. 7; in ix. 7 D-lat has *summus sacerdos*): txt AC[P] a b[1] f g k m Syr syr-w-ast [basm arm] æth Cyr_1 [Thdrt-txt]. *λειτ.* bef *καθ᾽ ημ.* ℵ[1]. om 2nd *και* D[1](and lat).

and death of Christ, and the will of God as fulfilled by Christ's obedience: the one includes the other: the latter was the condition of the former. Justiniani inclines to understand *ἐν ᾧ θελήματι* of the will of *Christ*, as expressed above: and so Calvin (quoting 1 Thess. iv. 3, "Hæc voluntas est *Christi*, sanctificatio vestra"), Schöttgen, and Carpzov. But clearly this cannot be so) **we have been sanctified** (see on the word **ἁγιάζω**, and on the use of the present and past passive participles of it, note on ch. ii. 11. Here the perfect part. is used, inasmuch as it is the finished work of Christ in its potentiality, not the process of it on us, which is spoken of: see ver. 14, *τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους*: which final completion is here indicated by the perfect part.) **through the offering of the body** (the reading *αἵματος* would, besides losing the reference to the *σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι*, introduce an inaccuracy into the typology. It is by the Blood of Christ that we are reconciled to God, but by the offering of His Body that we are made holy. The one concerns our acceptance as acquitted from sin; the other our perfection in holiness by union with Him and participation in His Spirit. Thus we distinguish the two in the Communion Service: "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood") **of Jesus Christ, once for all** (it may seem doubtful to which **ἐφάπαξ** belongs, whether to *τῆς προσφορᾶς*, or to *ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν*. For the former, may be said, that the *once-for-all-ness* of the offering of Christ is often insisted on by our Writer, cf. ch. vii. 27; ix. 12, 26, 28; vv. 12, 14. Against it, that thus we should seem to require the article *τῆς* before *ἐφάπαξ*. But this last is not needed, and no argument can be founded on its absence. Rather should we argue from the context, and say that the assertion is not mainly of our being sanctified once for all, though that does come in in ver. 14 as a consequence of the *μία προσφορά*, but of our sanctification having taken place by means of a final efficacious sacrifice, which does not, as those legal ones did, need repeating. I should therefore be disposed to join *ἐφάπαξ* with *προσφορᾶς*, with Syr., Œc., Thl. (*διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς ἐφάπαξ γενομένης*), Schlichting, Jac. Cappell., Limborch, Stein, al., and against Bleek, Lünem., Hofm., Delitzsch, and most of the best Commentators). 11—14.] See summary at ver. 1. 11.] **And** (*καί* introduces a new particular of contrast: 'and besides') **every high priest** (much has of late been said by Delitzsch against the reading **ἀρχιερεύς**, as bringing in an inaccuracy which our Writer could not be guilty of, seeing that the *high* priests did not officiate in the daily sacrifice. But all such arguments are worthless against preponderating evidence, and rather tend the other way, viz. to shew how natural it was to alter **ἀρχιερεύς** to **ἱερεύς**, on account of this very difficulty. So that on the "procliviori præstat ardua" principle as well, we are bound I conceive to retain **ἀρχιερεύς**. And with regard to the alleged inaccuracy, I really think that if closely viewed, it will prove rather to be a fine and deep touch of truth. The High-priesthood of our Lord is to be compared with that of the Jewish legal high priests. On the one side is Jesus, alone in the glory of his office and virtue of his sacrifice; on the other is the Jewish high-priesthood, not one man but many, by reason of death; represented in all its acts, personal or delegated, by its holder for the time, by **πᾶς ἀρχιερεύς**, offering not one, but many sacrifices. This **ἀρχιερεύς** is the representative of the whole priesthood. Whether he ministered in the daily service of the temple himself or not, it is he who embodies the acts and sufferings of Israel in his own person. How Delitzsch can say that such an idea is foreign alike to the Bible and the Jewish mind, I am at a loss to understand, considering the liberation at the death of the high priest, not to insist on the ceremonies themselves at the day of

αὐτὰς πολλάκις [u] προσφέρων θυσίας, [s] αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται [e] περιελεῖν ἁμαρτίας· [12] [f] οὗτος δὲ μίαν [g] ὑπὲρ [g] ἁμαρτιῶν [u] προσενέγκας θυσίαν [h] εἰς τὸ [h] διηνεκὲς [i] ἐκάθισεν [i] ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, [13] [k] τὸ λοιπὸν [l] ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως τεθῶ-

e Acts xxvii. 20, 40. 2 Cor. iii. 1 only. = 1 Chron. xxi. 8. Zeph. iii. 15. περιαιρήσεσθε τῶν πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰς πανουργίας ἁπάσας, Dem. p. 942. 29. f see ch. iii. 3. vii. 4. g ch. v. 1 reff. h ch. vii. 3 reff. i ch. i. 3 reff. k = Matt. xxvi. 45 ||. Heb., here only. l abs. here only ‡. (ch. xi. 10 reff.) Polyb. iii. 45. 6 al.

12. rec αυτος (*see note*), with D³KL rel Cyr-jer₁ Thdrt [Damasc] Thl Œc: txt AC D¹[P]א k 17 [47] Chr₂ [Euthal-ms] Cyr₁. εκ δεξιων A 31; εκ δεξια (sic) א¹, *ad dexteram* harl.

atonement, when he was clearly the centre and representative of the priesthood, and indeed of all Israel. In treating of the Head of so compact a system as the Jewish priesthood it is clearly allowable, if any where, to bring in the principle, "qui facit per alterum, facit per se." See ch. vii. 27, where the very same καθ' ἡμέραν is predicated of the ἀρχιερεύς) **standeth** (see reff. No priest nor other person might *sit* in the inner court of the temple, except the king. There is perhaps more than a fortuitous contrast to ἐκάθισεν below. So Œc. and Thl., aft. Chrys.: ἄρα τὸ ἑστάναι σημεῖόν ἐστι τοῦ λειτουργεῖν, τὸ δὲ καθῆσθαι, ὥσπερ ὁ χριστὸς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρός, σημεῖόν ἐστι τοῦ λειτουργεῖσθαι οἷα θεὸν ὄντα. The vulgate rendering, "*præsto est*," is clearly wrong) **day by day ministering** (see note, ch. viii. 2), **and** (καί brings out that in the λειτουργία, which the Writer wishes most to emphasize) **often offering the same sacrifices, the which** (i. e. of a sort which, such as) **can never take away** (lit. 'strip off all round:' so of a ring, Gen. xli. 42: Esth. iii. 10: Jos. Antt. xix. 2. 3: Ælian V. H. i. 21: Herod. iii. 41: of clothes from the body, Gen. xxxviii. 14: Deut. xxi. 13: Jonah iii. 6: 2 Macc. iv. 38. See reff.: and many more examples in Bleek. And such a word is peculiarly fitting to express the removal of that of which it is said, ch. v. 2, αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν, and which is called, ch. xii. 1, ἡ εὐπερίστατος ἁμαρτία. The sacrifice might bring sense of partial forgiveness: but it could never denude the offerer of sinfulness—strip off and take away his guilt) **sins**:

12.] **but He** ('this (man),' or, (priest): but such rendering should be avoided if possible, as should all renderings which import a new generic idea into the text, as always causing confusion: cf. for a notable example, 1 Cor. ii. 11 end in E. V.) **having offered one sacrifice for sins** (on the punctuation, see below) **for ever** (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές may be joined either with the preceding or with the following words. If with the preceding, as Thl. (θυσίαν . . . εἰς τὸ δ. ἀρκοῦσαν ἡμῖν, and so Œc.), Luther, Castellio, Beza b, Chr. F. Schmid, Bengel, Böhme, Stein, al., we observe the usage of the Epistle, which is to place εἰς τὸ διηνεκές *after* that which it qualifies (reff.): we have μία θυσία εἰς τὸ διηνεκές opposed to τὰς αὐτὰς θυσίας πολλάκις; and we keep the propriety of the sense, according to what follows, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως κ.τ.λ., and according to 1 Cor. xv. 28, where we are expressly told, that the session of our triumphant Saviour will have its end as such. If we join the words with the following, as Syr., D-lat., Faber Stap., Erasm., Calvin, Schlichting, Grot., Wolf, al., Schulz, De Wette, Bleek, Lünem., Ebrard, Hofmann, Delitzsch, al., we more thoroughly satisfy the construction, in which εἰς τὸ διηνεκές seems to refer better to an enduring state than to a past act, or at all events not to this last without a harsh ellipsis, "*having offered one sacrifice* (the virtue of which will endure) *for ever*:" we preserve the contrast between ἕστηκεν καθ' ἡμέραν and εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν: we preserve also the balance between the clauses ending προσφέρων θυσίας, and προσενέγκας θυσίαν: and we are in full accordance with the ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα so often insisted on. And to this latter arrangement I incline, not however laying it down as certain. The objection taken above, as to the change in the nature of Christ's session at the end, when all things shall have been put under His feet, may be met by saying that such change, being obviously included in His ultimate state of reception into God's presence in heaven, does not here *count as* a change, where the question is of renewal of sacrifice, with regard to which that session is eternal) **sat down on the right hand of God**,

13.] **henceforth waiting** (this sense of ἐκδέχομαι is said to belong exclusively to later Greek: but not altogether accurately, cf. Soph. Phil. 123, κεῖνον ἐνθάδ' ἐκδέχου. It is, however, much more frequent in the later classics. We have ἐκδέχ. ἕως ἄν

e = ch viii. 2. gen., ch. ix. 8.
f = Eph. iii 12.
g ch. ix. 18 (reff.) only.
l = 1 Pet. i. 3 reff.

[e] τῶν ἁγίων [f] ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, [20] ἣν [g] ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν [h] πρόσφατον καὶ [l] ζῶσαν, διὰ τοῦ [k] καταπετάσματος,

ACDKL ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

h (see note.) here only. (-τως, Acts xviii. 2.) Deut. xxxii. 17. Sir. ix. 10.
k ch. vi. 19 reff.

20. om και D[1].

exquisite is the skill of arrangement and development, that the very exhortation with which he closed the former portion of the Epistle where first he began to prepare the way for his great argument, ch. iv. 14—16, is now resumed, deepened indeed and expanded by the intervening demonstration, but in spirit and substance the same: *προσερχώμεθα μετ' ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως* here, answering to *προσερχώμεθα μετὰ παῤῥησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος* there, and *κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν* here to *κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας* there.

19.] **Having** (*ἔχοντες* is placed first as carrying the emphasis: 'possessing, as we do . . .') **therefore** (as above proved: *οὖν* collects and infers), **brethren** (see on ch. iii. 1), **confidence** (see on ch. iii. 6. **παῤῥησία** here as well as there is not justification, right (*ἐξουσίαν* Hesych.) to enter, but purely subjective, *confidence*, boldness) **as regards the** (our, see below) **entering into the holy places** (for construction, see reff. *καὶ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ ἀφέθησαν ἡμῖν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, παῤῥησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸ εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἅγια, τουτέστιν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.* Thl. **ἡ εἴσοδος** is *our* entering, not *Christ's* entering, as Heinrichs and Dindorf: see ch. iv. 16, *προσερχώμεθα μετὰ παῤῥησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος*) **in the blood of Jesus** (the *ἐν* introduces that wherein the confidence is grounded: cf. ref., *ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παῤῥησίαν καὶ* [*τὴν*] *προσαγωγήν*. He having once entered in with His blood as our High Priest, and thereby all atonement and propitiation having been for ever accomplished, it is in that blood that our boldness to enter in is grounded. To understand *ἐν*, with Bleek and Stier, as in ch. ix. 25, *εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια . . . ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ*, is in fact to make us, as priests, renew Christ's offering of Himself. "We enter," says Stier, "with the blood of Jesus, even with the same, wherewith He entered before us:" which is very like a contradiction in terms, and is at all events inaccurate theology. We do not take the blood of Christ with us into the presence of God: it is there already once for all, and our confidence of access is therein grounded, that it *is* there. See note on ch. xii. 24),

20.] **which** (entrance: so Œc. (below), Thl. (below), and most Commentators. Some, as Est., Erasm., Calv., Beza, refer the relative to *αἵματι*, making it attracted into the fem. by *ὁδόν*. Some again, as Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, al., and D-lat., refer it to *παῤῥησίαν*. The vulg., "quam initiavit nobis viam novam," will bear either) **He initiated** (first opened: better than E. V., "consecrated," which seems as if it existed before: so Œc., *ἣν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων νῦν νεωστὶ ἔτεμε*: and Thl., *ἥντινα εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁδὸν ἐνεκαίνισε, τουτέστι νέαν ὁδὸν ἐποίησεν, αὐτὸς ταύτης ἀρξάμενος, καὶ αὐτὸς ταύτην βαδίσας πρῶτος*. On the word, see note, ch. ix. 18) **for us** (as) **a way** (*ὁδόν* is predicative, 'to be a way') **recent** (*ὡς τότε πρῶτον φανεῖσαν*, Thdrt.: cf. Rom. xvi. 25, 26, *μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν κ.τ.λ.*, and ch. ix. 26. "On the use of **πρόσφατος**, see esp. Wetst. h. l. and Lobeck on Phryn. p. 374 f. The original meaning is 'slain before,' from *πρό* and *σφάζω* or *σφάττω*; and thus, *just before, recently, slain* or *killed*: so Il. ω. 757. According to usage, it means 'fresh,' *recens*, in contrast to *παλαιός*, old or antiquated: and is used not only of recently slain meat (Hippocr.), or a fresh corpse, *νεκρὸς πρόσφατος* (Herod. ii. 89, 121), but also *ἰχθύς, αἷμα, πόμα, σταφυλή* (Dioscorid. v. 12: Num. vi. 3), *ἄλφιτον, φῦκος, ἄνθος, ἔλαιον, ἕλκος, χιών* (Polyb. iii. 55. 1), *μάρτυρες* (Aristot. Rhet. i. 15), *νίκη* (Plutarch), *ἀτύχημα* (Polyb. i. 21. 9), *εὐεργεσίαι* (id. ii. 46. 1), *δίκαι* (Æschyl. Choeph. 800), *ὀργή* (Lys. p. 151. 5: Jos. Antt. i. 18. 3), *φθόνος* (Plut. Themistocl. p. 124 a), Demosth. p. 551. 15, *ἕκαστος, ἄν τι συμβῇ, πρόσφατος κρίνεται* (see also reff.): and Eccles. i. 9, *οὐκ ἔστι πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον*." Bleek. Others, as Passow, derive the word from *πρό*, and *φένω*. But *πρόσφατος* has not, as Ebrard would make it, the meaning of "ever fresh:" only that of *new*, 'of late origin.' "None before Him trod this way: no believer under the O. T. dared or could, though under a dispensation of preparatory grace, approach God so freely and openly, so fearlessly and joyfully, so closely and intimately, as we now, who come to the Father by the blood of Jesus, His Son." Stier) **and living** (as contrasted with the mere dead ceremony of entrance into the earthly holy place. This entrance is a real, living

[l] τουτέστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, [21] καὶ ἱερέα [m] μέγαν [n] ἐπὶ τον [o] οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, [22] [p] προςερχώμεθα [p] μετὰ [q] ἀληθινῆς καρ-

l ch. vii. 5 reff. m ch. iv. 14 reff. n see ch. iii. 6. Matt. xxv. 21, 23. o = 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. iv. 17. see 1 Pet. ii. 5. p ch. iv. 16. q = John iv. 37. xix. 35 al. Job ii. 3.

ins δια bef της D[1].

22. προςερχωμεθα D[-gr] KL[P] c d g h k o: txt ACℵ latt [Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc. μετ (for μετα) C Damasc.]

and working entrance; the animated substance of what is imported, not the dead shadow. And so Lünemann and Delitzsch: and very nearly, Ebrard and Stier. Most Commentators make ζῶσαν = ζωοποιοῦσαν, producing, or leading to life: so Faber Stap., Schlichting, Grot., Peirce, Wetst., Böhme, Kuinoel, De Wette, Olshausen. Others, as Bl., interpret it, "everlasting:" and so Chrys., οὐκ εἶπε ζωῆς, ἀλλὰ ζῶσαν αὐτὴν ἐκάλεσε, τὴν μένουσαν οὕτω δηλῶν: Œc., εἰς ζωὴν ὄντως φέρει, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ζῇ καὶ διαιωνίζει. πρόσφατον εἰπών, ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ· οὐκοῦν εἰ πρόσφατος, καὶ παυθήσεται· γηράσκουσα γὰρ καὶ παλαιουμένη καὶ αὐτή, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης καταλυθήσεται· οὐ μὲν οὖν, φησίν, ἀλλὰ πρόσφατος οὖσα ἀεὶ νεάζουσα καὶ ζῶσα ἔσται, οὐδέποτε ἐπιδεχομένη θάνατον καὶ κατάλυσιν) **through** (διά here in its primary local meaning, 'through,' not in its derived instrumental one. But no οὖσαν or ἄγουσαν need be supplied, as Bleek: διά follows directly upon ἐνεκαίνισεν) **the veil, that is, his flesh** (on καταπέτασμα, see note, ch. vi. 19. The Flesh of Christ is here spoken of as the veil hung before the holiest place; that weak human mortal flesh was the state through which He had to pass before He could enter the holiest in heaven for us, and when He put off that flesh, the actual veil in the temple was rent from top to bottom, Matt. xxvii. 51. And so in the main, the great body of interpreters: the Greek Commentators however, not quite accurately: e. g. Chrys., ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ αὕτη ἔτεμε πρώτη τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῷ ἐκείνην, ἣν καὶ ἐγκαινίσαι λέγει, τῷ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀξιῶσαι διὰ ταύτης βαδίσαι· καταπέτασμα δὲ εἰκότως ἐκάλεσε τὴν σάρκα· ὅτε γὰρ ἠρέθη εἰς ὕψος, τότε ἐφάνη τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. And similarly Thl. and Œc., the latter however giving an alternative, καὶ ὅτι ἔκρυπτεν ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὴν θεότητα· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιον καταπετάσματος. Thdrt. understands it of the body of the Lord partaken in the Holy Communion: no less strangely than erroneously: for it is *not* the *Body*, but the *Flesh* of Christ which is the veil: and what our Writer means by that expression is evident from ch. v. 7, where ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ points to the time of His suffering Humanity),— **21.] and** ('having:' τὸ ἔχοντες ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, Œc.) **a great Priest** (i. e. a great *High* Priest; but here his Priesthood, not his High-priesthood, is more brought into prominence. Do not suppose that μέγας ἱερεύς imports 'High Priest,' as ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας in the LXX and Philo: our Writer always uses ἀρχιερεύς for it, and in ch. iv. 14, calls our Lord ἀρχιερέα μέγαν. He is ἱερεὺς μέγας, because He is a Priest on his throne, a "sacerdos regius et rex sacerdotalis," as Delitzsch quotes from Seb. Schmidt) **over the house of God** (this substitution of the preposition of motion for that of rest, is indicative of a later phase of a language, and requires the supplying of τεταγμένον, or some similar word, to make it good Greek: so Ξενοκλέα ἔταξεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱππεῖς, Xen. Cyr. iv. 5. 19. The οἶκος θεοῦ here need not be more limited in meaning than in the similar passage ch. iii. 2: οἶκον δὲ θεοῦ τοὺς πιστοὺς προςηγόρευσεν, Thdrt., Œc., Estius, al. But it is alleged that the expression here must mean the heaven: Thl. having mentioned the other, says, ἤ, ὅπερ οἶμαι μᾶλλον, τὸν οὐρανόν· ἐκεῖνον γὰρ καὶ ἅγια καλεῖ, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ λειτουργεῖν τὸν ἱερέα λέγει, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐντυγχάνοντα: and so many Commentators. But Delitzsch well observes that the one meaning, the narrower, need not exclude the other, the wider. It is hardly probable, to begin with, that our Writer should in two places describe Christ as set ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, in meanings entirely different from each other. Clearly, the heavenly sanctuary is regarded by him as also including the earthly, the Church above as the home of the Church below: see ch. xii. 22 ff.), **22.] let us approach** (προσέρχεσθαι, see ref., = ἐγγίζειν τῷ θεῷ ch. vii. 19, and is a word belonging to worship. So that the participial clauses which follow are best regarded as both belonging to προσερχώμεθα, since they also describe requisite preparations for worship: see this further treated below, on ver. 23) **with a true heart** (χωρὶς ὑποκρίσεως, Chrys. So Hezekiah pleads, Isa. xxxviii. 3, ἐπορεύθην ἐνώπιόν σου μετὰ ἀληθείας ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀληθινῇ) **in full assurance**

δίας ἐν [r] πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως [s] ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας [t] ἀπὸ [u] συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ [v] λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα

r ch. vi. 11. Col. ii. 2. 1 Thess. i. 5 only †.
s ch. ix. 13 reff.
t = Acts xvi. 33. Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 25.
u so, but w. ἀγαθ., Acts xxiii. 1. 1 Tim. i. 5, 19. 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21. see ch. ix. 9 reff.
v John xiii. 10. Acts ix. 37. xvi. 33. 2 Pet. ii. 22. Rev. i. 5 only. Levit. xvi. 4.

rec ερραντισμενοι, with D[3]KLℵ[3] rel: εραντ. [m] 17: txt ACD[1][P]ℵ[1]. λελουσμενοι D[1][P]ℵ 39. 46. 73.

(**πληροφορία,** subjective, as in ch. vi. 11: see note there) **of faith** (with no doubt as to the certainty of our access to God by the blood of Jesus), **having our hearts sprinkled from** (pregnant construction for 'sprinkled, and by that sprinkling cleansed from') **an evil conscience** (a conscience polluted with the guilt of sin: for "if a man's practice be bad, his conscience, in so far as it is the consciousness of that practice, is *πονηρά*:" see Delitzsch, Biblische Psychologie, p. 163) **and having our body washed with pure water** (both these clauses refer to the legal purifications of the Levitical priests, which took place by means of blood and water. At their first dedication, Aaron and his sons were sprinkled with blood, their bodies and their clothes, Exod. xxix. 21: Levit. viii. 30. And so are we to be as God's priests, having access to Him, sprinkled with blood, not outwardly with that of the ram of consecration, but inwardly with that of the Lamb of God: the first could only produce *καθαρότητα τῆς σαρκός* (ch. ix. 13), but the second, pureness of heart and conscience in God's sight. The washing with water also (Exod. xxix. 4) was to be part of the cleansing of Aaron and his sons: nor only so, but as often as they entered the holy place or approached the altar, they were to wash their hands and feet in the brazen laver, Exod. xxx. 20; xl. 30—32: and the high priest, on the day of atonement, *λούσεται ὕδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*, Levit. xvi. 4. There can be no reasonable doubt that this clause refers directly to Christian baptism. The *λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος* of Eph. v. 26, and the *λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*, Titus iii. 5, are analogous expressions: and the express mention of *σῶμα* here, as distinguished from *καρδίας* before, stamps this interpretation with certainty. This distinction makes it impossible, with Calvin, Limborch, Owen, Bengel, Ebrard, and the old Socinians, Schlichting, al., to spiritualize away the meaning into "Christi spiritus et doctrina, seu spiritualis illa aqua, qua suos perfundit Christus, ipsius etiam sanguine non excluso" (Schlichting); for *σῶμα* confines the reference to an outward act. And so Thl. (*τῷ τοῦ βαπτίσματος· . . . . . τοῦ σώματος ἕνεκα παραλαμβάνεται τὸ ὕδωρ· διττῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἡμῶν, διττὴ καὶ ἡ κάθαρσις*), Thdrt., Œc., al. Böhme, Kuin., Thol., De W., Bleek, Lünem., Delitzsch, and the majority of Commentators. Still in maintaining the externality of the words, as referring, and referring solely, to Baptism, we must remember, that Baptism itself is not a mere external rite, but at every mention of it carries the thought further, viz. to that spiritual washing of which it is itself symbolical and sacramental. Notice here that the word is *τὸ σῶμα*, and not *τὴν σάρκα*, as ch. ix. 13: our whole natural life, and not the mere outside surface: that in which our soul dwells and works, the seat of the emotions and desires: this also must be purified in those who would approach God in Christ. So that I would understand with Delitzsch (whose note here by all means see), that the ***sprinkling the heart from an evil conscience*** is, so to speak, intra-sacramental, a spiritual application of the purifying Blood, beyond sacramental rites, and the ***washing the body with pure water*** is purely sacramental, the effect of baptism taken in its whole blessed meaning and fulfilment as regards our natural existence. The end of his note is very beautiful: "As priests we are sprinkled, as priests we are bathed: sprinkled so that our hearts are freed from an evil conscience, and thus from self-condemnation, sprinkled with Christ's Blood, to be sprinkled with which and to be certain of and joyful in justification before God is one and the same thing,—washed in Holy Baptism, whose pure water penetrates with its saving power not only into the depths of our self-conscious life, but also into the very foundation of our corporeity, and thus sanctifies us not only in the flesh, but in the body and in the spirit: so bringing us, in our whole personal existence, through the Blood speaking in the Sanctuary, through the Water welling forth out of the Sanctuary, into so real a connexion, so close an union with the Sanctuary itself, that we are at all times privileged to enter into the Sanctuary, and to use, in faith, the new and living way." On the further details of the passage see Hofmann, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, ii. 234: Schriftbeweis, ii. 2. 161. The perfect participles shew that a

[w] ὕδατι [w] καθαρῷ· [23] [x] κατέχωμεν τὴν [y] ὁμολογίαν τῆς [z] ἐλπίδος [a] ἀκλινῆ, [b] πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ [c] ἐπαγγειλάμενος· [24] καὶ [d] κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς [e] παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ [f] καλῶν [f] ἔργων, [25] μὴ [g] ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν [h] ἐπισυναγω-

...παροξυσμον αγα C.
ADKLP
ℵ a b c d
e f g h k
l m n o
17. 47

w Num. v. 17. Ezek. xxxvi. 25.
x ch. iii. 6 reff.
y = ch. iii. 1 reff.
z = ch. iii. 6 reff.
a here only †. Job xli. 14 Symm. ὅρκος βέβαιος, ἀκλινής, Philo de Spec. Leg. § i. vol. ii. p. 270.
b so 1 Cor. i. 9. x. 13. 1 Thess. v. 24. 2 Thess. iii. 3 al.
c see note. Tit. i. 2. James i. 12. ii. 5. 1 John ii. 25.
d = ch. iii. 1 reff.
e = here (Acts xv. 39) only ‡. (Deut. xxix. 28. Jer. xxxix. [xxxii.] 37 only.)
f Matt. v. 16. xxvi. 10. John x. 32, 33. 1 Tim. iii. 1 al[3]. Tit. ii. 7 al[3]. 1 Pet. ii. 12 only.
g Matt. xxvii. 46 ‖ Mk., from Ps. xxi. 1. 2 Cor. iv. 9. 2 Tim. iv. 10, 16. ch. xiii. 5. Wisd. x. 13.
h 2 Thess. ii. 1 only †. 2 Macc. ii. 7 only. (see note.)

23. *της ελπ.* bef *την ομολ.* D vulg [aft *ακλινη* 47]. aft *ελπ.* ins *ημων* ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving) [vulg F-lat Syr æth].
25. *εγκαταλιποντες* ℵ c l Chr-3-mss, *-λειπόντες* [D[3]] o: *καταλιπ.* D[1].

state is spoken of introduced by one act the effect of which is abiding): **23.]** (First we must treat of the punctuation and connexion. I have stated above the ground for attaching *καὶ λελουμένοι κ.τ.λ.* to the foregoing, with Syr., Primas., Faber Stap., Luther, E.V., Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Cramer, Michaelis (paraphr.), Wolf, Baumgarten, Storr, Kuin., De Wette, Bleek, Delitzsch,—not to *κατέχωμεν* with Erasm., Beza, Erasm. Schmid, Bengel, Peirce (and Michaelis as Peirce), Griesb., Knapp, Heinrichs, Schulz, Böhme, Lachmann, Tholuck, Tischdf. (edn. 2), Ebrard, Lünemann. Besides, 1. the ground there alleged, it may be further urged, 2. that the *λελουμένοι* has no imaginable connexion with *κατέχωμεν κ.τ.λ.*, whereas it continues to describe the condition in which we are to approach God: and, 3. that by joining this participial clause with what follows, the rhythm of the sentence (agst. Lünem.) is entirely broken up. Then, thus much being determined, our next question is, what stop to set after *καθαρῷ*. Bleek prefers a period, Delitzsch a comma only. I believe a colon, as after *ἐπαγγειλάμενος*, would best give the form of the sentence, in which the three verbs, *προσερχώμεθα* ... *κατέχωμεν* ... *καὶ κατανοῶμεν*, are correlative) **let us hold fast** (= *κρατῶμεν*, ch. iv. 14: let us hold with full and conscious possession: see ch. iii. 6, 14) **the confession** (see on ch. iv. 14: subjective, but in a pregnant sense,—that which we confess, held in our confession of it) **of our hope** (see ch. iii. 6: and bear in mind that **ἐλπίς** is used also for the object of hope subjectivized: our hope (subj.), as including that on which it is fixed) **so that it may be without wavering** ("Valcknaer compares *ἔχειν ἀκλινῆ τὸν λογισμόν*, 4 Macc. vi. 7." Del. The adjective predicates that which the confession becomes by being held fast: = *βεβαίαν*, ch. iii. 14. The word itself is late Greek, found in Ælian, V. H. xii. 64: Lucian, Encom. Demosth. 33: Philo, al.): **for He is faithful that promised** (viz. God, see reff.: and ch. vi. 13; xi. 11; xii. 26, as referring to Him the title **ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος**. Thl. interprets it, *ὁ χριστὸς ὁ εἰπών, ὅτι Ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται*, and similarly Œc., al., but not so accurately):

24.] and ("How beautifully does this chain of exhortations of our Writer fall into a triple division, according to St. Paul's trias of the Christian life, 1 Cor. xiii. 13: 1 Thess. i. 3; v. 8: Col. i. 4 f. Next to an exhortation to approach God in full assurance of *faith*, follows one to hold fast the confession of *hope*, and now comes one to emulate one another in *love*." Delitzsch. On the connexion, see above: we are still dependent on *ἔχοντες οὖν* above) **let us consider one another** (all of us have all in continual remembrance, bearing one another's characters and wants and weaknesses in mind. This is far better than the merely *one*-sided explanation given by Chrys., Thl. (*τουτέστιν, ἐπισκοπῶμεν εἴ τις ἐνάρετος, ἵνα τοῦτον μιμώμεθα· οὐχ ἵνα φθονῶμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα παροξυνώμεθα μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκείνῳ καλὰ ἔργα ποιεῖν*), Thdrt., Primas., Michaelis, Bleek (who endeavours to unite both views): **κατανοεῖν** has already been noticed, ch. iii. 1) **with a view to provocation** (usually we have **παροξυσμός** in a bad sense, as our word *provocation*: so in reff. The verb is sometimes used in the classics in a good sense: e. g. Xen. Mem. iii. 3. 13, *φιλοτιμίᾳ, ἥπερ μάλιστα παροξύνει πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἔντιμα*: Œcon. 13. 9, *αἱ φιλότιμοι τῶν φύσεων καὶ τῷ ἐπαίνῳ παροξύνονται*: Thuc. vi. 88, *παρελθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης παρώξυνέ τε τοὺς Λακεδ. κ. ἐξώρμησε, λέγων τοιάδε*. And thus the subst. must be taken here: "provocatio amoris et bonorum operum, cui," says Bengel, "contraria provocatio odii") **of** (tending to produce: or we may say that it is a *παροξυσμὸς ἀγάπης*, the love itself being thereby excited) **love and good works;** **25.]** **not deserting the assembling together of ourselves** (the word **ἐπισυναγωγή**, as its verb *ἐπισυνάγειν*, belongs to late Greek: Bleek gives

γὴν ἑαυτῶν, [l] καθὼς [lk] ἔθος [l] τισίν, ἀλλὰ [m] παρακαλοῦντες, καὶ [n] τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον [n] ὅσῳ [o] βλέπετε [p] ἐγγίζουσαν [q] τὴν [q] ἡμέραν. [26] [r] ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν [s] μετὰ τὸ

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

i John xix. 40. see 1 Macc. x. 89. 2 Macc. xiii. 4. k as above (i). elsw., Luke (i. 9 al[2]. Acts vi. 14 al[6].) only †. Wisd. xiv. 16. 2 Macc. xi. 25 only. constr., Acts xxv. 16. l = 1 Cor. iv. 18. 2 Cor. iii. 1. x. 2. 1 Tim. i. 3 al. m = ch. iii. 13 reff. n ch. vii. 20, 22 reff. o & constr., Rom. vii. 23. p = Matt. iii. 2 al. fr. Ezek. xii. 23. q = 1 Cor. iii. 13. 1 Thess. v. 4. r = here (1 Pet. v. 2) only. 2 Macc. xiv. 3. (-ιος, Philem. 14.) ἀκουσίως ἁμ., Lev. iv. 2, 27. v. 15 al. s ver. 15 reff.

for εαυτων, αυτων ℵ[1]. aft εθος ins εστιν D[1] vulg Chr-ms. οσον Kℵ[1] [c].

examples from Polyb., Plut., Phædrus. The LXX use the verb many times, of gathering in a hostile sense (Micah iv. 11: Zech. xii. 3; xiv. 2: Ps. xxx. 14 Aℵ: 1 Macc. iii. 58; v. 9) and of God gathering His people together (Ps. ci. 23 A (συναγ. Bℵ); cv. 47; cxlvi. 2: 2 Macc. i. 27; ii. 18). And so in N. T. (Matt. xxiii. 37; xxiv. 31: Mark xiii. 27: Luke xiii. 34). In the only place (ref.) where the substantive occurs, it is of our gathering together to Christ at His coming, just as the verb in the above-cited places of the Gospels. Here, the question is whether it is to be understood of the congregation of the faithful generally, the Church,—as the word congregation has come from the act of assembling to signify the body thus assembled,—or of the single acts of assembling and gathering together of the various assemblies of Christians at various times. The former is held by Primasius ("congregationem fidelium"), Calvin, Justiniani ("Ego malim de tota ecclesia hæc verba Pauli intelligere, ut hortetur Hebræos ad retinendam fidem, utque a cœtu fidelium non recedant"), Jac. Cappell., Böhme, Bretschneider, al. But the other is held by most Commentators, and seems far more appropriate here. Thus Chrys. (οἶδεν ἀπὸ τῆς συνουσίας κ. τῆς ἐπισυναγωγῆς πολλὴν οὖσαν τὴν ἰσχύν), Œc. (τὸ γὰρ ἀεὶ συνῆχθαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἀγάπης ἐστὶ γεννητικόν), Thl. (similarly), Beza, Camero, Schlichting, Limborch, Schöttgen, Wolf, al., and Tholuck, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünem., Hofm., Delitzsch, al. Del. suggests that our Writer may have used ἐπισυναγωγή, not συναγωγή, to avoid the Judaistic sound of this latter. Otherwise the use would be accountable enough, ἐπισυναγωγή being a συναγ. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, and thus pointing more at the several places where the assemblies were held), **as is the habit with some** (this **καθὼς ἔθος τισίν** pretty plainly shews that not formal apostasies, but habits of negligence, are in the Writer's view. How far these might in time lead to the other, is a thought which no doubt lies in the background when he says κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους, and παρακαλοῦντες: and is more directly suggested by the awful cautions which follow. Grot., al. compare Ignatius, ad Polycarp. 4, p. 721, πυκνότερον συναγωγαὶ γενέσθωσαν: and Ad Eph. 13, p. 656, σπουδάζετε οὖν πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν θεοῦ κ. εἰς δόξαν· ὅταν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε, καθαιροῦνται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ σατανᾶ, κ. λύεται ὁ ὄλεθρος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως), **but exhorting** (supply not τὴν ἐπισυναγωγήν, as Œc. (τίνα; τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, τουτέστιν, ἀλλήλους· ἀπὸ κοινοῦ γὰρ τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ληπτέον), Hofmann, al., but ἑαυτούς, out of the ἑαυτῶν just preceding. See ch. iii. 13, ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν. An alternative in Œc. supplies τοὺς ἀσθενεστέρους: but it is an unnecessary limitation: all would need it); **and so much the more** (this τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον is better taken as belonging to the two preceding participial clauses only, to which it is syntactically attached, than as belonging to the whole from κατέχωμεν), **as** (= ὅσῳ μᾶλλον, 'the more;' must be joined with βλέπετε, not with ἐγγίζουσαν, 'the nearer ye see') **ye see** (this βλέπετε, in the second person, is unexpected in the midst of the 'oratio communicativa.' It appeals at once to the watchfulness and discernment of the readers as regards the signs of the times. That Day indeed, in its great final sense, is always near, always ready to break forth upon the Church: but these Hebrews lived actually close upon one of those great types and foretastes of it, the destruction of the Holy City—the bloody and fiery dawn, as Delitzsch finely calls it, of the Great Day) **the day** (this shortest of all designations of the day of the Lord's coming is found only in reff. "It is the Day of days, the ending-day of all days, the settling-day of all days, the Day of the promotion of Time into Eternity, the Day which for the Church breaks through and breaks off the night of this present world." Delitzsch) **approaching**.

26—31.] *Caution, arising from the mention of that day,—which will be not a day of grace, but a day of judgment,—of the fearful peril of falling away from Christ.* The passage finds a close parallel in ch. vi. 4 ff., and much of what was there said will apply here.

26.] **For if we willingly sin** (contrast to ἀκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν, in reff. and the ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνοντες to the ἀγνοοῦντες

λαβεῖν τὴν [tu] ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς [u] ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἔτι [v] περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν [w] ἀπολείπεται θυσία, [27] [x] φοβερὰ δέ [y] τις [z] ἐκδοχὴ

t Rom. i. 28. Eph. i. 17. 2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 8. ii. 20. Prov. ii. 5.
u = 1 Tim. ii. 4. 2 Tim. ii. 25. iii. 7. Tit. i. 1. see 1 Tim. iv. 3. v ver. 6. w = ch. iv. 6 reff. x ver. 31. ch. xii. 21 only. Deut. i. 19 al. y w. adj., Acts viii. 9. φοβερόν τι θέαμα, Lucian, Philopat. 8. z here only †.

26. της επιγνωσιαν (sic) ℵ[1](την ℵ[3] : -σιν ℵ-corr[1]). ουκετι περιλειπεται θυσιαν περι αμαρτιας προσενενκιν D[1], *jam non restat peccatis hostia offere* D-lat. [The verse, except μετα . . . αληθειας is in Coisl-LXX-marg.]

κ. πλανώμενοι, ch. v. 2. The sin meant by ἁμαρτάνειν is sufficiently defined by the connexion (γάρ) with the preceding exhortations, and by the description of one who has so sinned in ver. 29. Neglect of assembling together, and loss of mutual exhortation and stimulus, would naturally result in (as it would be prompted by an inclination that way at first) the ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ of ch. iii. 12; the παραπεσεῖν of ch. vi. 6. It is the sin of apostasy from Christ back to the state which preceded the reception of Christ, viz. Judaism. This is the ground-sin of all other sins. Notice the present, not the aor. part. 'If we be found wilfully sinning,' not 'if we have wilfully sinned,' at that Day. It is not of an act or of any number of acts of sin, that the Writer is speaking, which might be repented of and blotted out: but of a *state* of sin, in which a man is found when that day shall come) **after the receiving** (having received) **the knowledge** ("It is usually said that γνῶσις is the weaker word, ἐπίγνωσις the stronger: or, the former the more general, the latter the more special: or, the former the more quiescent, the latter the more active: the truth in all these is, that when ἐπίγνωσις is used, there is the assumption of an actual direction of the spirit to a definite object and of a real grasping of the same: so that we may speak of a false γνῶσις, but not of a false ἐπίγνωσις. And the Writer, by the use of this word, gives us to understand that he means by it not only a shallow historical notion about the Truth, but a living believing knowledge of it, which has laid hold of a man and fused him into union with itself." Delitzsch. It is most important here to keep this cardinal point distinctly in mind: that the ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνοντες are not mere professors of religion, but real converts, or else ver. 29 becomes unintelligible) **of the truth** (the truth of God, as so often in St. Paul and St. John), **there is no longer left remaining** (see on ch. iv. 6) **a sacrifice for sins** (for there is but One true sacrifice for sins: if a man, having availed himself of that One, then deliberately casts it behind him, there is no second left for him. It will be observed that one thing is not, and need not be, specified in the text. That he has exhausted the virtue of the one sacrifice, is not said: but in proportion to his willing rejection of it, has it ceased to operate for him. He has in fact, as Del. observes, shut the door of repentance behind him, by the very fact of his being in an abiding state of willing sin. And this is still more forcibly brought out when, which Del. does not notice, the scene of action is transferred to the great day of the Lord's coming, and he is found in that impenitent state irreparably. This verse has been misunderstood, 1. by the Fathers, who apply it to the Novatian controversy, and make it assert the impossibility of a second baptism: so e.g. Thl., οὐ τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀναιρῶν λέγει ταῦτα, ὥς τινες παρενόησαν, ἀλλὰ δεἰκνυσιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δεύτερον βάπτισμα· διὸ οὐδὲ δεύτερος θάνατος τοῦ χριστοῦ. θυσίαν γὰρ τοῦτον καλεῖ, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς κάτοπιν. μιᾷ γὰρ θυσίᾳ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές· τὸ γὰρ βάπτισμα ἡμῶν τὸν θάνατον εἰκονίζει τοῦ χριστοῦ. ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκεῖνος εἷς οὕτω καὶ τοῦτο ἕν. And similarly Chrys., Œc., and Augustine, Inchoat. Exposit. Ep. ad Rom. 19, vol. iii. pt. ii., al. 2. By Theodore of Mopsuestia and others, who interpret it only of those in a state of impenitence, understanding that on penitence they will again come under the cleansing influence of the blood of Christ: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος βίου τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀναιρεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι τότε συγχώρησιν λαβεῖν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ πταίειν ἐνταῦθα μεμενηκότα, καὶ μηδεμίαν ἐπὶ τὸ πταίειν δεξάμενον αἴσθησιν, ἀλογίᾳ τινὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ἡδονῆς ἐπιτελοῦντα ἁμάρτημα); **27.**] **but** (there is left remaining: ἀπολείπεται is common to both clauses) **a certain** (this attaching of τις to an adjective is an elegance belonging to the more polished style of our Writer, and often found in the classics: e.g. ἐπίπονόν τινα βίον, Diod. Sic. v. 39: ὅτι μικρόν τι μέρος εἴη στρατηγικῆς τὰ τακτικά, Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 14: καὶ Κύρῳ δὲ μεγάλην τινὰ δοκῶ ἡμᾶς χάριν ὀφείλειν, ibid. vi. 4. 7: see also ref. Acts, and cf. Winer, § 25. 2. *c*. Bernhardy's account of the usage, Syntax, p. 442, seems to be the true one, that it has the power of a doubled adjectival sense, and generalizes the quality predi-

a ch. ix. 27.
b Isa. xxvi. 11
c Zeph. i. 18. iii. 8. see Ps lxxviii. 5 al.
d Col. ii. 15 only.

[a] κρίσεως, καὶ [bc] πυρὸς [bc] ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς [bd] ὑπεναντίους. 28 [e] ἀθετήσας τὶς νόμον Μωυσέως χωρὶς [f] οἰκτιρμῶν [g] ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν [g] ἀποθνήσκει·

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

e = Mark vii. 9. Luke vii. 30. 1 Cor. i. 19. Gal. ii. 21 al. Isa. xxiv. 16. (-τησις, ch. vii. 28.) f Rom. xii. 1 2 Cor. i. 3. Phil. iii. 1. Col. iii. 12 only. P.H. 2 Kings xxiv. 14. g Deut. xvii. 6. ἐπί = ch. ix. 17.

28. aft *οικτ.* ins *και δακρυων* D[1](and lat) syr-w-ast.

cated, indicating *some one* of that kind, it may be *any one*. This is exemplified where numerals, or the like of numerals are joined with *τις*,—e. g. *πᾶς τις, ἕκαστός τις, οὐδείς τις, τισὶν οὐ πολλοῖς* (Thuc. vi. 94), *τινὲς δύο νῆες* (id. viii. 100), *ἑκατόν τι* (Arr. Ind. 7), *ταύτας τινὰς τρεῖς* (Plato, Rep. x. p. 601 D), as Cicero, "tres aliqui." So here, some one *φοβερὰ ἐκδοχή* out of all that might befall various men and dispositions. The indefiniteness makes the declaration more awful) **fearful** (objective,—'tremendus,' not 'timidus,' furchtbar, not furchtsam: fearful to think of, frightful. No figure of hypallage must be thought of, as if *φοβερὰ ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως = ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως φοβερᾶς*, as Jac. Cappellus, Heinrichs, al., and Wolf, alt.) **reception** (i. e. *meed, doom:* not, as I believe universally interpreted without remark, *expectation*. *ἐκδοχή* appears never to have this sense, and this is the only place where it occurs in the N. T. Its meanings are, 1. *reception*, principally by succession from another: e. g. Æschin. *παραπρεσβ.* p. 32. 18, *οὐκ ὤκνουν κατ' αὐτοῦ λέγειν Φιλίππου, ἐπιτιμῶν ὅτι τὴν ἐκδοχὴν ἐποιήσατο πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ πολέμου*: Æschyl. Agam. 299, *ἤγειρεν ἄλλην ἐκδοχὴν πόμπου πυρός*: Eur. Hippol. 866, *νεοχμὸν ἐκδοχαῖς ἐπεισφέρει κακόν*: 2. peculiar to later Greek, and principally found in Polybius, *interpretation*, acceptation, e. g. of the sense of a sentence: so *καθάπερ ἐποιοῦντο τὴν ἐκδοχὴν οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι*, Polyb. iii. 29. 4: *ἐξ ὧν ἀνάγκη ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκδοχὴν ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*, "quibus ex rebus intelligi debet" &c., id. xii. 18. 7. And so Origen, comm. in Joann. tom. v. 4, vol. iv. p. 98, *διὰ τὴν πρόχειρον αὐτῆς (τῆς γραφῆς) ἐκδοχήν*. But of the subjective sense, derived from the later meaning of *ἐκδέχομαι*, I find no hint or example, except the mere assertion in our N. T. lexicons, that it has that meaning in this place. From what follows, it is much better to take it objectively; all which *ἀπολείπεται* is, the reception of the doom of judgment, and the *πυρὸς ζῆλος*, &c.) **of judgment** (i. e. by the *context*, unfavourable judgment), **and fervour of fire** (the stress is on *πυρός*, and *πῦρ* is personified. It is the fire of God's presence, identified with Himself, exactly as in ch. xii. 29, *ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον*: and it is the zeal, the fervour, the excandescence of this consuming fire, which awaits the apostate from Christ. *τὸ πῦρ ἐκεῖνο, καθάπερ τις ὑπὸ ζήλου κεντούμενος, ὃν ἂν ἐπιλάβηται, οὐκ ἀφίησιν, ἀλλὰ τρώγει καὶ δαπανᾷ.* Chrys. *ὅρα*, says Thl., *πῶς οἷον ἐψύχωσε τὸ πῦρ*) **which shall** (in *μέλλοντος* the Writer tranfers himself again to the present time: q. d. the fire which is destined to . . .) **devour** (*οὐκ εἶπε φαγεῖν μόνον ἀλλ' ἐσθίειν, ἀϊδίως δηλαδή.* Thl. The same expression is found in Il. ψ. 182, *τοὺς ἅμα σοι πάντας πῦρ ἐσθίει*) **the adversaries** (some have supposed the sense of *secret* enemies to be conveyed by *ὑπεναντίους*. But as Bl. remarks, the word is good Greek, and is constantly found, without any such further sense, representing merely *an enemy*, e. g. Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 38, where *ἐξαπατᾶν τοὺς πολεμίους* and *ἐξαπατᾶν τοὺς ὑπεναντίους* are used as synonymous: Herod. iii. 80, where *τὸ ὑπεναντίον τούτου* is simply 'the opposite of this:' see Lexx. The *ὑπό* is simply what may be called the 'subjectio rei secundariæ:' the prime agent is ever supposed to be highest, and his accidents come up from beneath: thus *ὑπέρχεταί μοί τι*,—cf. *ἵνα σφι γένεα ὑπογίνηται*, Herod. iii. 159, &c. It is probable that the Writer has throughout this clause had in his mind ref. Isa., *ζῆλος λήψεται λαὸν ἀπαίδευτον, καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται*). **28, 29.**] *Argument 'a minori,' to shew how grievous will be the punishment of the apostate from Christ.* There is a very similar inference in ch. ii. 2, 3; xii. 25. **28.**] **Any one having set at nought the** (not, '*a*;' see ch. vii. 18, 19, both for *ἀθετεῖν*, and for the difference between *νόμος* and *ἐντολή*) **law of Moses** (we must not take this as a general assertion, as true of whoever in any way broke the Mosaic law: but as an alleging of a well-known fact, that in certain cases a breaker of that law was subject to the penalty following. The form of the sentence might be changed thus, 'If Moses' law could attach to violations of it the inexorable doom of death,' &c. For the logical purpose of the 'a minori ad majus,' the greater punishment includes the less. The reference is especially to Deut. xvii. 2—7, where the punishment of death is at-

29 [h] πόσῳ δοκεῖτε [i] χείρονος [k] ἀξιωθήσεται [l] τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ [m] καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ [n] αἷμα τῆς [n] διαθήκης [o] κοινὸν [p] ἡγησάμενος [q] ἐν ᾧ [qr] ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ [s] πνεῦμα

h elsw. w. μᾶλλον, ch. ix. 14 al.
i 2 Pet. ii. 20 reff.
k constr., ch. iii. 3 reff. τὴν δ' Εὐρυδίκην...ἔκρινε μείζονος ἀξιῶσαι τιμωρίας. Diod. Sic. xix. 11.
l here only. Prov. xix. 29 al.
m Matt. v. 13. vii. 6. Luke viii. 5. xii. 1 only. Job xxxix. 15 al.
n Matt. xxvi. 28. ch. ix. 20 (from Exod. xxiv. 8). xiii. 20. Zech. ix. 11.
o see Mark vii. 2, 5. Acts x. 14, 28. xi. 8. Rom. xiv. 14 bis. 1 Macc. i. 47, 62.
p = Acts xxvi. 2. Phil. ii. 25. ch. xi. 11, 26. 1 Pet. i. 13 al. Job xiii. 6.
q Rom. xv. 16. ver. 10 al.
r ch. ii. 11.
s Zech. xii. 10.

29. om εν ω ηγιασθη A Chr-3-mss.

tached to the same sin as is here in question, viz. apostasy: ἐὰν εὑρεθῇ . . . . ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνὴ ὃς ποιήσει τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον κυρίου τ. θεοῦ σου, παρελθεῖν τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ, καὶ **ἐλθόντες** (ἀπελθόντες A) **λατρεύσωσιν θεοῖς ἑτέροις** κ.τ.λ.) **dies** (the normal present) **without benefit of** (**χωρίς**, apart from: not implying that no one felt compassion for him, but that such compassion, be it what it might, could not affect his doom) **mercies** (the merciful feelings of any who might be interested for him. **οἰκτιρμός**, see on ref. Rom., says Bleek, is a purely Alexandrine word, and in the LXX and N. T. is generally in the plural, answering to the Hebrew רַחֲמִים, bowels. χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν, φησί, ὥστε οὐδεμία συγγνώμη οὐδὲ ἔλεος ἐκεῖ. Chrys.) **before two or three witnesses** (**ἐπί**, as in ch. ix. 17, 'in the case of;' his death is an event contingent on, added to, the fact of two or three witnesses appearing. As to the sense, cf. Thl., τουτέστιν, ἐὰν ὁμολογηθῇ ὑπὸ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων ὅτι παρέβη τὸν νόμον. The allusion is to Deut. as above, where it is said, ἐπὶ δυσὶν μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ἀποθανεῖται): 29.] **of how much worse punishment** (though **τιμωρία** does not elsewhere occur in the N. T., we have the verb, Acts xxii. 5; xxvi. 11), **think ye** (**δοκεῖτε** stands separate from the construction, and forms an appeal to the judgment of the readers themselves), **shall he be found worthy** (viz. by God. The participle is in the aor., as pointing to the single fact of the doom, not to a continued estimate), **who trampled under foot** (aor. part. as spoken at that day, and looking back upon this life. τί δέ ἐστι καταπατήσας; τουτέστι καταφρονήσας· ὥσπερ γὰρ τῶν καταπατουμένων οὐδένα λόγον ἔχομεν, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ μηδένα λόγον ἔχοντες οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐρχόμεθα. Thl. See reff., and cf. John xiii. 18. Stier remarks, "Some of us remember the cry, 'Ecrasez l'infame!'") **the Son of God** (the higher title of the Mediator of the new covenant is used, to heighten the enormity of the crime), **and accounted common the blood of the covenant** (the **αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης**, being the τίμιον αἷμα of Christ Himself, far above all blood of sprinkling under the old covenant. Even that (Levit. xvi. 19) had hallowing power: how much more this. But the apostate κοινὸν ἡγήσατο this blood—accounted it mere ordinary blood of a common man, and if so, consented to its shedding, for then Christ deserved to die as a blasphemer. And this, of that holy Blood, by which we have access to God! So that we have quite enough for the solemn sense, by rendering κοινόν *common*, without going to the further meaning, *unclean*. Chrys. gives both meanings: κοινόν, τί ἐστι; τὸ ἀκάθαρτον, ἢ τὸ μηδὲν πλέον ἔχον τῶν λοιπῶν: Œc., κοινόν, τὸ μηδὲν τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρον, οἷον λέγουσιν οἱ φάσκοντες αὐτὸν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον· οὗτοι γὰρ οὐδὲν τοῦ ἡμετέρου διαλλάττον εἰς τιμὴν λέγουσιν αὐτό: Beza compares 1 Cor. xi. 29, μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα: and Bretschneider quotes Justin Mart. Apol. i. 66, p. 83, οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν. Cf. Acts x. 28, ἐμοὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξεν μηδένα κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον, where the two are distinguished. Syr. has "hath counted the blood of the covenant of him by which (whom?) he hath been sanctified as that of every man." The reader will recall our Lord's own τὸ αἷμα τὸ τῆς κ. διαθήκης, cf. ref. Matt. || Mark. See also our ch. xiii. 20) **in which** (as sprinkled with which; as his element and condition of sanctification) **he was sanctified** (see Levit. xvi. 19 LXX, and our ch. xiii. 12 and ix. 13. He had advanced so far in the reality of the spiritual life, that this blood had been really applied to his heart by faith, and its hallowing and purifying effects were visible in his life: which makes the contrast the more terrible. And Delitzsch finely remarks, as against the assertors of mere shallow supralapsarianism, that without former experience of grace, without a life of faith far more than superficial, so irrecoverable a fall into the abyss is not possible. It is worthy of remark how Calvin evades the deep truth contained in the words ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη: "Valde indignum est sanguinem Christi, *qui sanctificationis nostræ materia est*, profanare: hoc vero faciunt, qui desciscunt

τῆς [s] χάριτος [t] ἐνυβρίσας; [30] οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα [u] Ἐμοὶ [v] ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ [w] ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος· καὶ [x] πάλιν, [y] Κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. [31] [z] φοβερὸν τὸ [a] ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας [b] θεοῦ [b] ζῶντος. [32] [c] Ἀναμιμνή-

t here only †. w. acc., Jos. Antt. i. 8. 1. v. 8. 12. usy. w. dat., see Bl.
u Deut. xxxii. 35. see note.
v Luke xviii. 7, 8. xxi. 22. Acts vii. 24. Rom. xii. 19, from l. c. 2 Cor. vii. 11. 2 Thess. i. 8. 1 Pet. ii. 14 only. Ezek. xxv. 14.
w Luke xiv. 14 bis. Rom. xi. 3. xii. 19. 1 Thess. iii. 9. 2 Thess. i. 6 only. L.P.H. Isa. lxiii. 7.
x ch. i. 6 reff.
y Deut. xxxii. 36. Psa. cxxxiv. 14. = ch. xiii. 4.
z ver. 27.
a Matt. xii. 11. Luke vi. 39. x. 36. 1 Tim. iii. 6, 7. vi. 9 only. 2 Kings xxiv. 14. 1 Chron. xxi. 13. Sir. ii. 18.
b ch. iii. 12 reff.
c & constr., Mark (xi. 21) xiv. 72. 1 Cor. iv. 17. 2 Cor. vii. 15 (2 Tim. i. 6) only. Num. v. 15.

30. om λεγει κυριος D[1][P]ℵ[1] 17. 23[1]. 67[2] latt Syr copt æth-rom Ambr$_1$ Primas. aft παλιν ins οτι (*as in Deut* xxxii. 36: *Ps* cxxxiv. 14) D latt æth-pl[(Tischdf) Euthal-ms Antch$_1$] Thdrt$_1$(om$_1$). rec κυριος bef κρινει, with L[P]ℵ[3] rel copt Chr Thdrt$_1$: txt ADKℵ[1] 17 latt syrr æth [arm Euthal-ms Antch$_1$] Thdrt$_1$ Primas.

a fide:" thus making ἡγιάσθη into ἁγιαζόμεθα. Lightfoot's idea, that *Christ* is the subject of ἡγιάσθη, is hardly worth refutation (Hor. Hebr. in 1 Cor. xi. 29): as neither is that of Claudius, in Wolf, that διαθήκη is the subject), **and insulted** (ἐνυβρίζω, in prose, belongs to later Greek: but is found in the poets, e. g. Eur. Electr. 68, ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς οὐκ ἐνυβρίσας κακοῖς: Aristoph. Thesm. 719, τάχ' οὐ χαίρων ἴσως ἐνυβρίσεις: Soph. Philoct. 342, with an accus. as here, πρᾶγμ' ὅτῳ σ' ἐνύβρισαν. In prose it is found in Ælian, Polybius, Herodian, Josephus, principally with a dative of the object) **the Spirit of grace** (for τὸ πν. τῆς χάριτος, see ref. No two things can be more opposed, as Del. remarks, than ὕβρις and χάρις. And this remark guides us to the answer to the question whether χάριτος here is a gen. objective or subjective: whether it is the πνεῦμα which belongs to χάρις, so that it is the gift of the divine χάρις (so Grot., Schlicht., De W., Bleek, Lünem., and most of the moderns), or χάρις which belongs to πνεῦμα, so that it is the gift of and the character of the πνεῦμα. The latter is adopted by Calv., Estius, a-Lapide, Justiniani (altern., but prefers it. He gives the alternative very neatly put by Pseudo-Anselm: "Spiritui sancto gratis dato, vel gratiam danti"), Beza, Owen, al., Böhme, Von Gerlach, Delitzsch, al., and is much the more probable, both on account of the prophecy which is referred to, ἐκχεῶ ... πνεῦμα χάριτος κ. οἰκτιρμοῦ,—and on account of ἐνυβρίσας, which is most naturally referred to a Person as its object. Chrys. strikingly says, ὁ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν μὴ παραδεχόμενος, ὕβρισε τὸν εὐεργετήσαντα. ἐποίησέ σε υἱόν· σὺ δὲ θέλεις γενέσθαι δοῦλος; ἦλθε κατασκηνῶσαι πρός σε· σὺ δὲ ἐπεισάγεις σαυτῷ πονηροὺς λογισμούς. He does not hold with any definiteness that apostasy is here meant, but applies the whole text homiletically to wilful sin of any kind. Thl., in reproducing Chrys.'s sentence, puts τὸν διάβολον for πονηροὺς λογισμούς)? **30, 31.**] And this ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως and πυρὸς ζῆλος are certainties, testified to by God Himself. **30.**] **For we know Him who said, To me belongeth vengeance, I will repay, saith the Lord** (the citation is from Deut. xxxii. 35, and is given not in agreement with the Hebrew text (לִי נָקָם וְשִׁלֵּם, "To me (belongeth) vengeance and recompense") nor with the LXX (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως (i. e. ליום נ׳, as is read in the Samaritan Pent.) ἀνταποδώσω, so also Philo, Leg. Alleg. iii. § 34, vol. i. p. 108), but, remarkably enough, in verbal accordance with St. Paul's citation of the same text, Rom. xii. 19, even to the adding of the words λέγει κύριος, which are neither in the Heb. nor the LXX. Two solutions of this are possible: 1. that the expression had become a common saying in the Church; 2. that our Writer takes it from St. Paul's citation. A third alternative is of course open; that it is St. Paul himself, who quotes here as there. For a solution, see Prolegg. on the authorship of this Epistle): **and again, The Lord will judge His people** (no doubt quoted primarily from the passage where it primarily occurs, in ref. Deut. The κρινεῖ there expresses another function of the judge from that which is adduced here. There, He will judge for rescue and for defence: here, for punishment and for condemnation. But the *office of Judge*, generally asserted by κρινεῖ, involves all that belongs to a judge: and if there it induces the comforting of those whom He εἶδεν παραλελυμένους, κ. ἐκλελοιπότας ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ, κ. παρειμένους, here the same general office of judgment also induces the punishment of the wilful sinner and apostate). **31.**] *Axiomatic conclusion of these solemn warnings.* **It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God** (yet in reff. Kings, 1 Chron., David says, ἐμπεσοῦμαι δὴ εἰς χεῖρας κυρίου, ὅτι πολλοὶ οἱ οἰκτιρμοὶ αὐτοῦ σφόδρα, εἰς δὲ χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου

σκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς [d] φωτισθέντες πολλὴν [e] ἄθλησιν [f] ὑπεμείνατε [g] παθημάτων, [33] [h] τοῦτο μὲν [i] ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν [k] θεατριζόμενοι, [h] τοῦτο δὲ [l] κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως [m] ἀναστρεφομένων γενηθέντες· [34] καὶ γὰρ τοῖς

Frag. Mosq. υπεμεινατε... ADKL P ℵ Frag. Mosq. a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

d ch. vi. 4 reff. e here only †. Polyb. v. 64. 6. vii. 10. 2. Ælian, V. H. ii. 23. xi. 3. (-λεῖν, 2 Tim. ii. 5.) f constr., 1 Cor. xiii. 7. ch. xii. 2, 3. James i. 12. Wisd. xvi. 22. g 2 Cor. i. 6. 2 Tim. iii. 11 al.† h here only. classics, passim. i Rom. xv. 3. 1 Tim. iii. 7. ch. xi. 26. xiii. 13 only. P.H. Isa. xliii. 28. k here only †. = ἐκθεατρίζειν, Polyb. iii. 91. 10 al. l 2 Cor. i. 7 al. Isa. i. 23. m Matt. xvii. 23. 2 Cor. i. 12. ch. xiii. 18 al. Josh. v. 5. Ezek. xix. 6.

32. ταις προτ. ημεραις D¹. for ημερας, αμαρτιας ℵ¹.—add υμων ℵ¹(ℵ³ disapproving) [m 17 copt].

33. for θεατρ., ονιδιζομενοι D¹.

οὐ μὴ ἐμπέσω: and in ref. Sir. we have ἐμπεσούμεθα εἰς χεῖρας κυρίου, καὶ οὐκ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων· ὡς γὰρ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη αὐτοῦ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ. But the two sentiments are easily set at one. For the faithful, in their chastisement, it is a blessed thing to fall into God's hands: for the unfaithful, in their doom, a dreadful one. On ζῶν, as a characteristic of θεός, see on ch. iii. 12. Here, the idea of life and energy, attached to the name of God, brings vividly out the ζῆλος with which He will consume His adversaries). **32—34.**] As in ch. vi. 9—12, so here, the Writer turns from solemn exhortation and warning to *encouragement arising from the conduct of his readers in the past.* This their firmness did not look likely to end in apostasy: and accordingly by the memory of it he now cheers and invigorates them. φησὶν οὖν ὅτι μὴ ἄλλους τινὰς μιμήσασθε, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἑαυτούς. ὅρα δὲ πνευματικὴν σοφίαν· πρότερον κατασείσας αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς διὰ τοῦ τῆς γεέννης ἀναμνῆσαι, νῦν μαλάττει δι' ἐγκωμίων, οὐ κολακεύων, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτῶν τούτων προτρεπόμενος· ἀξιοπιστότερος γὰρ ὁ συμβουλεύων τινὶ ἑαυτὸν μιμήσασθαι καὶ ἃ προειργάσατο ἔργα. Thl.: and Thdrt., κεράννυσι τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ αὐστηρὸν τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἤδη κατωρθωμένων. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως εἰς προθυμίαν διεγείρει ὡς τῶν οἰκείων κατορθωμάτων μνήμη. **32.**] **But** (in contrast to these fearful things which have been spoken of) **call ever to mind** (**ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε**, stronger than the simple verb—call over in your minds, one by one: this meaning seems legitimate when a plural follows: and *present*, as implying a constant habit. The verb may be indicative, but is from the whole cast of the sentence, much more likely imperative) **the former days** (the accus. after ἀναμιμνήσκομαι is as good Greek as the gen.), **in which when (first) enlightened** (see on φωτίζω, note, ch. vi. 4), **ye underwent** (scil. with fortitude: which though not implied in the word, signifying mere endurance, yet often is in the context: cf. Xen. Hiero 7. 4 (Bl.), ὥστε ἐμοὶ μὲν εἰκότως δοκεῖτε ταῦτα ὑπομένειν, ἃ φέρετε ἐν τυραννίδι, ἐπείπερ τιμᾶσθε διαφερόντως τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων) **much** ('multum magnumque:' πολύς when used with words whose sense admits intensifying, strengthens, as well as repeats, the idea) **contest** (ἄθλησις tells its own meaning, from ἆθλος, ἀθλέω, as 'certamen,' a struggle or contest: and in this sense it occurs in reff.) **of sufferings** (the gen. may be either subjective, implying that your contest *consisted of* sufferings; or objective, that it was *waged with* sufferings, as the foe to be contended against: the former perhaps is the more probable from what follows: cf. συνεπαθήσατε, ver. 34), **33.**] (the *nature of these sufferings* is now specified) **partly** (see reff.) **being made a spectacle** (the theatre being the place where conspicuous punishments were inflicted, on account of the multitudes there assembling. See Acts xix. 29. The word θεατρίζω may therefore be literally taken, if (see Prolegg. § ii. and § iii. 3) the Epistle was written *to Rome, after the Neronian persecution.* See reff., and cf. 1 Cor. iv. 9, θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ. Thl. says, θεατριζόμενοι, τουτέστιν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ θέατρον παραδειγματιζόμενοι, καὶ ταῦτα τυχὸν παρὰ εὐτελῶν καὶ εὐδαιμόνων. And Chrys., οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἶπεν, ὀνειδισμοῖς, ἀλλὰ . . . μετ' ἐπιτάσεως πολλῆς θεατριζόμενοί φησιν· ὅταν μὲν γάρ τις ὀνειδίζηται καθ' ἑαυτόν, λυπηρὸν μέν, πολλῷ δὲ πλέον, ὅταν ἐπὶ πάντων) **in reproaches** (ὀνειδισμός is a word of later Greek. The dat. is one of manner in which) **and tribulations; partly also** (see above), **having become** (there is something of purpose in γενηθέντες, almost a middle sense, 'having made yourselves.' It is a fine encomium on their Christian sympathy and love) **partakers with them who were thus living** (viz. ἐν ὀνειδισμοῖς τε κ. θλίψεσιν: so Œc. and Thl. Some would give ἀναστρεφομένων an ethical sense: "who walk," have their Christian walk and conduct, "in this way," viz. as he exhorts *them* to endure, manfully and firmly. So

n ch. xiii. 3 reff.
o ch. iv. 15 (reff.) only.
p Matt. xxiii. 25. Luke xi. 39 only. Isa. iii. 14.
q Matt. xix. 21. Luke xi. 21. 1 Cor. xiii. 3 al. Gen. xxiv. 59.

ADKL PℵFrag. Mosq. a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

[n] δεσμίοις [o] συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν [p] ἁρπαγὴν τῶν [q] ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν [r] μετὰ χαρᾶς [s] προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς [t] κρείσσονα [u] ὕπαρξιν καὶ [v] μένουσαν. [35] μὴ [w] ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν [x] παῤῥησίαν ὑμῶν, [y] ἥτις ἔχει μεγάλην

r Matt. xiii. 20. Phil. i. 3. ii. 29. ch. xiii. 17. 1 Chron. xxix. 22. s = ch. xi. 35. t ch. i. 4 reff. u Acts ii. 45 only. 2 Chron. xxxv. 7 al. v = John xv. 16. 2 Cor. iii. 11. ch. xii. 17. 1 Pet. i. 23, 25, from Isa. xl. 8. w Mark x. 50 only. Prov. xxviii. 24 Bℵ. Isa. i. 30. Jer. lii. 2 compl. x = ch. iii. 6 reff. y = ch. viii. 5 reff.

34. rec (for *δεσμιοις*) *δεσμοις μου* (*see note*), with D³KL[P]ℵ rel [æth Orig₁] Clem₁ Euthal₁: *vinculis eorum* D-lat: txt AD¹ h 17 [47] vulg syrr copt [arm Euthal-ms Antch₁] Chr₂. *γινωσκον* (sic) ℵ. rec ins *εν* bef *εαυτ.*, with d e g k [Antch₁]: om ADKL[(P)]ℵ rel [Chr₁ Isid₁ Thdrt Damasc].—*εαυτους* Aℵ Frag-mosq [copt] Clem (Orig) [Euthal-ms: *vos* latt]. rec *κρειττονα*, with DKL[P] rel [Clem Orig Euthal-ms Isid Antch₁]: txt Aℵ 17 [Chr₁]. rec aft *υπαρξιν* ins *εν ουρανοις*, with D³KL [P]ℵ³ Frag-mosq² rel syrr [æth-pl arm] Orig₁ [Chr Isid₁ Euthal-ms Thdrt Antch₁ Damasc]: om AD¹ℵ¹ Frag-mosq¹ 17 latt copt æth[-rom] Clem₁ Chron₁ Primas.
35. for *αποβαλητε*, *απολυητε* D¹. rec *μισθαπ.* bef *μεγαλην*, with KL rel Chr Thdrt Damasc: txt AD[P]ℵ Frag-mosq m 17 (latt) Clem₁ Orig₁ Eus₁ [Euthal-ms].

Kypke, Kuinoel, al. But I prefer the other as more in accord with N.T. usage: cf. reff.). **34.**] *Illustration*, in reverse order, of the two particulars mentioned in ver. 33. **For ye both** (better than 'also,' seeing that this sentence is not additional to, but illustrative of the last in both its members) **sympathized with** (see on **συμπαθέω**, ch. iv. 15) **them who were in bonds** (first as to the reading. The mere diplomatic evidence is given in the var. read. Estius appears to be right when he says, "Porro facillimum fuit, Græca mutari unius literulæ ablatione, ut scriberetur *δεσμοῖς* pro *δεσμίοις*, cui lectioni deinde addiderunt pronomen *μοῦ*, eo quod Paulus alibi sæpe vinculorum suorum mentionem faciat." It is not easy on the other hand to explain how *δεσμίοις* should ever have been substituted for *δεσμοῖς μου*. The idea that *συμπαθῆσαι* requires a person and not a thing as its object, which is supposed by some to have caused the alteration to *δεσμίοις*, is not likely to have influenced a Greek copyist, seeing that it is wholly unfounded in Greek. We have *συμπαθεῖν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις*, ch. iv. 15; *συμπ. καὶ ταῖς μικραῖς ἀτυχίαις*, Isocr. p. 64 B, and *δεσμοί* are, after all, the *state* of the captive person. *δεσμίοις* is held to be the original by Grot., Beng., Wetst., Griesb., Scholz, Knapp, Lachm., Tischendorf, and is rejected, out of critical editors, only by Matthæi and Rink, who read *δεσμοῖς μου*, and Mill and Nösselt, who omit *μου*. Of commentators, the rec. is defended by Wolf, Carpzov, Michaelis, al. A full account is given of all the testimonies each way by Bleek: see also Delitzsch's note), **and ye took** (**προσδέχομαι** not only of expectation, but of reception: so in ref., *οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν*. So Chrys. and Thl. here, *τὸ προσεδέξασθε τὴν ἑκούσιον αὐτῶν ὑπομονὴν δηλοῖ*) **with joy the plundering of your goods** (so reff.: in Luke viii. 3, we have *τὰ ὑπάρχοντά τινι*. Bleek quotes *ἁρπαγὰς ὑπαρχόντων* from Polyb. iv. 17. 4), **knowing that ye have for yourselves** (*ἑαυτοῖς* dat. commodi) **a better possession** (reff.: a word of St. Luke's) **and abiding** (*τί ἐστι μένουσαν; βεβαίαν, οὐχ οὕτως ἀπολλυμένην ὥσπερ ταύτην* [cf. Matt. vi. 20]). **35—39.**] *Hortatory conclusion*, enforced by (ver. 36) the need of endurance, which itself is recommended by the assurance of the speedy coming of the Lord, and the knowledge that we are not of the number of the backsliders, but of those who live by that faith by which our hope is substantiated. **35.**] **Cast not away therefore** (it is better to keep the active, *intentional* sense of **ἀποβάλλω**, *to cast away*, than to take the accidental and involuntary sense, 'lose not,' with the vulg., "nolite amittere." This latter sense is common enough, e. g. Herod. viii. 65, *τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν κινδυνεύσει βασιλεὺς ἀποβαλέειν*: see many more examples in Bleek: and Dio Chrys. (in Wetst.) xxxiv. p. 425, *ἐὰν γὰρ ἀλόγως ἐνίοτε ἐγκαλεῖν δόξητε καί τις ὑμῶν περιγένηται, ... δέδοικα μὴ τελέως ἀποβάλητε τὴν παῤῥησίαν.* But seeing that we have such expressions as *κατέχειν τὴν παῤῥησίαν*, ch. iii. 6, it is more probable that the other meaning is intended. So in ref. Mark: so Ælian, Var. Hist. x. 13, *τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀπέβαλλεν*, &c.) **your confidence** (on the subjective sense of **παῤῥησία**, see ch. iii. 6, note), **the which** (**ἥτις**, not **ἥ**. The simple relative would predicate what follows of the one preceding individual antecedent only, whereas *ἥτις* predicates it of a whole class of which that antecedent is one. The Latin '*quippe*

[z] μισθαποδοσίαν. [36] [a] ὑπομονῆς γὰρ [b] ἔχετε [b] χρείαν, ἵνα τὸ [c] θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ [c] ποιήσαντες [de] κομίσησθε τὴν [ef] ἐπαγγελίαν. [37] [g] ἔτι γὰρ [ghi] μικρὸν [ik] ὅσον [k] ὅσον [l] ὁ [m] ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ [n] χρονιεῖ. [38] [o] ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως

z ch. ii. 2. xi. 26 only. (-δότης, ch. xi. 6.) a Luke viii. 15. Rom. ii. 7. Col. i. 11. ch. xii. 1. James i. 3, 4. 2 Pet. i. 6. Rev. i. 9 al. Ezra x. 2. b ch. v. 12 reff. c ver. 7. d ch. xi. 19 al. e ch. xi. 39. f ch. iv. 1 reff. g John xiii. 33. xiv. 19. Exod. xvii. 4. h as above (g). Matt. xxvi. 39, 73. John xvi. 16—19. 1 Cor. xi. 1, 16 only. i Isa. xxvi. 20. k here only. τί οὐκ ἀπεκοιμήθημεν ὅσον ὅσον στίλην, Aristoph. Vesp. 213. l Hab. ii. 3, 4. m see Matt. xi. 3 (& note) al. n Matt. xxiv. 48. xxv. 5. Luke i. 21. xii. 45 only. Isa. xiv. 1 (xiii. 22). o Rom. i. 17 & Gal. iii. 11, from Hab. ii. 4.

36. χρειαν bef εχετε ℵ[1]. κομισασθαι (sic) ℵ.
37. [for οσον οσον ο, οθεν D-gr.] χρονισει [D[1]]ℵ[1].
38. rec om 1st μου (see note), with D[3]KL[P] Frag-mosq[2] rel [syrr æth] copt Chr_1 [Eus_1 Euthal-ms $Thdrt_{h.l.}$ Damasc]: ins Aℵ Frag-mosq[1] vulg arm $Clem_1$ $Thdrt_1$ Sedul Primas, and (after πιστεως, as LXX-Bℵ) D[1] syrr Eus_1.

quæ' expresses it well: 'being of such sort, as . . .') hath (*present*, although the reward is future: hath, set down over against it: possesses in reversion) **great recompense of reward** (see on **μισθαποδοσία**, ch. ii. 2, note; also reff.). **36.] For** (justification of the foregoing μὴ ἀποβάλητε κ.τ.λ.) **of endurance** (**ὑπομονῆς** is placed first, carrying the main emphasis. "Paulatim," says Bengel, "Apostolus ab hoc versu ad 38 prophetam inducit." For in Hab. ii. 2, 3, the whole passage runs thus: ἐὰν ὑστερήσῃ, ὑπόμεινον αὐτόν· ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ. ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου (μου ἐκ πίστεως A) ζήσεται) **ye have need, that ye may do the will of God and receive the promise** (the aor. part., preceding an aor. verb, is often contemporary with it in time, and so requires to be rendered in English by a synchronous tense, as in the case of ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, he answered and said. And thus it certainly ought to be taken here. No endurance or patience would be wanted, when they had done the will of God, to receive the promise; because such interval as should elapse between their ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ in this sense, and κομίσασθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, would be not here, but in the intermediate state. But that which they really do want ὑπομονή for is that they may δοκιμάζειν τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον, and thus receive the promise: see ch. xiii. 21. **ἐπαγγελία**, as in reff., not the *word* of promise, but the substance of the promise, the promise in its fulfilment. **κομίζεσθαι**, reff., of gathering a reward, or a prize from a contest, see Eur. Hipp. 432, δόξαν ἐσθλὴν κομίζεται: Thuc. iii. 58, σώφρονα ἀντὶ αἰσχρᾶς κομίσασθαι χάριν). **37, 38.]** *Encouragement* to this endurance, by the fact of the time being short, and at the same time further proof of the necessity of it by God's renunciation of him that draws back: all from the same prophecy of Habakkuk. **37.] For yet a little little while** (this expression is not in Habakkuk, but is found in ref. Isa., ἀποκρύβηθι μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου, to which the Writer probably alludes. **μικρόν** is the accus. neut.: some (Lün., Del.) say, an independent nominative, referring to John xiv. 19; xvi. 16; but neither of those places determines the case. **ὅσον** is often joined to adjectives and nouns, &c., which denote size, to give a certain definiteness to the idea: so μικρὸν ὅσον, Lucian Hermot. 60; ὀλίγον ὅσον, ib. p. 62: and among other places in Wetst. and Loesner, we have the ὅσον repeated in ref.: in Arrian, Indic. 29, ὀλίγοι δὲ αὐτῶν σπείρουσιν ὅσον ὅσον τῆς γῆς: cf. Hermann on Viger, p. 726: Winer, § 36. 3, note. It gives the sense of very small, "aliquantillum" as Hermann expresses it: τὸ δὲ ὅσον ὅσον τὸ πάνυ μικρὸν δηλοῖ, Thl.), **He that is coming** (the solemn prophetical **ὁ ἐρχόμενος**, 'He that is to come:' see reff. There is no art. in the LXX, and ἐρχόμενος refers to the vision, or as αὐτόν and ἐρχόμενος in the masc. after ὅρασις, both are naturally referred to some one indicated by the ὅρασις; and ἐρχόμενος ἥξει, "coming it will come," is paraphrased into ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει, 'He that is coming shall come.' So Bengel: "Apostolus, articulo addito, verba prophetæ eleganter flectit ad Christum") **shall come, and shall not tarry. 38.]** *Continuation of the paraphrase:* the two clauses of Hab. ii. 4 being transposed. In the original it runs as in E. V.: "Behold his soul (which) is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith:" or, an ambiguity extending to all three places where the saying is quoted, here, and reff. Rom., Gal., "The just by his faith, shall live." But the other is more probable: see, on all points regarding the Hebrew text, Delitzsch's note. The transposition is apparently made on

ζήσεται, καὶ ἐὰν [p] ὑποστείληται, οὐκ [q] εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου [q] ἐν αὐτῷ. [39] ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν [r] ὑποστολῆς εἰς [t] ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ [s] πίστεως εἰς [u] περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.

XI. [1] [v]Ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων [v] ὑπόστασις, [w] πραγ-

p Acts xx. 20, 27. Gal. ii. 12 only. Job xiii. 8.
q Matt. iii. 17 ‖. xvii. 5. 1 Cor. x. 5. 2 Cor. xii. 10. (2 Thess. ii. 12.) 2 Kings xxii. 20.
r here only.
s gen., Luke ix. 55 v. r. Acts ix. 2. ch. xii. 11.
t Heb., here only. = Rom. ix. 22. Phil. i. 28. iii. 19 al.
u 1 Pet. ii. 9 reff.
v ch. iii. 14 reff.
w = ch. vi. 18. x. 1.

...ψυχη μου Frag. Mosq. ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

2nd μου bef η ψυχη D[1.3]. 39. απωλιας ℵ[1].

purpose, to prevent ὑποστείληται being understood to refer to ἐρχόμενος as its subject. **But my just man** (there is much controversy about **μου**, whether to insert it, and where to insert it. On the whole I agree with Bleek, that the position after δίκαιος, which is found in the LXX-A, was most probably that adopted by our Writer. This, being different from many copies of the LXX, would naturally be altered: and St. Paul's citations not having μου, it would naturally be omitted from our copies here. Delitzsch's reason for omitting it, that because our Writer quotes as St. Paul in ver. 30, he probably does here also, is in fact a depriving of that fact of all its real interest. Placed as in our text, **μου** will point out that man who is just before God, who belongs to God's people) **shall live by faith**: and (this **καί** has no place in the LXX, the first clause, here put last, being there asyndetous) **if he** (i. e. the δίκαιος, as Delitzsch very properly insists: not τις understood, nor ἄνθρωπος taken out of δίκαιος, but, in the true spirit of this whole cautionary passage, the very man himself who was justified, and partakes of the Christian life, by faith. The possibility of such a fall is, as he observes, among the principal things taught us by this Epistle) **draw back** (cf. ref. Gal., note. The middle and passive of **ὑποστέλλω** have usually an accus. of the object of fear: so Dinarchus contra Demosth. p. 11, τῆς ἐξ ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆς οὔτε τὴν Δημοσθένους οὔτε Δημάδου δύναμιν ὑποστειλαμένης: Demosth. p. 630, μηδὲν ὑποστελλόμενον μηδ' αἰσχυνόμενον. But sometimes it is absolute, as here: so Eur. Orest. 606, ἐπεὶ θρασύνῃ κοὐχ ὑποστέλλῃ λόγῳ. See several more instances in Kypke), **my soul** (τίνος ἡ ψυχή; τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς γραφῆς, ὡς τό, τὰς ἑορτὰς ὑμῶν μισεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου (Isa. i. 14), ἢ τοῦ χριστοῦ. The former reference is doubtless right, not the latter, nor that given by Calvin, "Perinde accipiendum est, ac si ex suo sensu Apostolus proferret hanc sententiam") **hath not pleasure in him** (for construction see reff.). 39.] Here again he returns from that which is threatening in appearance to that which is encouraging and reassuring. **But we** (emphatic; bringing with it, in its mention, all that we are as Christians and that God has made us: you and I, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, ch. iii. 1) **are not of backsliding** (there is no ellipsis after ἐσμέν, as υἱοί, or τέκνα: the gen. of category is common enough: see Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 165, who gives many examples. ὑποστολή takes up ὑποστείληται above. The word is found in Josephus, in several places: Kypke quotes οὐδεμίαν ὑποστολὴν ποιοῦνται κακοηθείας, and λάθρα τὰ πολλὰ καὶ μεθ' ὑποστολῆς ἐκακούργησε: but both his references, as well as those given by Bleek, are wrong. He also quotes from Plutarch, Moral. p. 501, ὅτε μάλιστα δεῖται ὑπομονῆς κ. σιωπῆς κ. ὑποστολῆς ὁ ἄνθρωπος) **unto** (as its result: so Rom. vi. 19 bis, εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, εἰς ἁγιασμόν) **destruction** (in St. Paul's sense: see reff.: the verb **ἀπόλλυμαι** is equally foreign to this Epistle, only occurring in the citation, ch. i. 11), **but of faith unto (the) preservation of (the) soul** (see on **περιποίησις**, note, 1 Thess. v. 9. But Delitzsch is right when he warns us against interpreting **περιποίησιν ψυχῆς** simply by περιπ. ζωῆς or σωτηρίας. "The soul (ψυχή) is the subject of life and salvation. Faith saves the soul, by linking it to God, the living One. The unbelieving man loses his soul: for not being God's, neither is he his own: all that his personality has in itself and round itself, is fallen under wrath and the powers of wrath").

CHAP. XI.]—'We are of FAITH,' concluded the last chapter. And now this great word comes before the mind of the Writer for its *definition*, its *exemplification*, its *triumphs*. By this, all the servants of God from the first have been upheld, and stimulated, and carried through their glorious course. By this exemplification the Writer evermore warmed and carried forward breaks out at last into a strain of sublime eloquence, in which he gathers together in one the many noble deeds of faith which time and space would not allow of his specifying severally.

1.] **Now Faith is** (the rec. text has a

μάτων [x] *ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων.* 2 [y] *ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ* [z] *ἐμαρ-*

x here (2 Tim. iii. 16 v. r.) only. Job xiii. 6. y = 1 Tim. v. 10. 2 Cor. viii. 20. z pass., ch. vii. 8 reff.

comma after *πίστις*, thus throwing the stress upon *ἔστιν*, and making it mean either, "Now there is a faith, which is" &c., or "Now faith really exists, being" &c. And the alleged ground for this arrangement is, that the ordinary rendering, "Now faith is," would require *πίστις δέ ἐστιν*, or *ἡ δὲ πίστις ἐστίν*. But this argument is nugatory. *ἔστιν* at the opening of the sentence does, it is true, often indicate emphatically absolute existence, e.g. ch. iv. 13: Acts xiii. 15: 1 Cor. viii. 5; xv. 44 al. fr. (in Del.); but frequently it is the mere logical copula, with a certain emphasis on it, carrying a strong affirmation or negation of the truth of the subsequent predication. See Delitzsch here, and Winer, § 7. 3. So that our Writer does not say, 'There is a faith, which is . . . . ,' nor 'Faith has a real existence, being . . . . ,' but he describes that *πίστις* to which in ch. x. 39 he had stated us to belong. And this word 'describes' is perhaps more strictly correct than 'defines:' for the words which follow are not a definition of that in which faith consists, but of that which faith serves as and secures to us. A *definition* would approach rather from the side of the subjective phænomena of faith. Yet when speaking broadly and not strictly, we may well call this the definition of faith: and nearly so Thomas Aquinas (in Del.), "Respondeo dicendum, quod licet quidam dicant prædicta Apostoli verba non esse fidei definitionem, quia definitio indicat rei quidditatem et essentiam, tamen, si quis recte consideret, omnia, ex quibus potest fides definiri, in prædicta descriptione tanguntur, licet verba non ordinentur sub forma definitionis." Delitzsch compares several forms of similar definitions in Philo, e.g. *ἔστι δὲ στεναγμὸς σφόδρα καὶ ἐντεταμένη λύπη* (Leg. Alleg. iii. 75, vol. i. p. 129): *ἔστι δὲ εὐχὴ αἴτησις ἀγαθῶν παρὰ θεοῦ* (Quod Deus Immut. 19, p. 285): *ἔστι γὰρ φιλοσοφία ἐπιτήδευσις σοφίας, σοφία δὲ ἐπιστήμη θείων κ. ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτιῶν* (De Congr. Quær. Erud. Gr. 14, p. 530): and an appositional one of faith itself, De Conf. Ling. 9, p. 409, where it is said to be *ἡ ὀχυρωτάτη καὶ βεβαιοτάτη διάθεσις*, and, De Migr. Abr. 9, p. 442, he says of faith, *ἀρτηθεῖσα γὰρ καὶ ἐκκρεμασθεῖσα ἐλπίδος χρηστῆς, καὶ ἀνενδοίαστα νομίσασα ἤδη παρεῖναι τὰ μὴ παρόντα, διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὑποσχομένου βεβαιοτάτην πίστιν, ἀγαθὸν τέλειον, ἆθλον εὕρηται.* It was this passage apparently which led Jerome to make the remark which Grotius quotes in his note on James ii. 23, "Quæ si quis recte consideret, inveniet optime concurrere cum eo quod Scriptor ad Hebræos, *Philoneum aliquid spirans* ut Hieronymo videtur, scripsit, *ἔστι δὲ πίστις κ.τ.λ.*" Notice that it is of *faith* in general, *all* faith, not here of faith in God in particular, that the Writer is speaking: and *πίστις* is anarthrous, as throughout the chapter) **confidence** (there has been much difference concerning the meaning of *ὑπόστασις*. The ancients for the most part understand it here as "substantia" (so vulg.), substance, the real and true essence: faith gives reality to things not yet seen, so that they are treated as veritably present. So e.g. Chrys., *ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι ἀνυπόστατα εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἡ πίστις ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεται· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ χαρίζεται ἀλλ' αὐτό ἐστιν οὐσία αὐτῶν· οἷον ἡ ἀνάστασις οὐ παραγέγονεν οὐδέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐλπὶς ὑφίστησιν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ψυχῇ*: Thdrt., *δείκνυσιν ὡς ὑφεστῶτα τὰ μηδέπω γεγενημένα*: Œc., *πίστις ἐστὶν αὐτὴ ἡ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία τῶν ἐλπιζομένων πραγμάτων· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἀνυπόστατά ἐστιν ὡς τέως μὴ παρόντα, ἡ πίστις οὐσία τις αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπόστασις γίνεται, εἶναι αὐτὰ καὶ παρεῖναι τρόπον τινὰ παρασκευάζουσα διὰ τοῦ πιστεύειν εἶναι*: Thl., *οὐσίωσις τῶν μήπω ὄντων καὶ ὑπόστασις τῶν μὴ ὑφεστώτων*: Ambr. (De Pœnit. ii. 3 (15), vol. ii. p. 419), Aug. (In Joann. Tract. lxxix. 1, vol. iii. pt. ii.), Vatablus ("rerum quæ sperantur essentia"), H. Steph. ("illud quod facit ut jam exstent, quæ sperantur"), Schlichting, Bengel, Heinrichs, Bisping, al. Others have rendered it "*fundamentum*:" so Faber Stap., Erasm.(paraphr.), Calvin, Beza ("illud quo subsistunt"), Clarius, Stein, Sykes, Carpzov, al. On the other hand the majority of modern Commentators have preferred the meaning which *ὑπόστασις* bears in ch. iii. 14, where see note: viz. "confidence." So Luther, Camero, Grotius, Hammond, Wolf, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al. And there can be no reasonable doubt, that this is the true rendering here. Thus only do the two descriptions given correspond in nature and quality: and thus only does *ὑπόστασις* itself answer to what we might expect by *ἐλπιζομένων* being used and not some word like *ἀνυποστάτων*. The one being subjective in both these cases of parallel, it is but reasonable that the other should be also. Delitzsch, as usual when any psycho-

τυρήθησαν οἱ [a] πρεσβύτεροι. [3] Πίστει [b] νοοῦμεν [c] κατηρ-

a = Matt. xv. 2 ‖ only.
b = Matt. xxiv. 15. Rom. i. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 7. Prov. i. 2, 6.
c = Rom. ix. 22. Ps. lxxiii. 16. lxxxviii. 37.

logical question arises, has gone into this matter at great length, and his note should by all means be read. He compares a very remarkable passage of Dante, Paradiso, xxiv. 52—81) **of things hoped for** (the old Latin versions were certainly wrong in rendering **ἐλπιζομένων** "*sperantium.*" But, granting that it is neuter, a question arises as to the arrangement of the word *πραγμάτων*, whether it belongs to *ἐλπιζομένων* or to *οὐ βλεπομένων*. Chrys., Œc., the vulg., Calvin in his version, Estius, Böhme, al. join it with the former: Thl., Ambrose, Aug., Faber Stap., most of the Commentators, and, as Bleek believes, all the editions, with the latter. And for two reasons, this seems to be the right connexion. It preserves the rhythm better, which otherwise would halt, by the second clause being so much shorter than the first,—and it is more likely that *πραγμάτων*, indicating as it does rather material objective facts than objects of hope, should be joined with the objective *οὐ βλεπομένων*, than with the subjective *ἐλπιζομένων*), **demonstration** (another dispute has arisen, about the meaning of **ἔλεγχος**. From *ἐλέγχειν*, to *convict*, or *convince*, of persons,—to *prove* or *demonstrate*, of things, comes *ἔλεγχος*, *conviction*, or *proof:* Aristot. Rhet. ad Alex. c. 14, *ἔλεγχος δέ ἐστιν ὃ μὲν μὴ δυνατὸς ἄλλως ἔχειν ἀλλ' οὕτως ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν.* So the vulg. has rendered "*argumentum,*"—Aug., Prosper., Mutianus, "*convictio,*"—Calvin, "*demonstratio*" or "*evidentia*" ("evidence," E. V.), Hammond (and similarly Luther), "*firma persuasio.*" Chrys. says, *βαβαί, οἵᾳ ἐχρήσατο λέξει εἰπὼν ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων· ἔλεγχος γὰρ λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν λίαν ἀδήλων* (but the reading of the best mss. and of the Benedictine edn. is *δήλων*)· *ἡ πίστις τοίνυν ἐστὶν ὄψις τῶν ἀδήλων, φησί, καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖς ὁρωμένοις φέρει πληροφορίαν τὰ μὴ ὁρώμενα:* Œc., *ἀπόδειξις τῶν οὐ βλεπομένων· ἀποδεικνυσι δὲ ὁρατὰ τὰ ἀόρατα ἡ πίστις· πῶς; τῷ νῷ καὶ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν ὁρῶσα τὰ μὴ φαινόμενα:* Thl., *ἔλεγχος, τουτέστι δεῖξις καὶ φανέρωσις ἀδήλων πραγμάτων· ποιεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα βλέπεσθαι τῷ νῷ ἡμῶν ὡς παρόντα.* The old Latin version in D renders most strangely, "*accusator non videntium.*" The modern Commentators are divided: some have taken the subjective sense of *conviction,—inward persuasion of the truth of:* so Menken, Bleek, De W., Lünem. But, as Tholuck remarks, this sense of the word is hardly borne out by usage. And therefore we seem driven back on the objective meaning as referred to things, viz. *proof*, or *demonstration*. This is adopted by Bengel, Böhme, Stier, Ebrard, Hofmann, al. As far as the *sense* is concerned, both come to the same in the end. It is faith, an act of the mind, which *is* this demonstration: it is therefore necessarily subjective in its effect,—is the demonstration *to him who believes*) **of matters** (see above) **not seen** (this *πράγματα οὐ βλεπόμενα* is a much wider designation than *ἐλπιζόμενα*, embracing the whole realm of the spiritual and invisible, even to the being and essence of God Himself: see below, ver. 6; and cf. Rom. viii. 24, where St. Paul's expressions differ slightly in form from these. There is no ground whatever for saying that our Writer makes faith identical with hope. Faith is the *ὑπόστασις* of *ἐλπιζόμενα*: Hope *exists* independently of it, but derives its reality, and is ripened into confidence, by its means. And faith is the demonstration to us of that which we do not see: cf. the beautiful words of Calvin: "Nobis vita æterna promittitur, sed mortuis: nobis sermo fit de beata resurrectione, interea putredine sumus obvoluti: justi pronuntiamur, et habitat in nobis peccatum: audimus nos esse beatos, interea obruimur infinitis miseriis: promittitur bonorum omnium affluentia, prolixe vero esurimus et sitimus: clamat Deus statim se nobis adfuturum, sed videtur surdus esse ad clamores nostros. Quid fierit, nisi spei inniteremur, ac mens nostra prælucente Dei verbo ac spiritu per medias tenebras supra mundum emergeret?"). **2.] For** (q. d. 'and so high a description of faith is not undeserved, seeing that . . .' The *γάρ* does not bring in any proof of the foregoing description, only shews that faith is noble enough to be dignified with the offices just named) **in** (not, "*by,*" merely: but elemental; in the domain, or region, or matter, of: so *ἐπαινέσω ὑμᾶς ἐν τούτῳ*, 1 Cor. xi. 22: and "*vituperari in amicitia,*" in Cicero (Del.)) **this** (not *αὐτῇ*, "*it:*" but more graphic and encomiastic: in this it was, that . . .) **the elders** (i. e. not merely those who lived before us, but those ancients whom we dignify with the name of elders: cf. Philo de Abrahamo, § 46, vol. ii. p. 39, *ὁ γὰρ ἀληθείᾳ πρεσβύτερος, οὐκ ἐν μήκει χρόνου, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐπαινετῷ βίῳ θεωρεῖται:* and Thdrt., *τουτέστιν οἱ πάλαι γεγεννημένοι, οἱ πρὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ διαλάμψαντες ἅγιοι.* Bleek cites Æschin. p. 20. 4, *Ὁμήρου, ὃν ἐν τοῖς*

τίσθαι τοὺς [d] αἰῶνας [e] ῥήματι θεοῦ, [f] εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ [g] φαινο-

d = ch. i. 2 reff. e ch. i. 3. vi. 5 reff. f = 2 Cor. vii. 3. viii. 6. g κόσμος, τὸ τοῦ φαινομένου τοῦδε ἀρχέτυπον, Philo, Conf. Ling. 34, vol. i. p. 431.

πρεσβυτάτοις καὶ σοφωτάτοις τῶν ποιητῶν εἶναι τάττομεν. So also *οἱ πατέρες*, see Rom. ix. 5: Heb. i. 1) **were testified of** (so reff. In this absolute usage, it is of course implied, that the testimony was a good one. The usage is principally that of St. Luke, Acts vi. 3; x. 22; xvi. 2; xxii. 12. There is no need with Bleek and Lünem. to separate the verb from *ἐν ταύτῃ*, and supply after 'hac in fide,' "*constituti*" or the like: see on the construction above).

3.] The Writer now begins his series of examples of the power of faith. But instead of opening them with the example of our first parents, which he probably passes over as not sufficiently recorded in Scripture, he adduces the great and primary postulate of faith which has regard to a fact contemporaneous indeed with them, and holding this first chronological place in the series: viz. the creation of the world itself. **By faith** (*πίστει* is the instrumental dative, nearly = *διὰ πίστεως*, with which indeed it is interchanged in ver. 33) **we perceive** (see ref. Rom., where the verb is used in the same sense of intellectual perception, *τὰ ἀόρατα* of God being the *νοούμενα*. The world itself, and the things therein, *καθορᾶται* by us: but the fact of its creation by God *νοεῖται*, with our rational or spiritual faculties) **the ages** (see note on ch. i. 2, where I have maintained that the expression *οἱ αἰῶνες* includes in it all that exists under the conditions of time and space, together with those conditions of time and space themselves, conditions which do not bind God, and did not exist independently of Him, but are themselves the work of His word. Chrys. here replaces **τοὺς αἰῶνας** in his paraphrase by *τὰ πάντα*, the universe. Since writing the note above referred to, I have seen Delitzsch's commentary, which strongly maintains the mere material sense of *οἱ αἰῶνες*, but not to me convincingly) **to have been framed** (so E. V. for **κατηρτίσθαι**: and we cannot perhaps do better. It is rather however, *furnished forth*, 'made to be, and to be what we find them:' see reff. Ps.) **by the word of God** (so Philo, in Del., *διὰ ῥήματος τοῦ αἰτίου ὁ σύμπας κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο*. *ῥῆμα* differs from *λόγος*, in being the *spoken word*, the command, as throughout Gen. i., whereas *λόγος* may be, as Del., the inward shaping of the thing willed, as well as its outward manifestation. Cf. Philo de Sacr. Abel et Cain, § 18, vol. i. p. 175, *ὁ γὰρ θεὸς λέγων ἅμα ἐποίει μηδὲν μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν τιθείς*. *ῥῆμα* must not here be taken for the personal word: ch. i. 2 is on a different matter), **so that** (it seems necessary here, with almost all Commentators except Hofmann, Lünem., and Delitzsch, to keep to the ecbatic *εἰς τό* as against the telic. For even granted that we have on the whole a good sense given by the telic,—that God's purpose in framing the *αἰῶνες* was that &c. (which I own I can hardly see), yet there would be two weighty reasons against admitting it here: 1. that it would be unnaturally introduced, because it is not this *purpose of God* which we apprehend by faith, but the fact which is supposed to testify to this purpose: whereas if we take the telic sense of *εἰς τό*, we must include the purpose itself in that which we apprehend: 2. that it does violence to *γεγονέναι*, which on that hypothesis ought to have been some subjective word, not, as it is now, a mere record of past fact. It would be philological labour thrown away to shew that the ecbatic sense of *εἰς τό* is legitimate. The directive force of *εἰς* may lie either in the purpose of the worker, or in the tendency of the result. Cf. esp. Luke v. 17) **not out of things apparent hath that which is seen** (i. e. the visible world) **been made** (the first and chief difficulty here is in the position of *μή*, and the conclusion which we are thence to form as to our rendering. Most of the translations (Syr., D-lat., "*ut ex non apparentibus*," vulg., "*ut ex invisibilibus*," Erasmus, Luther, al.) regard it as belonging to *φαινομένων*, and render as if it were *ἐκ τῶν μὴ φαινομένων* (so Scriv.'s a, *a secunda manu*). And so likewise Chrys. (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ ὄντα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός*), Thdrt. (*ἐξ ὄντων γὰρ δημιουργοῦσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὁ δὲ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς ἐκ μὴ ὄντων τὰ ὄντα παρήγαγε*), Œc., Thl., Faber Stap., Jac. Cappell., Estius, Calov., Heinrichs, Valcknaer, Tholuck, al. And, thus taking the construction, these render in two different ways: 1. take the *μὴ φαινόμενα* as things unseen, in contrast to the things seen; 2. as things non-existent, as contrasted with things existent. The former of these regard the assertion as meaning that God created the world out of the previously non-apparent Chaos, the "Thohu wa-Bohu" of Gen. i. 3; the latter as referring to the creation out of the ideas in the divine mind, in which (see this ably argued out in Delitzsch's Biblische Psychologie, pp. 23, 24) all creation præexisted from eternity. As against both these views it is asserted positively by

μένων τὸ βλεπόμενον [h] γεγονέναι. [4] Πίστει [i] πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ [k] παρὰ Κάϊν [l] προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ, δι' ἧς

h = John i. 3. ch. iv. 3. Gen. ii. 4. i = ch. iii. 3. Matt. vi. 25. xii. 41, 42. Mark xii. 33. (Rev. ii. 19?) k ch. i. 4 reff. l = ch. v. 1 reff.

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

CHAP. XI. 3. rec τα βλεπομενα (*change of number to suit φαινομενων*), with D^3KL rel vulg [syrr arm] Chr_2 [Thdrt Damasc]: txt A D^1(and lat) [P]ℵ 17 copt [æth] $Clem_1$ Ath_1 [Chr-2-mss_1 Euthal-ms].

Lünemann, and contended by Bleek and De Wette, that such a transposition of the negative particle is altogether impossible. Delitzsch replies that Chrys. and the Greek interpreters who so transposed it, understood their own language: and argues for the admissibility of the transposition, citing such expressions as ἡγουμένων ἀνδρῶν οὐ τῶν ἀδυνατωτάτων, Thuc. i. 5, and οὐκ ἐπὶ μεγάλοις μεγάλως διεσπουδάζετο, Arrian. Alex. vii. 23. 12, and such opinions as that of Valcknaer here, who calls it "consuetam Græcis transpositionem voculæ negantis," and Rost, § 135. 1, "If a single idea expressed by a noun is to be emphatically denied, which noun is preceded by an article or a preposition, then the particle of negation is put before the article or the preposition." And certainly it does seem difficult to deny the existence of such cases, and to say with Bleek, that no examples have been given where a μή or οὐ belonging to a participle or adjective is separated from it by a governing preposition: the only apparently applicable instance, 2 Macc. vii. 28, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός, being struck away by the Vatican reading being ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Still, if we grant the legitimacy of the inversion in cases of emphatic denial, it will remain for us to consider, whether such inversion is to be assumed here. And, I own, it seems to me quite unnecessary. The ultimate sense is in the main the same in either case; but the straightforward construction of the words gives by far the more apposite expressed meaning. In all that we see with our sense, of re-creation and reproduction, τὸ βλεπόμενον ἐκ φαινομένου γέγονεν. The seed becomes the plant: the grub the moth. But that which is above sight, viz. faith, leads us to apprehend, that this has not been so in the first instance: that the visible world has not been made out of apparent materials. On this acceptation of the construction, we need not interpret φαινόμενα otherwise than according to its plain meaning, things apparent: nor does the text stand committed to the before-mentioned præ-existence, or to any Philonian scheme of creation: being simply a negative proposition).

4.] **By faith** (see above) **Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain** (not elliptic, for παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Κάϊν: but as in reff., 'than Cain did.' But how πλείονα θυσίαν? First, there can be no doubt that the adj. must be taken not of quantity, but of quality. So Chrys., τὴν ἐντιμοτέραν λέγει, τὴν λαμπροτέραν, τὴν ἀναγκαιοτέραν: and Thdrt. and Thl., τὴν τιμιωτέραν. But how was it so? Our text answers us, πίστει. The more excellence must be looked for then rather in the disposition with which the sacrifice was offered than in the nature of the sacrifice itself. Gregory the Great (cited by Del.) says well, "Omne quod datur Deo, ex dantis mente pensatur; unde scriptum est, 'Respexit Deus ad Abel et ad munera ejus, ad Cain autem et ad munera ejus non respexit.' Neque enim sacrum eloquium dicit, respexit ad munera Abel et ad Cain munera non respexit, sed prius ait quia respexit ad Abel, ac deinde subjunxit, 'et ad munera ejus.' Idcirco non Abel ex muneribus, sed ex Abel munera oblata placuerunt." This beyond doubt is the principal ground of the πλείονα. With regard to the sacrifices themselves; with our present knowledge of type and sacrifice, many reasons might be alleged why that of Abel should be more according to God's will than that of Cain; but none of those reasons can be safely or decisively applied here. That Abel's consisted of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof—the *first and the best*, whereas Cain's was merely an offering of the fruit of the ground, perfunctory and common-place,—may be a circumstance not without weight in appreciating the term πίστει. That Abel's was an offering of slain animals, God's own appointed way, so soon after, of the sinner's approach to Him, whereas Cain's was only a gift, as if he could approach God without shedding of blood,—this may also be an important element in the term πίστει. But it would not be safe here to insist on either of these. The difference alleged by Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 141, that Abel brought the flesh of those beasts whose skin had covered his bodily nakedness,—in faith, as an offering imputing the covering of his soul's nakedness by God's grace,—is too far-fetched, and too alien from any subsequent typology of sacrifice, to be entertained for a moment), **by means of**

[m] ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι [n] δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος [o] ἐπὶ τοῖς [p] δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ. [5] Πίστει Ἐνὼχ [q] μετετέθη [r] τοῦ μὴ [st] ἰδεῖν [t] θάνατον, καὶ

m ver. 2. n Matt. xxiii. 35. see 1 John iii. 12. o = ch. viii. 1 reff. p ch. v. 1 reff. q ch. vii. 12 reff. = Gen. v. 24. Wisd. iv. 10. Sir. xliv. 16. r ch. x. 7, 9 reff. s = Acts ii. 27, from Ps. xv. 10. t Luke ii. 26. John viii. 51. see Ps. lxxxviii. 48.

4. for του θεου, τω θεω AD[1]א[1] 17 [Euthal-ms[1]]: txt D[3]KL[P]א rel vulg syrr copt [arm Clem$_1$ Chr Euthal-ms[2] Thdrt Damasc]. δια ταυτης D[1]. rec λαλειται (*perhaps a change to a more obvious meaning*, 'is spoken of:' *perhaps, with Bloomf, though not very prob, a mistake of the scribes by reason of a flourish after the* ει. *See note*), with DKL rel-harl [æth] Thdrt(*but see note*) Œc: txt A[P]א a[2] 17 [47] vulg syrr copt [arm] Clem$_1$ Orig$_1$ Ath$_1$ Chr$_3$ [Euthal-ms] Primas.

which (viz. which *faith*, not, which *sacrifice*, as Cramer: δι᾽ ἧς must apply to the same as δι᾽ αὐτῆς below, and that surely can refer to nothing but the πίστις which is the great leading idea of the chapter) **he was testified** (see above, ver. 2) **to be righteous** (when? by whom? not, by our Saviour, nor by St. John (reff.), though in both places such testimony is borne to him: but as explained in the next clause, at the time of his sacrifice, and by God Himself), **God bearing testimony upon** (in regard to: the same prep. and case, as in Gen. iv. 4, καὶ ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἀβὲλ καὶ **ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις** αὐτοῦ) **his gifts** (of what kind this testimony was, there can be little doubt. Theodotion's rendering, καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός, though wrong as a rendering, is probably right in fact. Cf. Exod. xiv. 24: 1 Kings xviii. 24, 38. Chrys. refers to this rendering, but erroneously attributes it to the Syr.: Thl. says, λέγεται δὲ ὅτι καὶ πῦρ κατελθὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀνήλωσε τὴν θυσίαν, καὶ ἐκ τούτου καὶ ὁ Κάϊν ἐπέγνω ὅτι προετιμήθη ὁ Ἀβέλ. πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως; διὸ καί τις τῶν μεταθεμένων τὴν Ἑβραΐδα εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν οὕτως ἔθηκεν, Ἐπέβλεπεν ἐπὶ τὰς θυσίας Ἀβὲλ ὁ κύριος καὶ ἐνέπρησε. Œc. also mentions the report); **and by means of it** (his faith, again, not, as Œc., al., his sacrifice: see above) **having died** (join together, not δι᾽ αὐτῆς ἀποθανών, as Œc., πρόφασις γὰρ αὐτῷ γέγονεν ἡ θυσία σφαγῆς, but δι᾽ αὐτῆς λαλεῖ: see below) **he yet speaketh** (viz. as interpreted by the parallel place, ch. xii. 24, where it is said of the αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, that it κρεῖττον λαλεῖ παρὰ τὸν Ἀβέλ,—by means of his blood, of which it is said by God in Gen. iv. 10, φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρός με ἐκ τῆς γῆς. So Th. Aquinas, Galen, Ribera, Jac. Cappell., Grot., Erasm., al., Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch. The interpretation of **λαλεῖ** (and of **λαλεῖται**, so that no safe inference can be gathered as to the reading from the fact of this interpretation) has usually been as in Chrys., πῶς ἔτι λαλεῖ; τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ ζῆν σημεῖόν ἐστιν καὶ τοῦ παρὰ πάντων ᾄδεσθαι θαυμάζεσθαι καὶ μακαρίζεσθαι (see also below): Thdrt., τὸ δὲ ἔτι λαλεῖ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀοίδιμός ἐστι μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καὶ πολυθρύλλητος, καὶ παρὰ πάντων εὐφημεῖται τῶν εὐσεβῶν: Œc., λαλεῖ δὲ τῇ φήμῃ, τῇ δόξῃ, τῇ μνήμῃ: Thl., δοξαζόμενος, μνημονευόμενος λαλεῖ, ὡς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς λαλεῖ ὁρώμενος μόνον. Probably the change to the passive has been due to this interpretation, that voice seeming more naturally to express it. Some of those who read λαλεῖ, have taken it in the sense of "speaks to us to follow his example." So Chrys. in the next words to those quoted above: ὁ γὰρ παραινῶν τοῖς ἄλλοις δικαίοις εἶναι, λαλεῖ: Thl., ἡ πίστις αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν ἔτι ζῆν καὶ διδάσκαλον καθίστασθαι πᾶσι, λαλοῦντα μονονουχὶ Μιμήσασθέ με κ.τ.λ.: Corn. a-Lapide,—joining however the two,—"Pietas, martyrium et memoria adhuc recens est et celebratur apud omnes fideles eosque ad sui imitationem exhortatur melius quam si Abel mille linguis eos exhortaretur:" Valcknaer, Kuinoel, al. And perhaps Stuart may be partly right, who, recognizing the allusion to Gen. iv. 10, says, "The form of expression only in our verse seems to be borrowed from Gen. iv. 10; for here it is the *faith* of Abel which makes him speak after his death; viz. to those who should come after him, exhorting and encouraging them to follow his example." I say *partly* right, for however this may be in the background, the cry of his blood is obviously primary in the Writer's thought, from ch. xii. 24, where the voice of Abel is contrasted with that of the Christian blood of sprinkling. Calvin and Delitzsch appear to have exactly hit the right point, in saying, "Porro singulare divini erga eum amoris hoc testimonium fuit, quod Deus curam habuit mortui: atque inde patet reputari inter Dei sanctos, quorum mors illi pretiosa est").

5, 6.] The *example of Enoch: and axiomatic declaration upon it.*

5.] **By faith** (πῶς δὲ πίστει μετετέθη; ὅτι τῆς μεταθέσεως ἡ εὐαρέστησις αἰτία, τῆς δὲ εὐαρεστήσεως ἡ πίστις. Chrys.)

οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, διότι [q] μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός. πρὸ γὰρ τῆς [u] μεταθέσεως [m] μεμαρτύρηται [v] εὐαρεστηκέναι τῷ θεῷ. [6] χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον [v] εὐαρεστῆσαι· πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν [w] προςερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι ἐστίν, καὶ τοῖς [x] ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν [y] μισθαποδότης γίνεται. [7] Πίστει [z] χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν [a] μηδέπω βλεπομένων [b] εὐλαβηθεὶς [c] κατεσκεύασεν [d] κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ,

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

u ch. vii. 12. xii. 27 only †. 2 Macc. xi. 24 only.
v here bis, ch. xiii. 16 only. Gen. l. c. vi. 9 al. (-τος, Wisd. iv. 10.)
w ch. iv. 16. vii. 25. x. 1, 22.
x Acts xv. 17, from Amos ix. 12. Rom. iii. 11, from Ps. xiii. 2.
y here only †. (-δοσία, ch. ii. 2.)
z = ch. viii. 5 reff.
a here only.
b here (Acts xxiii. 10 v. r.) only ‡. Prov. xxx. (see xxiv.) 5. Deut. ii. 4.
c Matt. xi. 10 ‖ L. Mark i. 2. Luke i. 17. ch. iii. 3, 4 bis. ix. 2, 6. 1 Pet. iii. 20 only. Num. xxi. 27.
d = 1 Pet. iii. 20. Matt. xxiv. 38. Luke xvii. 27 (ch. ix. 4. Rev. xi. 19) only. Gen. vi. 14 al.

5. (ηυρισκ., so ADℵ.) for διοτι, οτι ℵ[1]. μετετεθηκεν D[2.3]Lℵ[1] d [Euthal-ms]. rec aft μεταθεσεως ins αυτου, with D[3]KLℵ[3] rel syr [(Syr) arm Chr[1] Thdrt Damasc]: om AD[1][P]ℵ[1] 17 [47] latt copt [Euthal-ms]. (ευαρεστηκεναι, so AKL o 17 [47] Thl.)
6. om τω D[2]ℵ[1] [k] 17.

Enoch was translated, not to see death (cf. LXX, Gen. v. 24, after which this verse is framed: *καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνὼχ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκετο ὅτι* (ηὑρ. διότι A) *μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός.* **μετετέθη**, as in reff., by a sudden disappearance from this earth: *οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο*, cf. the similar expression of Livy i. 16, in relating the supposed disappearance of Romulus in the storm, "nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit." This translation was hardly, as Calvin, "mors quædam extraordinaria," though he means this in no rationalistic sense, as is plain from his accompanying remarks:—but rather a change which passed upon him altogether without death, from corruptibility to incorruptibility, from the natural body to the spiritual. The **τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν** is purpose and purport in one. The construction, after a sentence and in relation to it, is said by Winer, § 44. 4. *b*, to be chiefly familiar, in the N. T., to St. Luke and St. Paul. See reff.), **and was not found** (see above), **because God translated him. For before his translation a testimony is given to him** (the perfect implies the continued existence of the testimony in the text of Scripture) **that he hath pleased God** (on *εὐηρ.* and *εὐαρ.* see Winer, § 12. 3. *b*. The temporal augment, usual after *εὐ-* and *δυς-*, is omitted in the *κοινὴ διάλεκτος*): 6.] **but apart from faith it is impossible** (it is a general axiom, not a mere assertion regarding Enoch; if it were, we should expect *ἀδύνατον* (*ἦν*) *αὐτῷ*) **to please** (Him, as is evident) **at all** (this sense of doing a single act well pleasing to God, is given by the aorist: cf. Rom. viii. 8, *οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται.* The aor. expresses simply the verbal idea without reference to time; and therefore when in a negative sentence gives the exclusive meaning 'at any time,' 'at all'): **for it behoves him that cometh to God** (Luther, al. render, "him that will come:" but it is much more probable that **ὁ προσερχόμενος** is the habitual, official present—'the comer to God.' For the expression, see reff. It is that approach which is elsewhere designated *ἐγγίζειν τῷ θ.*, ch. vii. 19,—for the purposes of worship or of communion, or of trust, or service generally) **to believe** (aor., not *πιστεύειν*, because it is not here the state in which the comer is at his coming, but the state which has originated his coming, of which that coming is the fruit, which is insisted on) **that He is** (exists: his faith being to him thus a *πράγματος ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένου*), **and becomes** (is eventually: 'evadit') **a renderer of reward** (ch. ii. 2) **to them that seek Him out** (*ἐκζητέω*, more than *ζητέω*, as 'exoro' than 'oro.' Thus his faith is also to him an *ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις*: God's existence is realized to him by it, and by it his future reward assured). 7.] *Example of* Noah. Gen. vi. 8 ff. **By faith, Noah, having been warned** (viz. by God, Gen. vi. 13 ff. On the word, see note ch. viii. 5) **concerning the things not yet seen** (these words belong to *χρηματισθείς*, not to *εὐλαβηθείς*, as Erasm.(vers.) and Grotius. The latter asserts that *εὐλαβεῖσθαι περί τινος* occurs in Plato; but the passage appears to be Legg. xi. p. 927 c, *εὐλαβούμενον περὶ τροφήν τε καὶ παιδείαν ὀρφανῶν*, and it is asserted by others that *εὐλαβεῖσθαι περί τινος* is not found. Still it might surely be legitimate: we have *εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἀμφί τινι* in Lucian, Gall. 21. But the other arrangement is more rhythmical, and more obvious), **taking forethought** (see, on ch. v. 7, the distinction made by the Stoics, Diog. Laert. vii. 63: *φοβηθήσεσθαι μὲν τὸν σοφὸν οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλ' εὐλαβηθήσεσθαι· εὐλάβειαν εἶναι*

δι' ἧς [e] κατέκρινεν τὸν [f] κόσμον, καὶ [g] τῆς [g] κατὰ πίστιν [g] δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο [h] κληρονόμος. [8] Πίστει [i] καλούμενος

e = Matt. xii. 41, 42 || L. Wisd. iv. 16. f = ver. 38. James i. 27. 2 Pet. ii. 5. elsw., John passim. g κατά, here only. ἐκ, Rom. x. 6. διά, & ἐπί, w. dat., Phil. iii. 9. simple gen., Rom. iv. 11, 13. h ch. i. 2 reff. i ch. v. 4 reff.

8. ins ο bef καλουμενος AD[1] 17 arm Thdrt, *qui vocatur* latt.

ἐναντίαν τῷ φόβῳ, οὖσαν εὔλογον ἔκκλισιν. Many interpret it, "fearing God," understanding θεόν: and most, "fearing," but the above distinction is important) **prepared** (so 1 Pet. iii. 20; the LXX in Gen. vi. 15 have ποιεῖν) **the ark** (not "*an* ark:" see 1 Pet. l. c. The word **κιβωτός** had become appropriated to the well-known ark, and so was used anarthrously) **for the preservation of his house** (cf. Philo de Abr. § 8, vol. ii. p. 8, μόνος δὲ εἷς οἶκος, ὁ τοῦ λεχθέντος ἀνδρὸς δικαίου καὶ θεοφιλοῦς, διασώζεται); **by means of which** (to what does **ἧς** refer? to σωτηρίαν, to κιβωτόν, or to πίστει? Certainly not to the former: for thus Noah's σωτηρία would be the inheriting of the righteousness which is by faith. Possibly, to κιβωτόν (so Chrys., Œc., Thl., Faber Stap., Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappell., Grot., Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Bisping, al.); for it was by the building of it that he condemned the world in its unbelief, and by it that in some sense, as the manifested result of his faith, he became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. But it must be confessed that this latter part of the interpretation halts considerably. And on this account as well as on account of its inadequacy to the spirit of the passage, I do not hesitate, with Primas., Thomas Aquin., Luther, Cajetan, Justiniani, Wolf, Bengel, and most of the recent Commentators, to prefer πίστει as the antecedent: 'by which faith,' as above on δι' αὐτῆς, ver. 4. It is true, that πίστει here is somewhat far off; but it is the burden of the chapter, and continually before the Writer's mind, and it was by his *faith*, rather than by the results of that faith that he κατέκρινεν κ.τ.λ., and κληρ. ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.) **he condemned** (**κατέκρινεν** may be either imperfect, he condemned, while building the ark, the unbelieving world around,—or aor., he once for all condemned the unbelieving then, and in them, the world, which lies in unbelief. Better perhaps the latter. On the sense, Limborch says, "Et ille dicitur aliquem damnare, qui suo facto ostendit quid alterum oportuerit facere, et, quia non fecit, illum criminis commissi convincit, ac propterea juste puniri." See a like use in reff.) **the world** (reff.), **and became heir of the righteousness which is according to faith** (Noah is the first in Scripture who is called δίκαιος, צַדִּיק, Gen. vi. 9, as Philo, πρῶτος οὗτος δίκαιος ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀνεῤῥήθη γραφαῖς, Congr. Erud. Grat. § 17, vol. i. p. 532. Elsewhere Philo interprets the name itself of Noah thus: ἑρμηνεύεται γὰρ Νῶε ἀνάπαυσις ἢ δίκαιος, Leg. Alleg. iii. 24, p. 102: ὃς Ἑβραίων μὲν γλώττῃ καλεῖται Νῶε, τῇ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἀνάπαυσις ἢ δίκαιος, De Abr. 5, vol. ii. p. 5. See also Ezek. xiv. 14, 20, where he is named together with Daniel and Job as an example of δικαιοσύνη: and Wisd. x. 4, 6: Sir. xliv. 17: 2 Pet. ii. 5; where he is called κήρυξ δικαιοσύνης. And this righteousness, which is matter of history in the O. T., our Writer refers to his faith as its measure. So Calvin, "Moses refert illum fuisse justum: causam et radicem hujus justitiæ fidem fuisse, quia ille historice non refert, ex re ipsa apostolus testatur." This **δικαιοσύνη κατὰ πίστιν** seems to be altogether in St. Paul's sense, the righteousness which is by faith, Rom. iv. 13, though the expression itself is foreign to St. Paul. The κληρονόμος idea is also according to St. Paul. It should be noticed that the whole expression is used, in an Epistle in which righteousness by faith forms no part of the main subject, as one familiar and well known to the readers). **8—22.**] Thus far the examples have been taken from the antediluvian world. Next, he takes them from the patriarchs of Israel; with whom *the promise* was ever the object of faith: a *land*, in which they were strangers: a son, who was not yet born: a people, who were yet to be. **8.**] ABRAHAM'S *example*. **By faith Abraham, being called** (viz. by God, Gen. xii. 1 ff. With the art. (see var. read.), **ὁ καλούμενος Ἀβραάμ** can hardly mean any thing but 'he that was called, named, Abraham.' And the sense thus would be very good,—whatever Bleek and Delitzsch have said against it,—when we take into account the meaning of the name Abraham, the father of nations. That this change of name did not take place till 25 years after his removal from Haran, is no objection, but is just what would be the point raised: 'By faith, he who was (afterwards) called Abraham, father of nations' &c. Lünemann's rendering of ὁ καλούμενος, "he that was called by God," hardly requires refutation. But on the whole, I adhere to the rec. text.

'Αβραὰμ [k] ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τόπον ὃν ἔμελλεν λαμβάνειν [l] εἰς κληρονομίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν μὴ ἐπιστάμενος [m] ποῦ [n] ἔρχεται. 9 Πίστει [o] παρῴκησεν [p] εἰς [q] γῆν τῆς [q] ἐπαγγελίας ὡς [r] ἀλλοτρίαν, [s] ἐν σκηναῖς [s] κατοικήσας μετὰ 'Ισαὰκ καὶ 'Ιακὼβ τῶν [t] συγκληρονόμων [u] τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς· 10 [v] ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς [w] θεμελίους ἔχου-

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

k ch. v. 9. Matt. viii. 27 ‖. Rom. vi. 12, &c. 1 Pet. iii. 6. w. inf., here only. see note. l = Matt. viii. 4 al. fr. m elsw., = John (iii. 8 al7. 1 John ii. 11) only. n pres., John i. 40. Acts iv. 13. ix. 26. Gal. ii. 14. ver. 13. 1 Macc. vi. 9. Winer, § 40. 2. c. o Luke xxiv. 18 only. Gen. xvii. 8. xx 1. xxi. 23, 34. xxiv. 37. xxvi. 3. xxxv. 27. Exod. vi. 4. (-κος, Gen. xxiii. 4. -κησις, ib. xxviii. 4.) p constr., Mark i. 39 al. fr. q so χρόνος τ. ἐπ., Acts vii. 17. r Acts vii. 6. Luke xvi. 12. Ps. cviii. 11. s Acts xi. 29. 2 Kings xi. 11. t Rom. viii. 17. Eph. iii. 6. 1 Pet. iii. 7 only †. (-μεῖν, Sir. xxii. 26.) u so ch. vi. 17. v Acts xvii. 16. 1 Cor. xi. 33. xvi. 11. ch. x. 13. James v. 7 only ‡. Gen. xliii. 9 al. w Rev. xxi. 14, 19. Ps. lxxxvi. 1.

εις τοπον bef *εξελθ.* D latt. rec ins *τον* bef *τοπον* (*in ignorance of the usage aft a prep*), with D[3]KLℵ[3] rel [arm] Chr Thdrt Damasc: om AD[1][P]ℵ[1] 17 [Euthal-ms]. rec *ημελλεν*, with D[3]L[Pℵ Euthal-ms] Thdrt Œc: txt A[Woide] D[1]K Chr Damasc Thl. *εις κληρ.* bef *λαμβ.* ℵ[1].—om *εις* ℵ[1](insd by origl scribe or ℵ-corr[1]).

9. for *πιστει*, *και* D[1](and lat). aft *παρωκ.* ins *αβρααμ* D[3][P] m o. rec ins *την* bef *γην*, with D[1.3] rel Chr Thdrt Thl: om AD[2]KL[P]ℵ a[1] b[1] c d e g h k 17 [47 Euthal-ms] Damasc Œc. *συνκληρονομων* ADℵ 17. for *της αυτης*, *αυτου* D[1] 38: *αυτων* æth: om *της* ℵ[1]: *αυτης* bef *επαγγ.* ℵ-corr[1].

The manuscript evidence is strong for the other, but not overwhelming; and the comparison of *πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε* with *πίστει καλούμενος 'Αβραάμ* gives great support to the rec. In fairness it should be said, as Del. points out, that (*ὁ*) *καλούμενος*, appended to names, is exceedingly common with St. Luke (Luke i. 36; vi. 15; vii. 11; viii. 2; x. 39, &c.), and, as he also remarks, it may appear that Clem.-rom. read and understood this "he that was called Abraham," for he says, *'Αβραάμ ὁ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς πιστὸς εὑρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκοον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασι τοῦ θεοῦ*. Of the Greek Commentators, Thdrt. says, *τὸ ὁ καλούμενος 'Αβραάμ, διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐναλλαγὴν εἴρηκεν*: Œc., *θεοῦ καλοῦντος ὑπήκουσε, πιστεύσας ὅτι ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ καλεῖ*: Thl., *πίστει ὑπήκουσεν 'Αβραάμ, κελευόμενος ἀφεῖναι τὴν πατρίδα*) **obeyed to go out** (the infin. is epexegetic, explaining *wherein* he obeyed. Cf. Rev. xvi. 9: Col. i. 22, &c. Winer, § 44. 1) **to a** (or, 'the,' even without *τόν*, after a preposition) **place which he was hereafter to receive for an inheritance** (not that he was conscious even of this promise when he went out, for it was made to him afterwards in Canaan, see Gen. xii. 7), **and went out, not knowing where** (whither) **he was** (is) **going** (coming. The indic. *ἔρχεται* is perfectly normal, a matter of fact, not one of possibility only, being in question. Cf. *εἶδον ποῦ μένει*, ref. John: *ἐπίστασθε . . . πῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐγενόμην*, Acts xx. 18. But *οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ*, Matt. viii. 20, when the matter is one of mere possibility. See Winer, § 41. 4).

9.] **By faith he sojourned** (*παροικεῖν* in classical Greek signifies to dwell in the neighbourhood of, and is followed by a dative: so Thuc. iii. 93, *φοβούμενοι μὴ σφισι μεγάλῃ ἰσχύϊ παροικῶσιν*. Isocrates uses it in the sense of "to dwell alongside of," with another reference, and an accus.: *ἀπὸ Κνίδου μέχρι Σινώπης Ἕλληνες τὴν 'Ασίαν παροικοῦσι*, p. 74. But the Hellenistic sense is, to dwell as a stranger, to sojourn only. So LXX in reff.: so Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 54, vol. i. p. 511, *τῷ φιλαρέτῳ κατοικεῖν οὐ δίδωσιν ὁ θεός, ὡς ἐν οἰκείᾳ γῇ, τῷ σώματι, ἀλλὰ παροικεῖν ὡς ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ μόνον ἐπιτρέπει χώρᾳ*. And Confus. Ling. § 17, p. 416, *κατῴκησαν ὡς ἐν πατρίδι, οὐχ ὡς ἐπὶ ξένης παρῴκησαν*) **in** (pregnant construction, as often in St. Luke, see Acts vii. 4; viii. 40; xii. 19; xviii. 21: Luke xi. 7: he went into the land and sojourned there) **the land** (*γῆ* is one of those words which very commonly drop the article, especially when in government) **of the promise** (concerning which the promise, Gen. xii. 7, had been given) **as a stranger's** (as if it did not belong to him, but to another: see ref. Acts, which is strictly parallel, and cf. *γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ*, Gen. xv. 13), **dwelling** (the aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. before) **in tents** (cf. Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 3; xviii. 1 ff. *ὅπερ τῶν ξένων ἐστί, τῶν ἄλλοτε εἰς ἄλλο μέρος μεταβαινόντων διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τι ἴδιον*. Thl.) **with Isaac and Jacob** (Thl., Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Griesb., Lachm., al. join these words with *παρῴκησεν* above. But they more naturally belong to *ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας*, which has just preceded: for otherwise we should expect *ἐξεδέχοντο* in ver. 10) **the heirs with him of the same promise** (*τῆς ἐπ. τῆς αὐτῆς*, as

σαν [x] πόλιν, ἧς [y] τεχνίτης καὶ [z] δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός. [11] Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάῤῥα δύναμιν εἰς [a] καταβολὴν [b] σπέρ-

x ch. xiii. 14. y Acts xix. 24, 38. Rev. xviii. 22 only. = Wisd. xiii. 1. z here only †. 2 Macc. iv. 1. = Xen. Mem. i. 4. 7. Philo, passim. (-γεῖν, 2 Macc. x. 2.) a = ch. iv. 3. ix. 26 (see note) †. (2 Macc. ii. 29 only.) b = here only. Num. v. 13.

11. aft σαρρα ins η στειρα D[2] m [Euthal-ms]; στειρα D[1](and lat) vulg; στειρα ουσα [P 47] f syrr coptt [æth arm Thl].

ποιμένες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ, Luke ii. 8; the only other place where this arrangement is found. What is implied is, not so much that the promise was renewed to them, as that all three waited for the performance of the same promise, and in this waiting, built themselves no permanent abode): **10.**] **for** (reason of his παροικία in the land of promise as in a strange land) **he waited for** (the prep. in ἐκδέχομαι, as in ἐκζητέω above, ver. 6, intensifies the expectation) **the city which has the foundations** (beyond doubt, the heavenly city, the ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, thus contrasted with the frail and moveable tents in which the patriarchs dwelt. Delitzsch shows that the idea was an Old Testament one; and no other interpretation will suit the language here used. The πόλις θεοῦ ζῶντος of ch. xii. 22, and the μέλλουσα πόλις of ch. xiii. 14, must be here meant also. Of the earthly Jerusalem indeed it is said, ref. Ps., οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τοῖς ἁγίοις: but it is impossible that the earthly Jerusalem can be meant here. The lives of the dwellers in her rather corresponded to the precarious dwelling in tents than to the abiding in a permanent city: and the true reference of τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσα is to be found in ref. Rev., τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχων θεμελίους δώδεκα. As having these foundations, it forms a contrast to the tent, placed on the ground, and easily transported. Ebrard objects to this view, that it is unhistoric to say that the patriarchs looked for the heavenly city: but Del. well answers, that it is not the mere historic question, what they knew and expected, with which our Writer is concerned, but the question what it was that their faith, breaking through this knowledge in its yearnings for the future, framed to itself as matter of hope. The expectation of the literal fulfilment of a promise is one thing: the hopes and prospects and surmises built upon the character of that promise, another. The one is mere belief: the other is faith), **of which the architect and master-builder is God** (very similarly, ch. viii. 2, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος: cf. also ver. 16 below. τεχνίτης, so ref. Wisd., οὔτε τοῖς ἔργοις προσσχόντες ἐπέγνωσαν τὸν τεχνίτην. And Philo, Leg. Alleg. i. 7, vol. i. p. 47, οὐ τεχνίτης μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πατὴρ ὢν τῶν γιγνομένων: De Mut. Nom. § 4, p. 583, ὁ γεννήσας καὶ τεχνιτεύσας πατήρ: ib. (of *men*), δημιούργημα τοῦ τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν μόνου τεχνίτου. In Xen. Mem. i. 4. 7, it is said of the world, πάνυ ἔοικε ταῦτα σοφοῦ τινος δημιουργοῦ καὶ φιλοζώου τεχνήματι: and Plato, Tim. § 9, calls God δημιουργὸν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τεκταινόμενον αὐτόν. See Wetst.). **11.**] *Example of* SARAH, *whose faith worked with that of Abraham to produce Isaac.* **By faith Sarah herself also** (the καὶ αὐτή has been very variously interpreted. "Even S. who before was barren," says Schlichting: and to this view perhaps the gloss στεῖρα, or ἡ στεῖρα, or στεῖρα οὖσα, is owing (see digest): Chrys. says, ἐντρεπτικῶς ἐνταῦθα ἤρξατο, εἴ γε γυναικὸς ὀλιγοψυχότεροι φανεῖεν: and similarly Thl., Œc., al.: Bleek says, "even S. who was once incredulous:" and so De W., Winer, Lünem. But I believe Delitzsch is perfectly right in rejecting all these and falling back on St. Luke's usage of αὐτός and καὶ αὐτός, which is very frequent, as Winer remarks, § 22. 4, Remark: see Luke xx. 42, καὶ αὐτὸς Δαυείδ: xxiv. 15, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς: Acts viii. 13, ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτός: and especially καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος, Luke iii. 23: from which it appears that the words merely indicate transition from one personal subject to another, the new subject being thus thrown out into prominence) **received power for** (δύναμις εἰς is an expression of St. Luke's, Luke v. 17, δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν: the preposition indicating the direction in which the power is exercised) **the deposition of seed** (power, to fructify seed deposed. So Œc., ἐνεδυναμώθη εἰς τὸ ὑποδέξασθαι παιδοποιὸν σπέρμα. I am satisfied that this and no other is the meaning, from the fact that the expression is one so constantly used in this sense, and that the Greek reader would be sure thus to take it. No Greek Father, no ancient version, dreamt of any other meaning. So Chrys., εἰς τὸ κατασχεῖν τὸ σπέρμα, εἰς ὑποδοχὴν δύναμιν ἔλαβεν. Thl., τουτέστιν, ἐνεδυναμώθη εἰς τὸ ὑποδέξασθαι καὶ κρατῆσαι τὸ καταβληθὲν εἰς αὐτὴν σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ (giving another alt., dependent on the idea τὴν γυναῖκα οἷόν τι σπέρμα ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς συνεισάγειν and

ματος ἔλαβεν καὶ [c] παρὰ καιρὸν [d] ἡλικίας, ἐπεὶ [e] πιστὸν [f] ἡγήσατο τὸν [e] ἐπαγγειλάμενον. 12 [g] διὸ [g] καὶ ἀφ' [h] ἑνὸς ἐγενήθησαν, καὶ [i] ταῦτα [j] νενεκρωμένου, καθὼς τὰ [k] ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει, καὶ ὡς ἡ [l] ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ [m] χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ [n] ἀναρίθμητος. 13 [o] Κατὰ πίστιν

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

c = 2 Cor. viii. 3. d = Matt. vi. 27. Luke ii. 52. xii. 25. (xix. 3.) John ix. 21, 23 (Eph. iv. 13) only. Job xxix. 18. Jos. Antt. vii. 8. 4, γύναιον τὴν ἡλικίαν ἤδη προβεβηκός. e ch. x. 23 (reff.). f ch. x. 29 reff. g ch. xiii. 12. Luke i. 35. Acts x. 29. xiii. 35. xxiv. 26. Rom. i. 24. iv. 22. xv. 22 al. L.P.H. h ch. ii. 11 reff. Ezek. xxxiii. 24. i 1 Cor. vi. 8 (rec.). Xen. Anab. ii. 4. 15. j Rom. iv. 19. Col. iii. 5 only †. k Luke xxi. 25. Acts vii. 43 (from Amos v. 26). xxvii. 20 only. Exod. xxxii. 13. l Matt. vii. 26. Rom. ix. 27. Rev. xii. 18. xxii. 8 only. Gen. xxii. 17. m = here only. (ch. xiii. 15 al.) Judg. vii. 12 al. Herod. i. 180 al. "labrum fossæ," Liv. xxxvii. 37. n here only. Job xxi. 33. Prov. vii. 26. o ver. 7.

aft ελαβεν ins εις το τεκνωσαι D[1] m: simly syr. [om 2nd και D[1]-gr sah]. rec aft ηλικιας ins ετεκεν, with D[3]KL[P]ℵ[3] rel syrr [arm Chr_1 Thdrt Damasc]: om AD[1]ℵ[1] 17 latt coptt æth Chr-ms [Euthal-ms].

12. rec εγεννηθησαν, with D[2.3]Lℵ Chr Thdrt Damasc Thl: txt AD[1]K[P 17 Euthal-ms]. rec (for ως ἡ) ωσει, with (c, e sil) [Chr_1 Euthal-ms Thdrt]: txt ADKL[P]ℵ rel [Chr-ms Thl.—καθως η D[1] n]. om η παρα το χειλος D[1](and lat) æth[Tischdf].

interpreting the *καταβολή* of herself). Thdrt., *ἀπηγόρευσε γὰρ τὸν τόκον οὐ μόνον τὸ γῆρας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς μήτρας ἡ πήρωσις.* With regard to the phrase, see numerous examples in Wetst. and Bleek. Galen has, among many other passages, *τὸ τοῦ ἄῤῥενος σπέρμα τὸ καταβαλλόμενον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τοῦ θήλεως.* But this is objected to by several modern Commentators, Böhme, Stier, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., who take *καταβολή* as in *καταβολὴ κόσμου*, and *σπέρμα* the seed which should descend from her, her posterity, as in Gen. xii. 7 al. freq., and in ver. 18 and ch. ii. 16 of our Epistle. Of this meaning instances are not wanting, but all of them derive that sense from the other, and it is hardly possible, though such expressions as *καταβολὴ Ῥωμύλου* (Plut. de Fort. Rom. p. 320), *γενῶν ἀρχαὶ καὶ καταβολαί* (Plut. Vita Marc. Anton. p. 932) may occur, where the context makes it plain what is meant, that such an one as *καταβολὴ σπέρματος* should occur, so calculated to mislead, if both words had been intended in an unusual and metaphorical sense), and **that** (see Hartung, Partikellehre i. 145. His most apposite instances are in Latin: e. g. Plaut. Rud. i. 2. 33, "dabitur opera, atque in negotio:" Terent. Andr. ii. 1. 37, "ego vero, ac lubens") **beyond** (in inconsistency with, contrary to the law of) **the time of age** (proper for the *καταβολὴ σπέρματος*. So Abraham and Sarah are called *ὑπερήλικες* in Philo de Abr. § 22, vol. ii. p. 17: *ἤδη γὰρ ὑπερήλικες γεγονότες διὰ μακρὸν γῆρας ἀπέγνωσαν παιδὸς σποράν.* And Plato, Theæt. p. 149 c, has *τοῖς δι' ἡλικίαν ἀτόκοις προσέταξε*), **seeing that she esteemed Him faithful who had promised** (see ref.). 12.] *Wonderful result of this faith of Abraham and Sarah.* **Wherefore also** (*διὸ καί*, which occurs again ch. xiii. 12, is frequent in St. Luke and St. Paul, see reff.) **from one sprung there** (the reading is doubtful, but *ἐγεν. ἀπό* seems to suit better the *father*, whereas *ἐγενν. ἀπό*, 'these were born from,' would almost necessarily be said of the *mother*) **and that** (there is no foundation for Lünemann's notion, that the plur. **ταῦτα** has reference to the two circumstances, the deadness of Abraham and the unbelief of Sarah: *ταῦτα* in such sentences is perpetually the collective plural, = *τοῦτο*. Cf. Kühner, Gram. § 667 c, who gives as examples, Plato, Rep. iii. p. 404 B, Ὅμηρος . . . *ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἡρώων ἑστιάσεσιν οὔτε ἰχθύσιν αὐτοὺς ἑστιᾷ, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ τῇ Ἑλλησπόντῳ ὄντας*: Demosth. c. Phorm. Extr., *θανάτῳ ζημιώσαντες εἰσαγγελθέντα ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, καὶ ταῦτα πολίτην ὑμέτερον ὄντα*, "quamvis civis vester esset") **(from one) deadened** (past that vital power which nature requires: see ref. Rom.) **even as** (it may be asked what is the subject to *ἐγενήθησαν*? Some supply *τέκνα* or *ἔκγονοι*, see Winer, § 64. 3: but it is better to make the whole, *καθώς* to the end, the virtual subject, latent in *καθώς* = *ὡμοιωμένοι τοῖς ἄστρ. κ.τ.λ.*) **the stars of the heaven in multitude, and as the sand which is by the lip** (margin, cf. *παρὰ χεῖλος ἑκατέρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ* in ref. Herod. and Polyb. v. 14. 6; iii. 43. 8 al. fr. in index) **of the sea which is innumerable** (so ran the promises to Abraham, Gen. xiii. 16, *καὶ ποιήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς*: Gen. xv. 5, *ἀνάβλεψον δὴ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἀρίθμησον τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμῆσαι αὐτούς· καὶ εἶπεν, Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου*: and more fully Gen. xxii. 17, *πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τὴν παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης.* The comparison with the sand as indicating great number is frequently found in the

ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ [p] λαβόντες τὰς [pq] ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ [r] πόῤῥωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ [s] ἀσπασάμενοι, καὶ [t] ὁμολογήσαντες [t] ὅτι [u] ξένοι καὶ [v] παρεπίδημοί [w] εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. [14] οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες [x] ἐμφανίζουσιν ὅτι [y] πατρίδα [z] ἐπιζητοῦσιν. [15] καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης [a] ἐμνημόνευον

p ch. ix. 15. q plur., ch. vi. 12 reff. r Luke xvii. 12 only. Isa. xxxiii. 13. s so πόῤῥωθεν ἀσπάζεσθαι, Themist. Orat. xvi. p. 211 B. see note. t constr., John i. 20. 1 John iv. 15 (Acts xxiv. 14) only. u = Matt. xxv. 35, &c. Acts xvii. 21. Eph. ii. 19. 3 John 5 only. 2 Kings xv. 19. v 1 Pet. i. 1. ii. 11 only. Gen. xxiii. 4. Psa. xxxviii. 14. w pres., ver. 8 reff. x ch. ix. 24 reff. y elsw., Gospp. (Matt. xiii. 54, 57 ‖ Mk. L. John iv. 44) only. Esth. ii. 10. z Matt. vi. 32. xii. 39. Acts xii. 19. Phil. iv. 17 al. 1 Kings xx. 1. a = Acts xx. 35 al. 1 Chron. xvi. 15.

13. for λαβοντες, προσδεξαμενοι (*see note*) A: κομισαμενοι (*see ver* 39) [P]ℵ[1] 17. 23[1]. 39. 57. 71. 80 Chr-3-mss [Euthal-ms Damasc$_1$ Thl]. rec aft ιδοντες ins και πεισθεντες (with c, e sil): om ADKL[P]ℵ rel [vss gr-ff Aug$_1$]. aft ξενοι ins και παροικοι D[1](not lat).

14. ζητουσιν (*inquirere* D-lat) D[1] 109-78 Chr-ms Procop$_1$.

15. μνημονευουσιν ℵ 47. 73. 80 [Euthal-ms] Thdrt$_1$: μνημονευουσαν D[1]: εμνημονευσαν

O. T., e. g. Gen. xli. 49: Josh. xi. 4: 1 Sam. xiii. 5: 2 Sam. xvii. 11: 1 Kings iv. 29: Isa. x. 22. Cf. also Herod. i. 48, οἶδα δ' ἐγὼ ψάμμου τ' ἀριθμόν, καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης, and Pind. Olymp. ii. in fine, ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν). 13—16.] Before the Writer passes on to more examples of faith, he looks back over the patriarchal age, and gathers in one the *attributes of their faith*. 13.] In (according to, consistently with, in the course of: not this time πίστει, because their deaths were not the results of their faith, but merely according to and consistent with it) faith died these all (there is no need to say with Œc., Thl., Primas., al., ἐξῃρημένου τοῦ Ἐνώχ: the promises began with Abraham, and it is evident from the end of our verse, and from ver. 15, that the reference is solely to the patriarchs), **not having received** (the participial clause conditions and substantiates the κατὰ πίστιν .. ἀπέθανον: and for this reason it is μὴ λαβ. and not οὐ: 'as those who did not receive' &c.) **the promises** (plur., because the promise was again and again repeated to the patriarchs, see the citations from Gen. above, and add Gen. xvii. 5—8; xxvi. 3, 4; xxviii. 13, 14. The ἐπαγγελία here as so often comprehends τὸ ἐπηγγελμένον), **but having seen them from afar** (καὶ πεισθέντες, see var. readd., has come in from a gloss: so Chrys., οὗτοι πεπεισμένοι ἦσαν περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς καὶ ἀσπάσασθαι αὐτάς: Œc., καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι· πεισθέντες), **and greeted them** ("From afar they saw the promises in the reality of their fulfilment, from afar they greeted them as the wanderer greets his longed-for home even when he only comes in sight of it at a distance, drawing to himself as it were magnetically and embracing with inward love that which is yet afar off. The exclamation, 'I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord,' Gen. xlix. 18, is such an ἀσπασμός, such a greeting of salvation from afar." Delitzsch. Wetst. quotes Virg. Æn. iii. 522, "Quum procul obscuros colles humilemque viderem Italiam .... Italiam læto socii clamore salutant"), **and confessed that they were strangers and sojourners upon the earth** (this Abraham did, ref. Gen., to the children of Heth, πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγώ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν: and Jacob, Gen. xlvii. 9, to Pharaoh, αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς μοι ἃς παροικῶ κ.τ.λ. See Ps. cxviii. 19: Eccles. xii. 5: Philo de Agricult. § 14, vol. i. p. 310, τῷ ὄντι πᾶσα μὲν ψυχὴ σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν οὐρανόν, ξένην δὲ γῆν ἔλαχεν: and Confus. Ling. § 17, p. 416, διὰ τοῦτο οἱ κατὰ Μωυσῆν σοφοὶ πάντες εἰσάγονται παροικοῦντες· αἱ γὰρ τούτων ψυχαὶ στέλλονται μὲν ἀποικίαν δή ποτε τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. In Wetst., several citations are given from the classics where human life is called a παρεπιδημία. The word is found in Ælian (V. H. viii. 4) and Polybius (xxxii. 22. 4), and παρεπιδημέω and -μία often).

14.] **For** (justification of the assertion, that it was κατὰ πίστιν that they ran and finished their course, by the inference from their own confession) **they who say such things make manifest** (so Acts xxiii. 15: where see examples in Wetst. The word in this sense is pure classical Greek: cf. Plato, Soph. p. 244, ὑμεῖς αὐτὰ ἡμῖν ἐμφανίζετε ἱκανῶς, τί ποτε βούλεσθε σημαίνειν, ὁπόταν ὂν φθέγγησθε; and p. 218, ζητοῦντι καὶ ἐμφανίζοντι τί ποτε ἐστίν) **that they seek after** (in ἐπιζητέω, the preposition implies the direction of the wish or yearning) **a home** (our English word 'country,' without some possessive pronoun, does not give the idea strongly enough. Even Bleek, who might have given it, daß sie ein Vaterland suchen, has rendered, daß sie nach der Heimath suchen:—οἱ ξένους ἑαυτούς, φησίν, ὀνομάζοντες, δηλοῦσιν ὡς οὐδὲν

ἀφ᾽ ἧς [b] ἐξέβησαν, εἶχον ἂν [c] καιρὸν [d] ἀνακάμψαι· [16] νῦν δὲ [e] κρείττονος [f] ὀρέγονται, [g] τουτέστιν [h] ἐπουρανίου· διὸ οὐκ [i] ἐπαισχύνεται [j] αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς [k] θεὸς [l] ἐπικαλεῖσθαι [k] αὐτῶν· [m] ἡτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς [n] πόλιν. [17] Πίστει [o] προσενήνοχεν

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

b here only. Josh. iv. 16 al.
c w. inf., 1 Pet. iv. 17. Rev. xi. 18 al. Esth. ii. 12.
d Matt. ii. 12. Luke x. 6. Acts xviii. 21 only. Exod. xxxii. 27. Judg. xi. 39 A.
e ch. i. 4 reff.
f 1 Tim. iii. 1. vi. 10 only †. (act., Job viii. 20 Symm.)
g ch. ii. 14 reff.
h ch. iii. 1 reff.
i ch. ii. 11 reff.
j constr., Mark viii. 38 bis ‖ L. Rom. i. 16. 2 Tim. i. 8. (Isa. i. 29 Aℵ[1-3b].)
k Exod. iii. 6, 15, 16.
l inf., aft. ἐπαισχ., ch. ii. 11.
m Matt. xx. 23. xxv. 34. John xiv. 2, 3. Gen. xxiv. 14.
n ver. 10.
o ch. v. 1 reff.

17. 31 B[r] Chron₁. rec (for εξεβησαν) εξηλθον, with D[3]KLℵ[3] rel [Chr Procop₁ Thdrt], εξηλθεν o: txt AD[1][P]ℵ[1] 17 [Euthal-ms Ps-]Ath₁ Chron₁ Damasc₂. om αν D[1].

16. rec νυνι, with d e g h: txt ADK L[e sil P]ℵ rel [Ps-]Ath Chr [Euthal-ms Procop₁] Thdrt Chron₁ [Damasc]. επικαλ. αυτων bef 2nd θεος D[1](and lat) [P] 115.—καλεισθαι K: αυτους [L].

οἰκεῖον κρίνουσι τῶν παρόντων, ἀλλ᾽ ἑτέρων ἐπιθυμοῦσι πραγμάτων. Thdrt.).

15.] **And if indeed** (‘posito,’ that . . . . . : hence the indicative) **they were mindful** (see below. Bl., De W., Lünem. render it, “had made mention,” as in ver. 22. And so Del. inclines. But this would necessitate a very harsh ellipsis: If we found them making mention &c., they might have had opportunity to gratify the wish thus expressed) **of that** (home) **from which they went out, they would continually be having opportunity to return** (**ἀνακάμπτω** is neuter generally, in classical Greek also: cf. Herod. ii. 8, *ταύτῃ μὲν λῆγον ἀνακάμπτει εἰς τὰ εἴρηται τὸ ὄρος.* The two imperfects in this sentence present some little difficulty. The general rendering of dependent imperfects is as in John v. 46, *εἰ ἐπιστεύετε Μωυσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί,* “If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me.” So also in Latin: “Servi . . . . mei si me isto pacto metuerent, ut te metuunt omnes cives tui, domum meam relinquendam putarem,” Cic. in Cat. i. 7: “If my slaves feared me . . . . I should think.” But such a rendering here is out of the question, both events being past and gone: we could not say, ‘If they remembered . . . . they might have opportunity.’ It would therefore seem that the imperfects are here used not so much in their logical temporal places, as on account of the *habitual* sense which both members of the sentence are meant to convey: ‘If they were, through their lives, mindful &c., they would have through their lives,—they would continually be having, opportunities’ &c.):

16.] **but now** (as the case now is: the logical *νῦν*: see 1 Cor. xiii. 13 note, and our ch. viii. 6) **they desire** (*ὀρέγεσθαί τινος*, classical: see many instances in Wetst. on 1 Tim. iii. 1) **a better** (home), **that is, a heavenly one** (the justification of this assertion, which seems to ascribe N. T. ideas to the O. T. fathers, must be found in such sayings as that of the dying Jacob, Gen. xlix. 18, which only represent a wide class of their faithful thoughts): **wherefore God is not ashamed of them** (reff.) **to be called** (here *ἐπαισχύνεσθαι* has a double object, *αὐτούς* and *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι*. For the latter construction also see reff.) **their God** (viz. in reff. Exod. Thdrt. (not Chrys. as Bleek) says, *ὁ γὰρ τῶν δυνάμεων κύριος καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης καὶ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ποιητής, ἐρωτηθεὶς Τί ὄνομά σου, τἄλλα πάντα καταλιπὼν ἔφη Ἐγὼ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ.* From the present *ἐπαισχύνεται*, and especially from the clause which follows, it is probable, as Bleek has well remarked, that the Writer intends not merely to adduce that God did once call Himself their God, but that he is *now* not ashamed to be so called, they enduring and abiding with Him where He is: in the same sense in which our Lord adduces the same circumstance, Matt. xxii. 31 ff and ‖. See below): **for He prepared for them a city** (permanent and eternal, in contrast to the tents in which they wandered. There are two ways of understanding this clause: 1. with Schlichting, Grot., Böhme, De W., Hofmann, Delitzsch, to take the aor. as a pluperfect, “for God had prepared for them a city:” “quia Deus cœlestem illam patriam et regnum suum Abrahamo, Isaaco, et Jacobo destinavit, propterea se Deum illorum summumque patronum jure et merito appellat,” Schlicht.: 2. with Thl., al., and Bleek, *τοσοῦτον οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτούς, ἀλλ᾽ οἰκείους ἔχει, ὥστε καὶ τὴν πόλιν, ἣν ἐπεθύμουν, τὴν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἡτοίμασεν αὐτοῖς.* I would adopt a modification of this last. God is not ashamed of them, nor to be called their God: and we find proof of this not only in His thus naming Himself, but in His *preparing* for them a city: the home for which they yearned: He did not deceive their hopes, but acted as their God by verifying those hopes. Thus, and thus only, does

Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ [p] πειραζόμενος, καὶ τὸν [q] μονογενῆ [o] προσέφερεν ὁ [r] τὰς ἐπαγγελίας [s] ἀναδεξάμενος, [18] πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη [t] ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ [u] κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα· [19] [v] λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ [w] ἐκ νεκρῶν [w] ἐγείρειν δυνατὸς ὁ θεός,

p Gen. xxii 1. q Luke vii. 12. viii. 42. ix. 38. 1 John iv. 9 al. Tobit iii. 15. r plur., ch. vi. 12 reff.

s = here (Acts xxviii. 7) only +. (2 Macc. vi. 19. viii. 36 only.) t ch. vii. 17 reff. u = Rom. ix. 7, from Gen. xxi. 12. Isa. xlviii. 1. v = & constr., Rom. ii. 3. viii. 18. 2 Cor. x. 7, 11. 1 Macc. vi. 9. w Matt. xvii. 9. 1 Cor. xv. 12. Gal. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 21 al.

17. om *αβρααμ* 8-pe Chr-3-mss: marked with ast in syr: ins aft *πειραζ.* D[1](and lat); bef *προσεν.* 71. *ισακ* (sic) [D[1]]א, so ver 18 (and 20 [D[1]] א-corr[1]).

18. om *οτι* D[1](and lat) [P] a[1] 238 Chr_2[ins_1].

19. for *εγειρειν*, *εγειρε* (= -*ραι*) A; *εγειραι* [P] 17 [Euthal-ms] Chron. *δυναται* AD[2], *possit* D-lat: txt D[1·3]KLא rel $Orig_1$ Cyr[-p_1 Euthal-ms] Chr_3 Thdrt $Chron_1$ [$Damasc_1$, *δυνατος εστιν* P], *potens est* vulg [Orig-int_1].—*ο θς εγειρει*, omg *δυνατος*, o.

ἡτοίμασεν keep its proper emphasis, and the aor. its proper time: *they looked for a city:* and God refused not to be called their God, for He *prepared* for them that city, verified those their hopes. And if we ask for the *interpretation* of *ἡτοίμασεν*, I answer, in the preparation of the way of Christ, and bringing in salvation by Him, of which salvation they in their anticipation of faith were partakers, John viii. 56, Ἀβραὰμ . . . *ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη*).

17—31.] Having spoken thus generally of the faith of the patriarchs, he returns to *individual instances*, and begins again with Abraham, recounting the severest test to which his faith was put. *ἐνταῦθα οὐ τοὺς ἀνθρωπίνους μόνον ὑπερβῆναι ἐχρῆν λογισμούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερόν τι πλέον ἐπιδείξασθαι· τὰ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐδόκει τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ μάχεσθαι, καὶ πίστις ἐμάχετο πίστει καὶ πρόσταγμα ἐπαγγελίᾳ* κ.τ.λ. Chrys. Cf. Sir. xliv. 20 (*καὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὑρέθη πιστός*): Wisd. x. 5 (*αὕτη . . τὸν δίκαιον . . ἐπὶ τέκνου σπλάγχνοις ἰσχυρὸν ἐφύλαξεν*): 1 Macc. ii. 52: James ii. 21. 17.] **By faith, Abraham hath offered** (perfect, as if the work and its praise were yet enduring: not, "was offering" as commonly taken, "was in purpose to offer," which would be the imperfect. Bleek quotes from Salvian de Gubernat. Dei i. 8, p. 17, "Immolari sibi Deus filium jussit: pater obtulit, et quantum ad defunctionem cordis pertinet immolavit." Besides which consideration, the *προσφέρειν*, the *ἀνενέγκαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον*, did actually take place) **Isaac when tempted** (cf. *καλούμενος* ver. 8: and ref. Gen.), **and** (the *καί* rises into climax: not only Abraham Isaac, but &c.) **he that had accepted the promises** (**ἀναδεξάμενος**, more than *ἔχων*, ch. vii. 6; he had as it were with open arms accepted and taken to himself each and all of the promises, the possession of Canaan, the multiplication of his seed, the blessing of all nations in his seed) **was offering** (now the Writer transforms the time into the purely temporal and strict one—he was in the act of offering—the work was begun) **his only-begotten** (so Aquila, and similarly Symm. (*τὸν μόνον σου*) in Gen. xxii. 2, for בִּנְךָ אֶת־יְחִידְךָ, *τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν*, LXX. And so Philo de Somn. i. § 34, vol. i. p. 650, *Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ μόνου παιδὸς ὁλοκαυτώσεως.* Chrys. says, *τί οὖν ὁ Ἰσμαήλ; πόθεν ἦν; μονογενῆ λέγω, φησίν, ὅσον εἰς τὸν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λόγον*), 18.] **he to whom** (**πρὸς ὅν** refers, not to Isaac, as many Commentators and our E. V., "of whom it was said," but to Abraham, the immediate antecedent in the text, and the immediately resumed subject, after the relative clause, *λογισάμενος κ.τ.λ.*) **it was spoken** (by God: but the aor. need not be made into a pluperfect), **In Isaac** (the *ὅτι* is found in ref. Gen., and in a causal meaning. The most probable account of its appearing here is, that the Writer takes it from the O. T. text, but uses it as the recitative particle) **shall thy seed be called** ("Three ways," says Delitzsch, "of interpreting this are possible, 1. after Isaac shall thy seed be named (Hofm.): 2. in, through, of, Isaac shall seed be called into being to thee (Drechsler): 3. in Isaac shall seed be named to thee, i. e. in or through him shall it come that a seed of Abraham shall be possible (Bleek)." Then he puts aside the first, seeing that only once is the seed of Abraham called Isaac (Amos vii. 9), and the second, seeing that קָרָא (though sometimes bearing the meaning, see Isa. xli. 4) never so absolutely signifies "to call into existence" as it must on that interpretation: and prefers the third. In Isaac, through and in descent from him, shall thy seed be called thy seed: only Isaac's descendants shall be known as Abraham's seed): 19.] (reason of this paradoxical conduct: because Abraham's faith was able, in anticipation, to clear the suspicion of God's faithfulness by the suggestion of His power. He could

x = (see note) Matt. xii. 44. y = (see note) ch. ix. 9. z = Matt. xxv. 27. Gen. xxxviii. 20 al.

[x] ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν [y] παραβολῇ [z] ἐκομίσατο. [20] Πίστει

ADKLP ℵabcd efghk lmno 17.47

and would make a way to the keeping of His own promise) **reckoning that God is** (not, *was*, see below) **able to raise** (no supply of "*him*" is admissible, as mistakenly inserted by many Commentators and even by the E. V. It was not God's power to raise *Isaac*, but God's power, generally, to raise from the dead, that Abraham believed. This, which is so plain from the form of the sentence, is made plainer still by the use of the present ἐγείρειν, not the aor. ἐγεῖραι which would more probably be used if a single case had been in view: see Matt. xvi. 21: Mark xiv. 28: Luke iii. 8; ix. 22. The aor. here (see digest) has probably been a correction arising from the application to Isaac) **even from (among) the dead** (St. Matt. commonly uses, with ἐγείρειν, ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν: St. Luke, John, Paul, ἐκ νεκρῶν), **from whence** (i. e. from the dead: so Thdr.-mops., Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grot., Lamb. Bos, Michaelis, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Stier, Hofmann, Delitzsch. But most Commentators regard ὅθεν as the illative particle, "whence," "unde," as in the other five places where it occurs in this Epistle, ch. ii. 17; iii. 1; vii. 25; viii. 3; ix. 18. The whole meaning is discussed below) **he also** (καί; *besides the* λογίσασθαι. It belongs, not to ἐν παραβολῇ alone, but to the whole fact, ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο—to the verb with its qualifying adverb) **received him back** (so κομίζεσθαι often: e. g. Polyb. i. 83. 8; iii. 51. 12, of captives: i. 59. 7, of money expended: iii. 40. 10, of hostages: x. 34. 3, 8, 10, of wife and children (μάλιστα πεπεισμένος οὕτως τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα κομιεῖσθαι): of a fortress or city, ii. 51. 6 al. fr. So Philo de Joseph. § 35, vol. ii. p. 71, κομίσασθαι τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἀνύβριστον: § 38, p. 74, τίς γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο πατρὶ δωρεὰ μείζων ἢ τὸν ἀπογνωσθέντα (Joseph) κομίσασθαι; And Josephus, Antt. i. 13. 4, uses the word of Abraham and Isaac on the very occasion here in question: οἱ δὲ παρ' ἐλπίδας ἑαυτοὺς κεκομισμένοι. See also reff. and 1 Macc. xiii. 37: 2 Macc. vii. 29; x. 1. In the face of these examples, Sykes and Schulz assert that the word never has this meaning) **in a parable** (figuratively: in what sense, see below). This clause has been very variously interpreted. The prevalent understanding of it, since Camerarius and Raphel, has been, "whence (= wherefore) also he received him by means of (*in*, instrumental) his surrender of him." And this Lünemann, who has adopted it, calls the simple and only right sense of the words. According to this view παραβολή signifies a giving up to danger, a παραβάλλεσθαι (τὴν ψυχήν), which latter is an expression often found, e. g. Hom. Il. ι. 322: Thuc. ii. 44. But though there is abundant example of the verb in this sense, there is none of the substantive, nor any thing approaching to one (in Passow indeed we have as a sense of παραβολή, das Dransetzen, aufs Spiel setzen, Wagen, Wagniß, Wagstück; and in Liddell and Scott, "the making a venture;" but it is entirely unsupported by example, either in classic or Hellenistic Greek, and therefore very properly excluded by Palm and Rost). This rendering then must fall to the ground, unless it can be shewn that no other will serve, and thus we are justified in supposing it the only case in which παραβολή occurs in this sense. Near akin to this is the view of Raphel (and Krebs), who says, "Quemadmodum ἐν ἀληθείᾳ pro ἀληθῶς, ἐν τάχει pro ταχέως, aliaque hujusmodi dicuntur: ita etiam ἐν παραβολῇ pro παραβόλως puto accipi posse: quo verbo sæpius utitur Polybius: cujus interpres Casaubonus, licet verterit *audacter*, et Camerarius in comment. utriusque linguæ *periculose*, certum tamen est, aliquibus locis etiam *insperato* verti posse:" cf. παρ' ἐλπίδας in Josephus, above. Then he attempts to prove this from Polybius and from Pliny, Ep. ix. 26. 4, "Sunt enim maxime mirabilia quæ maxime insperata, maxime periculosa, utque Græci magis exprimunt, παράβολα." But neither this nor any of the passages from Polyb. proves his point; every one of them having the meaning *boldly*, not *unexpectedly*. It seems then that we must abandon all idea of this class of interpretations, and fall back on the usual one, found in our ch. ix. 9, and every where else in the N. T., of a likeness or figure. In favour of this meaning it may also be asked, Is it in the least probable that our Writer would have put before his readers so common an expression in so uncommon a sense? But, when we have taken the more ordinary meaning, we are by no means set at rest. For, α. Hammond, Lamb. Bos, Alberti, Mill, Sykes, Schulz, Stuart, refer the words to the *birth* of Isaac,—"from whence," i. e. ἐκ νενεκρωμένου σώματος, "he had at first received him." But, 1. this would certainly require the more definite pluperfect, not the quasi-pluperfect of an aorist reaching back beyond λογισάμενος; and, 2. it

καὶ περὶ μελλόντων [a] ηὐλόγησεν Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακὼβ καὶ τὸν Ἡσαῦ. [21] Πίστει Ἰακὼβ [b] ἀποθνήσκων ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσὴφ ηὐλόγησεν, καὶ [c] προςεκύνησεν [c] ἐπὶ τὸ [d] ἄκρον

a ch. vii. 1. Gen. xxvii. 27 ff.
b Gen. xlviii. 21. so -κειν, Luke viii. 42.
c Gen. xlvii. 31. 3 Kings i. 47.
d Matt. xxiv. 31 || Mk. Luke xvi. 24 only. 1 Kings xiv. 27.

20. rec om 1st και, with D[3]KL[P]ℵ rel syrr coptt [æth arm Chr[1] Sevrn[1]]: ins AD[1] b[1] m 17 latt Chr[1] [Euthal-ms] Thdrt Damasc Primas. (ηὐλογησεν, so A m 17 Chr[1] [Euthal-ms] Thdrt.) om ισαακ ℵ[1](ins ℵ-corr[1.3]).
21. (ηυλογησεν, so AD 17 Chr[1] [Euthal-ms] Thdrt[2].)

would be harsh and unnatural that the ἐκ νεκρῶν should refer to the person himself who ἐκομίσατο αὐτόν. β. Corn. a-Lapide regards Isaac himself as the παραβολή, interpreting by the Latin "in parabolam (εἰς παραβολήν); id est, ut Isaac esset parabola, fabula, proverbium, exemplum memorabile &c. . . . ut cum Deus per se aut suos nobis aliquid jusserit licet arduum et difficile, exemplum Isaac ob oculos habentes, fidenter et generose nos offeramus," &c. γ. Bengel, on the other hand, regards Abraham as the παραβολή, "omnis enim posteritas celebrat fidem Abrahæ, offerentis unigenitum." δ. Others take ἐν παραβολῇ to mean, *as a type;* either of the Resurrection generally (so Thdrt., ὡς ἐν συμβόλῳ καὶ τύπῳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως· τῇ γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀναιρεθεὶς προθυμίᾳ, τῇ τοῦ κεκωλυκότος τὴν σφαγὴν ἀνεβίω φωνῇ—but afterwards he refers the figure to the passion of Christ: al.),—or of our Lord's sufferings (so Chrys., τουτέστιν, ἐν ὑποδείγματι· ἐν τῷ κριῷ, φησί. πῶς; τοῦ γὰρ κριοῦ σφαγιασθέντος οὗτος ἐσώθη· ὥστε διὰ τοῦ κριοῦ αὐτὸν ἔλαβεν, ἀντὶ τούτου σφάξας ἐκεῖνον. ταῦτα δὲ τύποι τινὲς ἦσαν· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ὁ υἱός ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ σφαγιαζόμενος: Œc., among many interpretations, Primas., Carpzov, al.). But, undeniable as is the typical reference of the whole occurrence to Christ, His sufferings and Resurrection, it seems exceedingly improbable that our Writer should have intended so much for his readers by ἐν παραβολῇ. We come then, approaching what I believe to be the true meaning, to, ε. that given by Theodore of Mopsuestia: τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι ἀκολούθως ἔτυχεν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει· τῇ γὰρ ἀναστάσει πιστεύσας, διὰ συμβόλων τινῶν ἀποθανόντα αὐτὸν ἐκομίσατο. τὸ γὰρ ἐν πολλῇ τοῦ θανάτου προσδοκίᾳ γενόμενον μηδὲν παθεῖν, τοῦ ἀληθῶς ἀναστησομένου σύμβολον ἦν, ὅσον τοῦ θανάτου πρὸς βραχὺ γευσάμενος, ἀνέστη μηδὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου παθών· τὸ γοῦν ἐν παραβολῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν συμβόλοις. So Calvin, "Tametsi vere non resurrexerit Isaac, quodammodo tamen videtur resurrexisse, quum repente et mirabiliter inexspectata Dei gratia eripitur:" Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grot., Jac. Cappell., Scaliger, Heinsius, and many others, Bleek, De W., Stier, Hofmann, Delitzsch. The objection to this seems to be that which Del. himself brings against some of its supporters, that it does not go far enough for ἐν παραβολῇ, but by its "*quodammodo,*" and "*similitudine quadam,*" weakens it too much. We may with reason ask, *What was* the παραβολή? if it is meant merely, that though not actually, yet in some sense, Abraham received Isaac from the dead, would not ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν be the more obvious way of expressing this? The true identification of the παραβολή is I am persuaded to be found in the figure under which Isaac was sacrificed, viz. the ram, as already hinted by Chrysostom. Abraham virtually sacrificed his son: God designated Isaac for the burnt-offering, but provided a ram in his stead. Under the figure of that ram, Isaac was slain, being received back by his father in his proper person, risen from that death which he had undergone ἐν παραβολῇ, in, under, the figure of the ram. Chrys. himself afterwards, in recapitulating, gives this very interpretation as an alternative: ὅθεν αὐτὸν φησί, καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο· τουτέστιν, ἐν αἰνίγματι· ὥσπερ γὰρ παραβολὴ ἦν ὁ κριὸς τοῦ Ἰσαάκ.

20.] **By faith, Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things future also** (the καί belongs, not to πίστει,—πίστει καὶ περὶ μελλ., by faith and that respecting things future,—as Lünem., al. (Syr. joins πίστει περὶ μελλ.), for πίστις περί, though good Greek, is not N.T. language,—but to περὶ μελλ.,—blessed them concerning not only things present, but things future also. Jacob is named before Esau, as the worthier and more important in the theocratic sense; perhaps also as having gained the greater portion of the blessing).

21.] **By faith Jacob, when dying** (reff.), **blessed each of the sons of Joseph** (the faith consisted in transposing his hands wittingly, laying the right hand on the head of the younger, Ephraim, who was to become the greater tribe): **and he worshipped** (this incident is not connected

e = Matt. ii. 19 al. Gen. l. 26.

τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. [22] Πίστει Ἰωσὴφ [e] τελευτῶν περὶ

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

with the other, but took place before it, on another occasion, when Jacob made Joseph swear to him that he would bury him with his fathers, and not in Egypt, Gen. xlvii. 31. Perhaps the Writer inverts the order of the two, to bring the two acts of blessing, that of Isaac and that of Jacob, together. This act of worship was one of faith, inasmuch as it was connected with a command, the point of which was, God's promise respecting the land of Canaan. And the faith was shewn by the turning of his aged and dying body in a posture of thankful adoration) **on the top of his staff** (an incalculable quantity of idolatrous nonsense has been written on these words by R.-Cath. Commentators, taking as their starting-point the rendering of the Vulg. "et adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus," and thence deriving an argument for the worship of images, assuming that there was an image or symbol of power upon *Joseph's* staff, to which they apply the words. But first, it must be *Jacob's*, not Joseph's staff, which is intended—"virgæ *suæ*," not "*ejus*," as Faber Stap. remarked, and Aug. notices, qu. 162, in Genesin, vol. iii. pt. i., "Quod habent Latini codices, *Et adoravit super caput virgæ ejus*, nonnulli codices emendatius habent, *Adoravit supra caput virgæ suæ, vel in capite virgæ suæ*, sive *in cacumine*, vel *super cacumen* (notice, there is nothing here about *adoravit fastigium*, of which see more below). Fallit eos enim verbum Græcum quod eisdem litteris scribitur sive *ejus*, sive *suæ*: sed accentus dispares sunt, et ab eis qui ista noverunt in codicibus non contemnuntur; valent enim ad magnam discretionem. Quamvis et unam plus literam habere posset, si esset *suæ*, ut non esset *αὐτοῦ*, sed *ἑαυτοῦ*." Then what follows is well worth transcribing: "Ac per hoc merito quæritur, quid sit quod dictum est. Nam facile intelligitur senem qui virgam ferebat eo more quo illa ætas baculum solet, ut se inclinavit ad Deum adorandum, id utique fecisse super cacumen virgæ suæ, quam sic ferebat, ut super eum caput inclinando adoraret Deum. Quid est ergo, *Adoravit super cacumen virgæ ejus*, id est, filii sui Joseph? An forte tulerat ab eo virgam, quando ei jurabat idem filius, et dum eam tenet, post verba jurantis, nondum illa reddita mox adoravit Deum? Non enim pudebat eum ferre tantisper insigne potestatis filii sui, ubi figura magnæ rei futuræ præsignabatur: quamvis in Hebræo facillima hujus quæstionis absolutio esse dicatur, ubi scriptum perhibent, *Et adoravit Israel ad caput lecti*, in quo utique senex jacebat, et sic positum habebat, ut in eo sine labore, quando vellet, oraret. Nec ideo tamen quod septuaginta interpretati sunt, nullum vel levem sensum habere putandum est." The reader will observe that there is nothing here of adoring the staff or the top of the staff. What Jerome thought of such an idea, is plainly seen, Quæst. Heb. in Genesin, vol. iii. p. 371: "In hoc loco quidem frustra simulant adorasse Jacob summitatem sceptri Joseph, quod videlicet honorans filium, potestatem ejus adoraverit: cum in Hebræo multo aliter legatur,—et adoravit, inquit, Israel ad caput lectuli: quod scilicet, postquam ei juraverat filius, securus de petitione quam rogaverat adoraverit Deum contra caput lectuli sui. Sanctus quippe et Deo deditus vir, oppressus senectute, sic habebat lectulum positum, ut ipse jacentis habitus absque difficultate ulla ad orationem esset paratus." The idea itself is found in Chrys., but without the *image*: *τουτέστι, καὶ γέρων ὢν ἤδη προσεκύνει τῷ Ἰωσήφ, τὴν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ προσκύνησιν δηλῶν τὴν ἐσομένην αὐτῷ*. And so Thl., Phot. in Œc., and apparently Thdrt.: so Erasm. (par.), "Longius etiam prospiciebat senis fides, cum exosculans virgam filii Joseph, veneraretur in eo Christum omnibus imperaturum, cujus ille delatus et proditus a fratribus imaginem gesserat." I will only cite the inference from the above ancient data in Corn. a-Lapide, as most instructive regarding the grounds on which age after age the chief abominations of the church of Rome have been introduced: "Recte ergo *ex hac adoratione sceptri Josephi* Patres Concilii Niceni II. *probant adorationem et cultum imaginum*, eumque non in imagine hærere, sed ad prototypum suum referri et transire docent." The real question with regard to the passage is confined within very narrow limits. The same Hebrew word מטה signifies a staff, or a bed, according as it is pointed מַטֶּה or מִטָּה. And, as there are no points in the ancient Heb. text, it is an open question, which meaning we are to take. The LXX have taken *ῥάβδος*, though as Jerome notices, in loc., they have rendered the same word *κλίνη* in Gen. xlviii. 2, two verses after. Our E. V. has taken this latter: "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." And so almost all the moderns agree in taking it. Stuart, it is true, has argued at some length for the meaning "staff," on the ground that the eastern beds have no head properly so called, being merely a carpet or rug spread on the ground. But

τῆς [f] ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ [g] ἐμνημόνευσεν, καὶ περὶ τῶν [h] ὀστέων αὐτοῦ [i] ἐνετείλατο. 23 Πίστει Μωυσῆς γεννηθεὶς ἐκρύβη [j] τρίμηνον ὑπὸ τῶν [k] πατέρων αὐτοῦ, διότι εἶδον [l] ἀστεῖον τὸ παιδίον· καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ [m] διάταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως. 24 Πίστει Μωυσῆς [n] μέγας γενόμενος

f = here (Luke ix. 31. 2 Pet. i. 15) only. Ps. cxlii. 1.
g with περί here only, see note. = 2 Kings xiv. 11.
h Matt. xxiii. 27. Luke xxiv. 39. John xix. 36, from Exod. xii. 46 [Eph. v. 30] only. Gen. l. 25.
i w. περί, Matt. iv. 6 ∥ L. (from Ps. xc. 11) only. Num. xxvii. 19.
j here only. Gen. xxxviii. 24. 4 Kings xxiii. 31 B. xxiv. 8. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 2, 9 only. see John iv. 35. (fem.) Herod ii. 124, τὴν τρίμηνον ἑκάστην.
k = here only. (Eph. vi. 4. Col. iii. 21. Prov. xix. 14?) see note.
l Acts vii. 20 only. Exod. ii. 2.
m here only. Ezra vii. 11. Wisd. xi. 7 (of the same order) only.
n = (Rom. ix. 12.) Gen. xxxviii. 11. Exod. ii. 11. Hom. Odyss. β. 314. σ. 217.

23. (only the Δ of διαταγμα is left in A, and there could hardly have been room for the word on the part which has perished.) at end ins πιστι μεγας γενομενος μωυσης ανιλεν τον αιγυπτιον κατανοων την ταπινωσιν των αδελφων αυτου (*prob interpoln from Acts* viii. 23) D vulg-3-mss(apud Sabatier).

he has in his mind in thus objecting, a bed*stead*, not a bed. The head of a bed, be it where or what it may, is that part of it where the person's head lies: and Delitzsch has made it probable from the Heb. verb, וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, "se prostravit," that Jacob turned himself in his bed so as to lay his face to the pillow: cf. Isa. xxxviii. 2. If the 'staff' is to be taken, then it must be his own, not Joseph's staff, which is indicated, and the gesture might have had a meaning correspondent to the thought in Gen. xxxii. 10, ἐν τῇ ῥάβδῳ μου διέβην τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῦτον: viz. the recognition of that God who had supported him through life, and declaration of his having done with all human supports. On the whole, see Suicer, vol. ii. p. 858. It is due to the better R.-C. Commentators, such as Estius and Justiniani, to say, that no such inference as that cited above is to be found in them. Some have expressed surprise that no mention is made of the far more important blessings of the twelve sons of Jacob in Gen. xlix.: and conjectures have even been made to amend the text: e. g. that of Böhme, ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ: but both without reason. Delitzsch says well, "He plucks, so to speak, only the flowers which stand by his way, and leaves the whole meadow-full to his readers"). **22.] By faith, Joseph when dying** (the word in ref. Gen.) **made mention of** (every where else in the N. T. μνημονεύω is, as in the classics, to *remember* (see on ver. 15), and is found either with a gen. or with an accus., but not with περί, e. g. Luke xvii. 32: Acts xx. 35: Matt. xvi. 9: 1 Thess. ii. 9) **the exodus** (by this time technically so known, from the title of the second book of Moses: see ref. Ps., and Jos. Antt. v. 1. 20) **of the sons of Israel, and commanded concerning his bones** (viz. when he said καὶ συνανοίσετε τὰ ὀστᾶ μου ἐντεῦθεν μεθ' ὑμῶν. Even Joseph, who had attained such eminence and power in Egypt, did not account it his country, but in faith spoke of the promise of God as certain, Gen. l. 24, and realized it so as to enjoin the removal of his own remains when it should come to pass).

23.] Now the writer passes on to Exodus, and its chief example, Moses, who even in his preservation by his parents was the child of faith. **By faith Moses when born was hidden three months** (τρίμηνον is probably feminine, see ref. Herod., and cf. τὴν δευτέραν ἔκμηνον, Polyb. xxvii. 6. 2: τὸν χρόνον τὸν τῆς τριμήνου, Æschin. Ctes. p. 63. 34. τὸ τρίμηνον is also in use: Polyb. i. 38. 6; v. 1. 12, and in Plut. and Ptolemy: and we have ὁ ἑξάμηνος, Xen. Hell. ii. 3. 9) **by his parents** (**οἱ πατέρες** is explained by Bengel, al., "Occultatus est Moses a *patribus*, id est a patre (Amram) et ab avo, non materno, qui erat ipse Levi, sed paterno, qui erat Kohath. Vixit ergo Kohath, nascente Mose. Magnus loci hujus recte explicati usus est in chronologia sacra." But whatever inferences are deduced from it rest, it is to be feared, on a very slender foundation: for there can be no doubt that οἱ πατέρες does signify *parents*. In a passage of Parthenius, Erot. 10, cited by Wetst., we have εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν Λευκώνης ἐλθών, παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αἰτησάμενος αὐτὴν ἠγάγετο γυναῖκα. See other Greek and Latin examples in Wetst. The instance given by Delitzsch from Plato, Legg. vi. p. 772 end, is not decisive, ἀγαθῶν πατέρων φύντι. In the Hebrew text of Exod. ii. 2, it is his mother only who does the whole: but the LXX have the plural as here), **because they saw the child was comely** (so in Exod. ἀστεῖον, τουτέστιν ὡραῖον, τῇ ὄψει χαρίεν, Thl.: καὶ νῦν ἀστεία εἶ σὺ ἐν τῷ εἴδει σου, Judith xi. 23. Thdrt. says, εἰς γὰρ τὸ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποβλέψαντες εἶδος, θείας αὐτὸ κηδεμονίας ἤλπισαν ἀπολαύσασθαι): **and they feared not the command of the king** (to destroy all the male children, Exod. i. 22. So Philo,

o = here only. Wisd. xii. 27. Jos. Antt. iv. 5. 1. ποίῳ; μαθὼν γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἀρνοίμην τὸ δρᾶν, Soph. Phil. 118.

[o] ἠρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ, 25 [p] μᾶλλον [pq] ἑλόμενος [r] συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ [s] λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ [t] πρόσκαιρον ἔχειν [u] ἁμαρτίας [v] ἀπόλαυσιν· 26 μείζονα [w] πλοῦτον [x] ἡγησάμενος τῶν Αἰγύπτου [y] θησαυρῶν τὸν [z] ὀνειδισμὸν

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

p here only. Jer. viii. 3 A. classics, passim in Wetst. q Phil. i. 22. 2 Thess. ii. 13 only. Deut. xxvi. 18. r here only †. κακουχεῖσθαι, ver. 37 reff. s ch. iv. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 10. see Rom. xi. 1. t Matt. xiii. 21 ‖ Mk. 2 Cor. iv. 8 only †. u = ch. iii. 13 al. (see note.) v 1 Tim. vi. 17 only †. w. gen, Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 33 al. in Bleek and Wetst. (-λαύειν, Prov. vii. 18.) w = Rom. xi. 12. x = ch. x. 29 reff. y elsw., Mt. Mk. L. only, exc. 2 Cor. iv. 7. Col. ii. 3. Deut. xxviii. 12 al. fr. Rom. xv. 3. 1 Tim. iii. 7. ch. x. 33. xiii. 13 only. Isa. xliii. 28.

26. rec *εν αιγυπτω*, with rel Cyr-jer$_1$ Chr-montf$_2$ [Damasc Œc], *εν αιγυπτου* (*itacism*) A 17: *αιγυπτιων* 23, *ægyptiorum* vulg: *ægyptum* D-lat: txt D[-gr] KL[P]ℵ e f h n [47] syrr copt [æth arm Orig$_1$ Syn-ep-Antch$_1$] Clem$_1$ Eus$_1$ Chr-3-mss Thdrt Phot$_1$ [Thl].

Vita Mos. i. 3, vol. ii. p. 82, *γεννηθεὶς ὁ παῖς εὐθὺς ὄψιν ἐνέφηνεν ἀστειοτέραν ἢ κατ' ἰδιώτην, ὡς καὶ τῶν τοῦ τυράννου κηρυγμάτων ἐφ' ὅσον οἷόν τε ἦν τοὺς γονεῖς ἀλογῆσαι.* Their faith was, loving trust in God who had given them so fair a child, which led them to perform as far as in them lay, the duties of parents to it, and not the cruel part which the tyrant prescribed. **διάταγμα** is a word of later Greek: see reff., and Philo de Decal. § 4, p. 183).

24–28.] *The faith of Moses when come to man's estate.* **24.**] **By faith Moses, when grown up** (**μέγ. γεν.**, *τουτέστιν ἀνδρωθείς*, Thl. The expression is from ref. Exod. Schulz and Bretschn. imagine it to mean, having become great, viz. in dignity as a citizen: but the usage is the other way, see reff.), **refused** (add to reff., Herod. iii. 1, *οὐκ εἶχε οὔτε δοῦναι οὔτε ἀρνήσασθαι*: vi. 13, *εἶδον γὰρ τοὺς Ἴωνας ἀρνευμένους εἶναι χρηστούς*: Eur. Iph. Aul. 972, *οὐκ ἠρνούμεθ' ἂν τὸ κοινὸν αὔξειν*) **to be called son of a daughter of Pharaoh** (perhaps **θυγατρός** is indefinite; but it is by no means certain: all these nouns of relation are used constantly without the article, when they are undeniably definite. There is no record in the O. T. of this refusal of Moses: but the fact of the adoption was matter of Jewish traditionary belief, see Philo below, and the Rabbinical testimony in Schöttgen: and the refusal is fairly gathered from his whole conduct. It is interesting to read and to compare the inflated account of the same in Philo, Vita Mos. § 7, p. 85 f.: *ὁ δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸν φθάσας τὸν ὅρον τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐτυχίας, καὶ θυγατριδοῦς μὲν τοῦ τοσούτου βασιλέως νομισθείς, τῆς δὲ παππῴας ἀρχῆς ὅσον οὐδέπω γεγονὼς ἐλπίσι ταῖς ἁπάντων διάδοχος, καὶ τί γὰρ ἄλλ' ἢ ὁ νέος βασιλεὺς προσαγορευόμενος, τὴν συγγενικὴν καὶ προγονικὴν ἐζήλωσε παιδείαν, τὰ μὲν τῶν εἰσποιησαμένων ἀγαθά, καὶ εἰ λαμπρότερα καιροῖς, νόθα εἶναι ὑπολαβών· τὰ δὲ τῶν φύσει γονέων, εἰ καὶ πρὸς ὀλίγον ἀφανέστερα, οἰκεῖα γοῦν καὶ γνήσια*), **25.**] **choosing rather** (**μᾶλλον αἱρεῖσθαι** with an accus. of a noun or an infin. of a verb, is very common in the best Greek. Wetst. has accumulated two whole columns of examples) **to suffer affliction with** (reff.) **the people of God, than to possess a temporary enjoyment of sin** (is **ἁμαρτίας** gen. objective, of the thing enjoyed (as usually, see examples in Bleek) or gen. subjective, of the thing to which the enjoyment belongs? Delitzsch maintains the latter (so also Bleek), resting on the nature of the contrast: participation of the lot of God's people being set against the enjoyment of sin: so that the lot of God's people is parallel with *ἁμαρτία*, the latter signifying apostasy from God and his people. But surely the antithesis is a false one. It is *κακουχία* on the one hand, which is opposed to *ἔχειν ἀπόλαυσιν ἁμαρτίας* on the other: the possession of affliction (with God's people), to the possession of the enjoyment of sin. Thus we have *αἱ τῶν ἀφροδισίων ἀπολαύσεις*, Xen. Hier. i. 26: *σίτων καὶ ποτῶν ἀπόλαυσις*, id. Mem. ii. 1. 33 al. And I do not see how the other view accords with the anarthrous *ἀπόλαυσιν*), **26.**] **esteeming** (the second aor. part. is contemporary, not antecedent, to the first: it comes in with a slightly ratiocinative force—"esteeming, as he did") **the reproach of Christ** (what is the **ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ**? Certainly not, with Thl. (so even Lünem.), merely reproach *similar to that of Christ*: *ὥσπερ γὰρ ὕστερον τὸν χριστὸν ὠνείδιζον οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐεργετούμενοι, καὶ τελευταῖον ἐσταύρωσαν· οὕτω καὶ πρότερον Μωσῆν οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐεργετούμενοι*: nor again does the more usual explanation, *τὸ διὰ χριστὸν ὀνειδίζεσθαι* (Chrys.), satisfy the genitive here; nor even the modification of it which makes Moses thus choose, from a principle of faith in the Messiah to come. Thdrt. is better, who explains it *τὸ ἐν τύπῳ χριστοῦ*: but then he generalizes it off into *τὸ κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων τολμώμενον*, as Thl. above. The typical sense is not excluded:

τοῦ [a] χριστοῦ, [b] ἀπέβλεπεν γαρ εἰς τὴν [c] μισθαποδοσίαν. 27 Πίστει [d] κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως, τὸν γὰρ [e] ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν [f] ἐκαρτέρησεν.

...γαρ n.

a gen., = ch. xiii. 13. 2 Thess. iii. 5. 2 Cor. i. 5.
b here only. Ps. x. 5. Cant. v. 17 (vi. 1). εἰς μόνον τὸ λυσιτελὲς τὸ ἐκ τῶν ἁρπαγῶν ἀποβλέπων, Jos. B. J. ii. 15. 1.
c ch. ii. 2. x. 35 only +. (-δότης, ver. 6.)
d Matt. iv. 13. 1 Kings xxxi. 7.
e Rom. i. 20. Col. i. 15, 16. 1 Tim. i. 17 only. Gen. i. 2. Isa. xlv. 3. 2 Macc. ix. 5 only.
f here only. Job ii. 9. Isa. xlii. 14. Thuc. ii. 44 al. in Bl.

27. κατελειπεν (*itacism*) AL[2][[1](Tischdf)] d o 17 [47[1]].

but it is included in a higher one. Far better is Bleek, "reproach which Christ had to bear in his own person, and has to bear in his members." And in this view, we may say, as Del. and Hofm., that all Israel's reproach was Christ's reproach: Israel typified Christ; all Israel's sufferings as the people of God were Christ's sufferings, not only by anticipation in type, but by that inclusion in Christ which they, His members before the Head was revealed, possessed in common with us. So Estius, "*improperium Christi*, i. e. populi Dei Christum exspectantis, quatenus injuria membrorum in caput redundat." Nay Christ was ever present in and among God's people: and thus De Wette well and finely says here, "The Writer calls the reproach which Moses suffered, the reproach of Christ, as Paul, 2 Cor. i. 5: Col. i. 24, calls the sufferings of Christians the sufferings of Christ, i. e. of Christ dwelling, striving, suffering, in his Church as in His body; to which this reproach is referred according to the idea of the unity of the Old and New Testaments, and of the eternal Christ (the Logos) already living and reigning in the former." And so Tholuck. See the whole well discussed in Delitzsch's note: and in Bleek. Cf. ch. xiii. 13) **greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he looked** (ἀποβλέπειν εἰς is well defined by Bl., "so to look at any thing, as to be by waiting for it, or generally by the regard of it, determined or strengthened in a course of action." So Demosth. Mid. p. 515, οὐδ' ἀπέβλεψεν εἰς τὰς οὐσίας τὰς τούτων: Isocr. ad Nicocl., ὅταν μὲν γὰρ ἀποβλέψωσιν εἰς τὰς τιμὰς κ. τοὺς πλούτους κ. τὰς δυναστείας: and often in Plato, e. g. Gorgias, p. 474 D, 503 D: Alcib. (2) 145 A: Legg. iv. 707 C) **to the recompense of reward** (reff.: viz. the great eternal reward spoken of vv. 39 f.: not the possession of Canaan merely, as Grot.). **27.] By faith, he left Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king** (*when?* this is much disputed. Was it when he fled after the murder of the Egyptian? or when he left Egypt with the children of Israel, of which Jos. says, Antt. ii. 11. 1, κατέλιπον τὴν Αἴγυπτον μηνὶ Ξανθικῷ? Against the latter, which is the opinion of Lyra, Calvin, Schlichting, Grot., Calov., Heinr., Böhme, Kuin., Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, al., it seems a decisive objection, that the Exodus was made not in defiance of the king of Egypt, but with his consent, and at his urgent instance. It is also a lesser objection to it that thus the chronological order is broken, the next particular, the institution of the Passover, having taken place previously to the Exodus. A third objection is, and one not easily got over, that the singular κατέλιπεν cannot well be referred to an event in Israel's history, but must refer to the personal history of Moses. Otherwise we should expect διέβη below in ver. 29. Regard being had to these objections, I cannot but think that to understand κατέλιπεν of the Exodus is altogether impossible. It must then refer to the former flight. And this is the view of all the ancient expositors, Greek and Latin: and among the moderns, of Zeger, Jac. Cappell., Heinsius, Calmet, Bengel, Michaelis, Schulz, De Wette, Stengel, Thol., Lünem., Delitzsch, al. But we are here met by a startling difficulty. In Exod. ii. 14 we read that on finding that his slaying of the Egyptian was known, ἐφοβήθη Μωυσῆς: here we read, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως. Were it not for this difficulty, we may safely say that the other interpretation would never have been thought of; but standing as it does, it is no wonder that it has driven Commentators to another resource. Still, if owing to other circumstances in the text it is, as we have seen it to be, necessary to refer it to that first leaving of Egypt, we have no right to set those aside on account of this difficulty: rather should we say that there must be some solution of it, however difficult to find. Those which have been given are certainly not satisfactory. The old ones (Chrys., Thl., Œc., al.) go mainly on this, that he so left Egypt, as intending to return to it, but avoiding the thrusting of himself into danger at the moment. Thdrt. seems to regard μὴ φοβηθεὶς as a pluperfect aor. part., "when he had set at nought" the king's anger: τὴν μὲν Αἴγυπτον φοβηθεὶς κατέλιπε, θαρσαλέως δὲ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον κατηκόντισε, τὴν φυγὴν τοίνυν ἀντὶ τῆς αἰτίας τέθεικε τῆς φυγῆς. Of the moderns, Bengel says, "*Timuit*, et

28 Πίστει [g] πεποίηκεν τὸ [g] πάσχα καὶ τὴν [h] πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος, ἵνα μὴ ὁ [i] ὀλεθρεύων τὰ [j] πρωτότοκα [k] θίγῃ αὐτῶν. 29 Πίστει [l] διέβησαν τὴν [m] ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

g = Matt. xxvi. 18. (see Acts xviii. 21 v. r.) Deut. xvi. 1 al. h here only †. i here only. Exod. xii. 23. (-ευτής, 1 Cor. x. 10. ἐξολεθρ., Acts iii. 23. 1 Chron. xxi. 12, 15.) j ch. i. 6 reff. Exod. xii. 12. Ps. civ. 36. k Col. ii. 21. ch. xii. 20 only. Exod. xix. 12 only. l Luke xvi. 26. Acts xvi. 9 only. Gen. xxxi. 21. m Acts vii. 36 only. Exod. x. 19 al. alw. w. θάλ., exc. Isa. lxiii. 2.

28. (ολεθρευων, so AD Damasc.)

fugit: *non timuit* neque respexit, quam in partem rex vel cædem Ægyptii vel fugam Mosis esset accepturus." De Wette supposes that the Writer did not remember the expression in Exodus: Lünem. makes a distinction between objective and subjective fear, which, in that shape, seems too refined for use here: Delitzsch, while objecting to Lün., yet takes one form of his view, that the *flight* was occasioned by fear, but the *leaving Egypt* was done without regard to what might be the anger of the king and court thereupon. In attempting to give a solution of it, I may confess that I see as yet no *satisfactory* one. It may be that the truth is, that though the fact of his flight was the effect of his fear, the same flight itself, the dereliction of Egypt and reserving himself for further action, shewed that that fear did not *possess* nor bear him away. But on any solution, the difficulty remains. Had it stood φοβηθείς, instead of μὴ φοβηθείς, the whole would have been plain enough: 'when he feared the anger of the king'): **for he endured as seeing the invisible One** (or, 'the King who is invisible:' cf. 1 Tim. i. 17. Some, as Bengel, Schulz, al., join **τὸν ἀόρατον**, as an object, with **ἐκαρτέρησε**, which is against usage, *καρτερέω* being never found with a personal object: see reff. and other examples in Bl. So also the vulg., "invisibilem tanquam videns sustinuit." Ebrard calls it a pregnant construction for *τὸν ἀόρατον τιμῶν ἐκαρτέρησε*: but this is little better and quite unnecessary. The simple and usual construction is the right one, and that adopted by the Greek expositors: so Thl., *ὥσπερεὶ γὰρ ὁρῶν τὸν θεὸν συνόντα αὐτῷ, οὕτως ἐκαρτέρει πάντα.* Jos. says of Moses similarly, Antt. iii. 11. 1, *ἄπορός τε ὢν τροφῆς ἀπηλλάττετο τῇ καρτερίᾳ καταφρονῶν*). **28.] By faith he hath celebrated** (**ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα** is ever used simply for to keep the passover, and though Bl. and Lünem. see here a mingling of the ideas of celebrating and instituting, it seems better to keep to universal usage. The perf. is used, on account of the Passover being a still enduring feast) **the Passover** (not as some interpret *πίστει*, in faith of the Redeemer to come, which point does not enter into consideration here: but by that faith which was to him the evidence of things unseen, viz. of the promise that the Destroyer should *pass over* and not hurt them. So Calvin well, "Qui fide celebratum fuisse pascha interpretantur, quia Moses in Christum respexerit, verum quidem dicunt: sed apostolus simpliciter hic fidei meminit, quatenus in solo Dei verbo acquiescit, ubi res ipsa non apparet: ideo intempestivum est subtilius philosophari") **and the affusion of the blood** (viz. of the blood of the paschal lamb on the lintel and door-posts: *πρόσχυσιν αἵματος ἐκάλεσε τὴν κατὰ τῶν φλιῶν τῶν θυρῶν χρίσιν*, Œc. The word **προσχέειν** is the common rendering by the LXX of the Heb. זָרַק, to sprinkle, and is ordinarily used of those cases where the blood was sprinkled round the altar, e. g. Levit. i. 5; vi. 32 al. fr. So that the word applies well to this ordinance, where the blood was sprinkled by means of a bunch of hyssop), **that he who destroyed the firstborn might not touch them** (the **ἵνα μή** belongs to both the preceding clauses, not to the latter only, as Del.. for though it is true that it was the sprinkling of the blood only which caused the destroyer to pass over, yet this sprinkling itself was only a subordinate part of *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα*. The **ὀλεθρεύων τὰ πρ.**, the destroying angel, see reff. and cf. Sir. xlviii. 21, is the הַמַּשְׁחִית of Exod. xii. 23, the *πληγὴ τοῦ ἐκτριβῆναι* of ib. ver. 13; understood by Asaph, Ps. lxxviii. 49, of evil angels. The verb *ὀλεθρεύειν* is Alexandrine, and with its compound **ἐξολ-** frequently found in the LXX. The neuter *πρωτότοκα* includes all of both sexes of man and beast: so Exod. xii. 12, *πᾶν πρωτότοκον . . . ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους*: and in ref. Ps. It is hardly necessary to observe, that the connexion of the words is as above, and not *ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὀλεθρεύων θίγῃ τὰ πρωτότοκα αὐτῶν.* The common construction of *θιγγάνω* is with the partitive genitive: it is (reff.) of rare use in the Greek Scriptures. **αὐτῶν**, of a subject not before expressed, is to be understood out of the context as meaning the Israelites, who sprinkled the blood. It prepares the way for the change into the plur. at the next verse). **29.] By faith, they** (see above) **crossed** (the verb **διαβαίνω** is used of crossing water, whether

διὰ [n] ξηρᾶς γῆς, ἧς [o] πεῖραν [p] λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι [q] κατεπόθησαν. 30 Πίστει τὰ [r] τείχη Ἱεριχὼ ἔπεσαν, [s] κυκλωθέντα [t] ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας. 31 Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ [u] πόρνη οὐ [v] συναπώλετο τοῖς [w] ἀπειθήσασιν, [x] δεξαμένη τοὺς [y] κατα-

n = Matt. xxiii. 15 only. Exod. xiv. 29. o ver. 36 only. Deut. xxviii. 56 only (both w. λαμβ.). = Xen. Cyr. vi. 1. 28 al. see Bl. p = 2 Tim. i. 5. 2 Pet. i. 9. q = here only. (1 Pet. v. 8 reff.) Exod. xv. 4 (B), 12. Num. xvi. 30, 32. r Acts ix. 25. 2 Cor. xi. 33. Rev. xxi. 12, &c. only. Josh. vi. 20. s Luke xxi. 20. John x. 24. Acts xiv. 20 (Rev. xx. 9 v. r.) only. Josh. vi. 6 (7). t = Acts xiii. 31. xix. 8, &c. u Matt. xxi. 31, 32. James ii. 25 al. Josh. ii. 1. vi. 25. v here only. Gen. xviii. 23. xix. 15 al. w ch. iii. 18 reff. x Matt. x. 40, 41 al. y here only. Gen. xlii. 9, &c. (-πεῖν, Gal. ii. 4.)

29. rec om *γης* (*as* LXX), with D³KL[P] rel Thdrt Damasc: ins AD¹ℵ 17 [47] latt Syr copt [æth arm Euthal-ms] Chr Thdrt-ms. *κατεποντισθησαν* k 10. 31. 49. 71-3. 109. 213 Chr₂(but mss vary) Thdrt.

30. rec *επεσε*, with K rel; *επεσεν* D³L [Euthal-ms]: *επεσον* m Chr-2-mss: txt AD¹[P]ℵ 17 Chr-ms.

31. aft *η* ins *επιλεγομενη* ℵ¹(ℵ³ disapproving) [Ephr₁].

in boats, or on a bridge, or swimming or wading: e. g. Herod. i. 75, of the river Halys, Κροῖσος, ... *κατὰ τὰς ἐούσας γεφύρας* **διεβίβασε** *τὸν στρατόν*: . . . . *ἀπορέοντος ὅκως οἱ* **διαβήσεται** *τ. ποταμὸν ὁ στρατός*: . . . . *ἐπεί τε καὶ ἐσχίσθη τάχιστα ὁ ποταμός, ἀμφοτέρῃ* **διαβατὸς** *ἐγένετο*. Here it is used of a *bridge*, of *crossing, generally*, and of a *ford*. See other examples in Bl.) **the red sea** (so the LXX always for יַם־סוּף, the sea of (red) weeds) **as through dry land** (we should rather expect *ὡς ξηρὰν γῆν*; but the unusual expression is apparently borrowed from the narrative in Exodus (ref.), *οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπορεύθησαν διὰ ξηρᾶς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης*): **of which** (viz. of the *red sea*, not, of the *dry land*, as Böhme, Kuinoel, and Klee. For as Lün. observes, the idea of the sea is necessarily called up again by *κατεπόθησαν*, shewing that it, and not the dry land, is the leading idea) **the Egyptians making experiment** (here, *πεῖραν λαμβάνειν* is in an active sense: in ver. 36, in a passive. Both are sufficiently common: e. g. for the active, Plato, Protag. p. 342 A, *εἰ βούλει λαβεῖν μου πεῖραν ὅπως ἔχω*: ib. 348 A: Gorg. 448 A: Polyb. ii. 32. 5, *ἔκριναν τῆς τύχης λαβεῖν πεῖραν*. See many others in Bleek: and for the other sense, on ver. 36) **were swallowed up** (by the sea. The verb is a general one, qualified by the particular mode of *καταπίνεσθαι*. So in reff. Exod. and Num.: Diod. Sic. i. 32, *τῶν δ' ἀποσχιζομένων μερῶν τὸ μὲν . . . . ὑπ' ἄμμου καταπίνεται*. And Polyb. ii. 41. 7, using the word of drowning, qualifies it: *Ἑλίκης, τῆς . . . . ὑπὸ τῆς θαλάττης καταποθείσης*. There is something to be said for the reading *κατεποντίσθησαν*, though it is weakly supported by mss.,—as being the Alex. reading of the LXX in Exod. xv. 4, and found in Chrys. and Thdrt. Bleek inclines to think that our Writer may have had it in his Alexandrine LXX).

30.] *A second example of the strength of faith in Israel generally.* **By faith** (of Israel, who obeyed the command of Joshua through all the days, which to the unbeliever would seem irrational. Cf. Chrys., *οὐ γὰρ δὴ σαλπίγγων ἠχὴ λίθους οἷά τε καταβάλλειν ἐστί, κἂν μυρία τις ἔτη σαλπίζῃ, ἀλλ' ἡ πίστις πάντα δύναται*), **the walls of Jericho** (more commonly *τῆς Ἱεριχώ*: but our Writer frequently omits the demonstrative article, see ver. 17; ch. iv. 7; vii. 11; ix. 4) **fell** (cf. Josh. vi. 5, 20. In the former of these it is *πεσεῖται τὰ τείχη*, in the latter *ἔπεσεν ἅπαν τὸ τεῖχος*: our Writer uses the plural verb with *τείχη*: each and every defence fell together), **having been compassed about** (see the narrative in Josh. vi.) **during seven days** (**ἐπί**, of time, with an accusative, gives the whole duration: see reff., and Winer, 49. l. 2).

31.] The *last example* is one connected with the taking of Jericho, just mentioned. **By faith** (shewn in her confession Josh. ii. 9, "I know that Jehovah hath given you the land:" and ib. ver. 11, "Jehovah your God, He is God in heaven above and in earth beneath") **Rahab the harlot** (not to be softened into "*cauponaria*," as Valckenaer, al. Clement of Rome devotes to her a whole chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, and has no idea of her other than as an harlot. Calvin says well, "Hoc (epitheton) ad anteactam vitam referri certum est: resipiscentiæ enim testis est fides." See note, Matt. i. 5) **did not perish with them who were disobedient** (on the word **ἀπειθέω**, see note ch. iii. 18. The inhabitants of Jericho were disobedient to the will of God manifested by the signs and wonders which he had wrought for Israel: as is implied by Rahab's speech, Josh. ii. 9—12), **having received** (viz. to her house: *κατέλυσαν ἐκεῖ*, Josh. ii. 1) **the spies** (sent by Joshua to Jericho: *ἀπέστειλεν Ἰησοῦς δύο νεανίσκους κατασκο-*

σκόπους [z] μετ' εἰρήνης. [32] Καὶ [a] τί ἔτι λέγω; [b] ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ [c] διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψὼν καὶ Ἰεφθάε, Δαυεὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, [33] οἳ διὰ πίστεως [d] κατηγωνισαντο βασι-

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

z Acts xv. 33 only. Gen. xxvi. 29.
a see John xi. 47.
b here only ‡. Obad. 5 Ed-vat. A(not B F.) (Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18 compl.) only. see note.
c Mark v. 16 ‖ L. ix. 9. Luke ix. 10. Acts viii. 33 (from Isa. liii. 8). ix. 27. xii. 27 only.
d here only †. later writers, Plutarch, Ælian (V. H. iv. 8), Polyb. freq. (Bl.)

32. om ετι D[1][-gr]. rec γαρ bef με, with D[3]KL[P] rel Clem [Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt]: om γαρ b[1]: txt AD[1][ℵ] 17. aft περι ins δε D[1][-gr]. om τε και (aft βαρακ) Aℵ 17 vulg copt Clem [Epiph$_1$ Cyr$_1$] Ambr$_1$.—και βαρακ κ. σ. D[1]. om και (bef ιεφθαε) Aℵ 17 Clem [Epiph$_1$ Cyr$_1$].

πεῦσαι, Josh. ii. 1) **with peace** (reff.: so that they had nothing hostile to fear from her). On the introduction of Rahab in James ii. 25, as an example of justification by works, see note there.

32—40.] The Writer breaks off, feeling that such an illustration of faith by examples would be endless, and *gathers up those many which remain in one*,—ξυλλήβδην τῶν λοιπῶν μνημονεύει, as Thdrt.

32.] **And what say I** (λέγω is most probably indicative, not subjunctive: cf. ref.: and see Winer, 41. *a*. 3: Bernhardy, p. 396. The sense is the same: 'What am I saying, going to say, more,' is tantamount to 'what shall I say more') **yet** (more, any further)? **for the time** (ὁ χρόνος ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, φησίν, ἁρμόδιος καὶ οἷον ἡ συμμετρία, Œc.: ποῖος; ἢ ὁ πᾶς· εἴρηται δὲ τοῦτο, ὡς συνηθὲς ἡμῖν λέγειν, ὑπερβολικῶς· ἤ, ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ σύμμετρος, Thl. The latter is the more probable) **will fail me** (ἐπιλίποι ἄν με would imply, *if I undertook it*,—the hypothesis affecting the whole clause: the ind. future states the failure of the time as a positive certainty, the hypothesis now lying in the pres. part. διηγούμενον. The phrase is a common one, and the construction regular: cf. Demosth. p. 324. 17, ἐπιλείψει με λέγοντα ἡ ἡμέρα τὰ τῶν προδοτῶν ὀνόματα: Julian, Orat. i. p. 341 B, ἐπιλείψει με τἀκείνου διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος: Philo de Merc. Meretr. § 3, vol. ii. p. 167, ἐπιλείψει με ἡ ἡμέρα λέγοντα τὰ τῶν κατ' εἶδος ἀρετῶν ὀνόματα: and many other examples, Greek and Latin, in Wetst. and Bleek) **narrating** (if I narrate) **concerning** (so we have in Plato, Euthyd. p. 6 C, πολλὰ περὶ τῶν θείων διηγήσομαι) **Gideon** (it is almost impossible to determine satisfactorily the arrangement of the copula from the manuscript evidence: and if once we allow subjectivities to creep in, there is no end to the varieties which different men may find suitable. I have left the rec. text, which though against Aℵ, has the great body of manuscripts with it. And thus standing, the names form two groups: 1. Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σάμψων, καὶ Ἰεφθάε, ... 2. Δαυεὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν: the former, the Judges: the latter, the Prophets, David and Samuel at the head of them, the former as a king, the latter as a judge, being exceptional and transitional. The order is not chronological: Gideon, the first mentioned, is posterior in time to Barak, the second; Samson, the third, to Jephthah, the fourth; and David, the first of the second group, posterior to Samuel, the second. The reason for this may be the greater celebrity of Gideon as a champion of the faith than of Barak, and of Samson than of Jephthah: and in the second group, it is natural to put David, for his eminence, first, and besides, Samuel thus becomes the first in the rank of the Prophets properly so called, Acts iii. 24. Delitzsch's arrangement, which makes Γεδεὼν Βαράκ τε καὶ Σάμψων the first group, Ἰεφθάε, Δαυεὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ the second, and the Prophets a third, suits indeed the strictly pressing of the τε καί in the two places, which is a trifling matter, —but by placing Jephthah with David, and separating Samuel from the Prophets, breaks up the real and far more important classification. The τε καί is in fact no more than the simple copula in sense, but a little varied: and as De Wette has remarked, Gideon and Barak, David and Jephthah are not more nearly connected by it, than the other names by καί. On Gideon, see Judg. vi.—viii.) **and Barak** (Judg. iv. v. Barak was not so strong in faith as he might have been, though he did believe, and go to the fight, and triumph: see Judg. iv. 8, 9) **and Samson** (Judg. xiii.—xvi.) **and Jephthah** (Judg. xi. 1—xii. 7) **and David and Samuel and the prophets**; **33.**] **who** (οἵ does not strictly identify the antecedents, but more nearly = οἵτινες, 'quales' rather *which* than *who*: for many of the actions which follow were done by others than those previously mentioned) **through faith** (these words διὰ πίστεως, apply to the whole sentence as far as ἀλλοτρίων ver. 34. διὰ πίστεως instead of πίστει for the first time in the chapter, suits perhaps better the miscel-

λείας, [e] εἰργάσαντο [e] δικαιοσύνην, [f] ἐπέτυχον [f] ἐπαγγελιῶν, [gh] ἔφραξαν [g] στόματα [i] λεόντων, [34] [j] ἔσβεσαν [k] δύναμιν [k] πυρός, ἔφυγον [l] στόματα [l] μαχαίρης, [m] ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ, [n] παρεμβολὰς

e Acts x. 35. James i. 20. Ps. xiv. 2. f ch. vi. 15 reff. g Rom. iii. 19. 2 Macc. xiv. 36 Ald. Dan. vi. 22 Theod. h as above (g). 2 Cor. xi. 10 only. Prov. xxi. 13. i Rev. iv. 7 reff. j Matt. xii. 20 (from Isa. xlii. 3). xxv. 8. Mark ix. 44, &c. (from Isa. lxvi. 24.) Eph. vi. 16. 1 Thess. v. 19 only. k Wisd. xvi. 19. l Luke xxi. 24. Josh. xix. 48 al. m elsw., P. only (Rom. iv. 20. Eph. vi. 10 al4.), exc. Acts ix. 22. Judg. vi. 34 AB(not Ed-vat. F). Ps. li. 7 (9) only. n = here (ch. xiii. 11, 13. Acts xxi. 34, 37. xxii. 24. xxiii. 10, 16, 32. Rev. xx. 9) only. Judg. iv. 16. vii. 14 al.

33. ηργασαντο D[1]א[1] [47[1]]. στομα D[1][-gr].
34. (μαχαιρης, so AD א, also [D[1]א] in ver. 37.) ενεδυναμωθ. AD[2·3]: εδυναμωθ. א[1].

laneous verbs of predication which follow, e. g. ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός) **subdued kingdoms** (on the verb, see reff., and examples in Wetst. and Bl.,—Plut. Numa, § 19, ἀπὸ Καίσαρος, τοῦ καταγωνισαμένου Πομπήϊον, &c. The acts referred to may be Gideon's victory over the Midianites (Judg. vii.), Barak's over the Canaanites (ib. iv.), Samson's over the Philistines (ib. xiv. ff.), Jephthah's over the Ammonites (ib. ix.), David's over the Philistines (2 Sam. v. 17—25; viii. 1; xxi. 15 ff.), Moabites, Syrians, Edomites (ib. viii. 2 ff.), Ammonites (ib. x. xii. 26 ff.)), **wrought righteousness** (so Samuel, the righteous judge, 1 Sam. xii. 3, 4: David, the righteous king, 2 Sam. viii. 15: 1 Chron. xviii. 14: and indeed in a wide sense all of them, see Jer. xxiii. 5: Ezek. xlv. 9, τοῦτο κοινὸν τῶν ἁγίων ἁπάντων, as Thdrt.), **obtained promises** (the words are capable of two senses: 1. got from God spoken promises, as e. g. the Prophets: or 2. obtained the fulfilment of promises. (1) is taken by Chrys. (referring it to the promise to David that his seed should sit on his throne), Thdrt., Primas., Schlicht., Bleek, Ebrard, al. But it seems to me altogether improbable that the Writer should thus illustrate faith by a fact which, though it may have accompanied faith in the recipient, was certainly no fruit or direct triumph of it: and that in the face of such sayings as Josh. xxi. 45 and 1 Kings viii. 56, and of Gideon's trials of God. The objection which is brought against (2), that it is inconsistent with μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ver. 13, and with οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ver. 39, is very simply answered: it is not said that they ἐπέτυχον τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν or τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, but anarthrously: they obtained promises, but not *the* promises which were yet future. And so most Commentators), **stopped the mouths of lions** (referring principally, it may be, to Daniel, of whom it is said, Dan. vi. 22, that God sent his angel and stopped (סְגַר, ἐνέφραξε Theodotion; LXX freely, ἔσωσέν με ἀπὸ τῶν λ.) the mouths of the lions: where notice also the addition (ver. 23 Theod.), ὅτι ἐπίστευσεν ἐν τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ. But reference may be also to Samson, Judg. xiv. 6, and David, 1 Sam. xvii. 34: and I may add, Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, 2 Sam. xxiii. 20: 1 Chron. xi. 22),

34.] **quenched the power of fire** (so the three companions of Daniel,—Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, Dan. iii. Thl. says, οὐκ εἶπε δὲ ἔσβεσαν πῦρ, ἀλλὰ δύναμιν πυρός, ὃ καὶ μεῖζον· ἐξαπτόμενος γὰρ ὅμως δύναμιν τοῦ καίειν οὐκ εἶχε κατ' αὐτῶν. It is said of them, 1 Macc. ii. 59, that they πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός. Delitzsch reminds us that one of the two martyrs at Brussels, Henry Voes and Joh. Esche, when the flames of the faggots rose round him, said, that it felt to him as if they were strewing roses under him), **escaped the edge** (στόματα, plur., because the Writer has various examples in mind) **of the sword** (e. g. David from Saul, 1 Sam. xviii. 11; xix. 10, 12; xxi. 10: Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 1 ff.: Elisha, 2 Kings vi. 14 ff., 31 ff.: Jeremiah, Baruch, Jer. xxxvi. 26: Ebedmelech, Jer. xxxviii. 8 ff., compared with xxxix. 18), **were made strong out of weakness** (so Samson, after his hair grew, Judg. xvi. 28 ff.: David, who ends so many of his plaintive psalms with jubilant thanksgiving: Hezekiah, who after deadly sickness was restored to fifteen years of health, 2 Kings xx.: Isa. xxxviii. [see also ref. Judg., of Gideon]. The ancient expositors refer the words, not so probably, to the strengthening of Israel after the return from the captivity: so Chrys., ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, τουτέστιν, ἀπὸ αἰχμαλωσίας. τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐπάνοδον τὴν ἀπὸ Βαβυλῶνος ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεται), **were made** (see note on ch. iv. 3) **strong in war** (Thdrt. says, καὶ οἱ προῤῥηθέντες, καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ματταθίου παῖδες, Ἰούδας καὶ Ἰωνάθης καὶ Σίμων. It is not improbable that these later glories of the faith were also before the Writer's mind: they unquestionably are in the next verse), **put to flight** (the classical usage: so Il. ε. 37, Τρῶας δ' ἔκλιναν Δαναοί: Il. ξ. 510: Od. ι. 59) **armies** (παρεμβολή, which occurs in ch. xiii. (reff.) in its usual sense of a *camp*, is

[o] ἔκλιναν [p] ἀλλοτρίων. 35 [q] ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν, ἄλλοι δὲ [r] ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ [s] προςδεξάμενοι τὴν [t] ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα [u] κρείττονος ἀνα-

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

o = here only. Homer, passim. p = here only. Isa. i. 7. Ps. cviii. 11 al. fr. q = 4 Kings iv. 36, 37. r here only †. (-νον, 2 Macc. vi. 19, 28.) s = ch. x. 34. t = here only. (ch. ix. 15 al.) u = ch. i. 4 reff.

35. γυναικας AD[1]ℵ[1], *acceperunt mulieres de resurrectione mortuorum suorum* D-lat: *accep. mul. de res. mortuos suos* vulg. απετυνπανισθ. D[1].

not unfrequently used in Hellenistic Greek for the army which is in the camp: see reff., and add Ælian, Var. Hist. xiv. 46, *οἱ κύνες προπηδῶντες ἐτάραττον τὴν παρεμβολήν*) **of aliens** (see reff. The word is common in the LXX, of Gentiles, aliens from God's people. The reference of the fact may be general, to many who have preceded: but I should rather regard it as describing the Maccabæan victories. Delitzsch would understand all from ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας, of those times: the escape of Mattathias and his sons into the mountains, the increase and success of the little band that strengthened itself in God, the first victories of Judas Maccabæus over Apollonius, Seron, and others, the formal and victorious war of the Asmonæan heroes with the Syrians and neighbouring people. "That the Writer," he continues, "should recognize these as illustrious deeds of faith, is no wonder. In our times indeed it is the custom to represent the mighty revival of the Maccabæan period rather as human than divine, rather as patriotic and popular than theocratic and national: but the book of Daniel shews us, in prophetic delineation of that time, the holy people of the Most High, conflicting with the atheistic and antichristian prince of this world, and ascribes to this conflict the highest imaginable importance in reference to the sacred history. Therefore I hold that the clauses from ἔφυγον pass beyond τῶν προφητῶν, and over the book of Daniel to the first of Maccabees, which in the LXX is attached to it: which indeed is generally acknowledged with regard to the two last clauses, and is the more certain because παρεμβολή (מַחֲנֶה), both in the sense of a *camp*, and in that of an army in order of battle, is one of the favourite words in 1 Macc., and ἀλλότριοι (as well as ἀλλόφυλοι) occurs there, as the translation of זָרִים or נָכְרִים: e. g. i. 38; ii. 7: cf. xv. 33." And perhaps after all, this may be the true view).

35.] **Women received** (back: so Xen. Cyr. v. 1. 1, *ταύτην οὖν (τὴν γυναῖκα) ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Κῦρος διαφυλάττειν . . ἕως ἂν αὐτὸς λάβῃ*. See also below) **their dead by** (out of, by means of, their reception springing out of it as its cause) **resurrection** (not, *the resurrection*: see below. The cases alluded to seem to be those of the widow of Zarephath, 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff., and the Shunamite, 2 Kings iv. 17 ff., whose sons were raised, the former by Elijah, the latter by Elisha. The faith must be that of the women themselves, the subject of the sentence, not merely that in the Prophets): **but** (for the contrast, see below) **others were broken on the wheel** (the case especially referred to is that of Eleazar, 2 Macc. vi. 18—end; and the τύμπανον seems to have been an instrument like a wheel or drumhead, on which the victim was stretched and scourged to death: cf. reff. Josephus, de Macc. v. 9, 10 (4 Macc. v. 32), makes Eleazar say to Antiochus, *πρὸς ταῦτα τροχοὺς εὐτρέπιζε κ.τ.λ.* And in the deaths of the seven brothers, which are related differently from the account in 2 Macc. vii., we read of the first (4 Macc. ix. 12), *ἀνέβαλον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τροχόν*, and similarly of several of the others. See Bleek and Wetst. for examples of the word. It occurs in the Schol. to Aristoph. Plut. 476, *ὦ τύμπανα καὶ κύφωνες, οὐκ ἀρήξετε*, where the Schol. says, *τύμπ., ξύλα, ἐφ' οἷς ἐτυμπάνιζον· ἐχρῶντο γὰρ ταύτῃ τῇ τιμωρίᾳ*. And in Aristot. Rhet. ii. 5 al.), **not accepting** (οὐ, because the fact of their absolutely refusing is mainly in view) **the deliverance** (offered to them: see in the deaths of the seven brethren passim, 2 Macc. vii. Eleazar himself says, 2 Macc. vi. 30, *δυνάμενος ἀπολυθῆναι τοῦ θανάτου, σκληρὰς ὑποφέρω κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἀλγηδόνας*), **that they might obtain a better resurrection** (there can I think be little doubt that Chrys.'s explanation of κρείττονος is right: *κρείττονος; . . . οὐ τοιαύτης, οἵας τὰ παιδία τῶν γυναικῶν*. Those sons were raised by a kind of resurrection to a life which should again end in death: but these expected a glorious resurrection to endless life. Cf. 2 Macc. vii. 9, *ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἀποθανόντας ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ νόμων εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει*: also ib. vv. 11, 14, 20, 23, 36. And so Thl., Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. Œc. understands κρείττονος as opposed to the resurrection of the ungodly to judgment, Dan. xii. 2:

στάσεως [v] τύχωσιν, 36 ἕτεροι δὲ [w] ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ [x] μαστίγων [yz] πεῖραν [y] ἔλαβον, ἔτι δὲ [a] δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς, 37 [b] ἐλιθάσθησαν, [c] ἐπρίσθησαν, [d] ἐπειράσθησαν, [e] ἐν [f] φόνῳ [f] μα-

v = Luke xx. 35. 2 Tim. ii. 10 al. L.P.H. 2 Macc. iv. 6. w here only. 2 Macc. vii. 7. (-αίζειν, Matt. xx. 19 al.) x = Acts xxii. 24 (Mark iii. 10. v. 29, 34. Luke vii. 21) only. 2 Macc. (vi. 30.) vii. 1. y ver. 29. = Xen. Anab. v. 8. 15. z = Wisd. xviii. 20, 25. 2 Macc. viii. 9. a Luke viii. 29. Acts xvi. 26. Phil. i. 7 al. Ps. cvi. 14. b John [viii. 5] x. 31, 32, 33. xi. 8. Acts v. 26. xiv. 19. 2 Cor. xi. 25 only. 3 Kings xvi. 6, 13 only. c here only. Amos i. 3. Sus. 59 [Theod. (καταπ. LXX)] only. d (see note.) (James i. 2.) e Rev. vi. 8 reff. xxii. 10. f here only. Num. xxi. 24. Deut. xiii. 15 al.

36. *ενπεγματων* D[1] : *ενπεγμων* ℵ.
37. for *επρισθ. επειρασθ.*, *επιρασθ. επιρασθ.* D[1] : *επειρασθ.* bef *επρισθ.* L[P]ℵ 17

κρείττονος . . . ἡ οἱ λοιποὶ ἄνθρωποι· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις πᾶσι κοινή, ἀλλ' οὗτοι ἀναστήσονται, φησίν, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ οὗτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον. And so Thl. as an altern. Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Winer, Lünemann, al. strangely regard it as comparing the *ἀνάστασις* with the mere temporal *ἀπολύτρωσις* just spoken of: but if so, why not *κρείττονος* **ἀπολυτρώσεως**? Hence we may perhaps understand the **ἄλλοι δέ**, distinguishing these even higher triumphs of faith from these former): **36.**] **others again** (no further contrast need be brought out; *ἄλλοι μέν, ἕτεροι δέ*, is common enough in recounting various classes) **had trial** (the passive sense of *πεῖραν λαμβάνειν*, as we had the active before, ver. 29, where see examples of that use. The passive signification is found Polyb. xxviii. 9. 7, *πολλοὺς ἂν ἐποίησε τῆς αὐτῆς τύχης πεῖραν αὐτῷ λαβεῖν*: Diod. Sic. xii. 24, *τὴν θυγατέρα ἀπέκτεινεν, ἵνα μὴ τῆς ὕβρεως λάβῃ πεῖραν*: Jos. Antt. ii. 5. 1, *οὗ (τοῦ θεοῦ) πεῖραν τῆς προνοίας εὐθὺς ἐλάμβανον.* See more in Bleek on ver. 29) **of cruel mockings** (so the E. V. well: for the word must mean insult accompanied with cruelty, judging from its use in the place here referred to, viz. 2 Macc. vii. 7, *τὸν δεύτερον ἦγον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν*: and 10, *μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ τρίτος ἐνεπαίζετο.* See also 1 Macc. ix. 26) **and of scourgings** (see reff. 2 Macc.), **yea moreover** (**ἔτι δέ** rises in climax: so out of many examples in Bleek, Xen. Œcon. v. 12, *ἔτι δὲ ἡ γῆ θέλουσα . . . διδάσκει*, "and moreover the earth of herself teaches," &c.) **of bonds and prison** (so Jonathan, 1 Macc. xiii. 12. But perhaps he now speaks more generally, e. g. of Hanani, 2 Chron. xvi. 10, Micaiah, the son of Imlah, 1 Kings xxii. 26, and Jeremiah, Jer. xxxii. 2, 3 al.): **37.**] **they were stoned** (so Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20—22, referred to by our Lord, Luke xi. 51 and Matt. xxiii. 35: and thus Chrys. and Thdrt. There was a tradition, reported by Tertull. (Cont. Gnost. Scorpiac. 8, vol. ii. p. 137, "Hieremias lapidatur"), Ps.-Epiphanius (De Vit. et Obit. Prophet.), Jerome (Advers. Jovinian. lib. ii. 37, vol. ii. p. 381), al., that Jeremiah was stoned at Daphne in Egypt, by the people: and perhaps the Writer refers to this also. Carpzov fancies it to refer still to the Maccabæan times, which cannot be, seeing that stoning was not a Greek but purely Jewish punishment. Œc., Thl., Grot., al. refer to Naboth, 1 Kings xxi.: but this is hardly probable), **they were sawn asunder** (the traditional death of Isaiah (found in Justin M., Trypho, § 120, p. 213: Tertull. as above, and De Patient. 14, vol. i. p. 1270: Origen, Ep. ad African. 9, vol. i. p. 19: Lactant. Instt. iv. 11, vol. i. p. 477: Aug. C. D. xviii. 24, vol. vii.: Jerome on Isa. lvii. 1, vol. iv. p. 666 al.: see also Wetst. here, and Suicer ii. 831) at the hands of King Manasseh. There seems no reason to doubt, that this tradition was known in the apostolic times: Jerome calls it a "certissima traditio apud Judæos," and says "unde et nostrorum plurimi illud quod de sanctorum passione ad Hebræos ponitur, 'et serrati sunt,' ad Esaiæ referunt passionem." The account is given in the apocryphal Ascensio Isaiæ, which was written by a Christian author in Greek, probably in the second century: and the Ethiopic version of which was published by Abp. Laurence. The punishment was used sometimes in the case of captives in war: see 2 Sam. xii. 31: 1 Chron. xx. 3), **were tempted** (certainly it is surprising, to meet with so mild a word in the midst of torments and ways of dreadful death. Our surprise is not much mitigated by the sense given e. g. by Stuart, "temptations presented by persecutors to the victims of their torture, in order to induce them to forsake their religion, and worship the gods of the idolaters." And this surprise having been all but universally felt, various have been the conjectures resorted to. 1. Some have been for leaving out the word altogether. Its very form, coming so soon after *ἐπρίσθησαν*, was suspicious. It might have been a mistake for it, and thus admitted by its side in some MS. which was made from copies containing both: it might have been a marginal gloss of some dull student: besides (see digest), authority

χαίρης ἀπέθανον· [g] περιῆλθον ἐν [h] μηλωταῖς, ἐν [i] αἰγείοις [k] δέρμασιν, [l] ὑστερούμενοι [m] θλιβόμενοι [n] κακουχούμενοι 38 ὧν οὐκ ἦν [o] ἄξιος ὁ [p] κόσμος, ἐπὶ [q] ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι,

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

g Acts xix. 13. xxviii. 13. 1 Tim. v. 13 only. Wisd. vi. 13. h here only. 3 Kings xix. 13, 19. 4 Kings ii. 8, 13, 14 only. (see Clem. in note.) i here only. Exod. xxv. 4. xxxv. 6, 26. Num. xxxi. 20 only. k here only. Exod. xxv. 5. see Zech. xiii. 4. Matt. iii. 4 ‖ Mk. l = Luke xv. 14. 2 Cor. xi. 8. Phil. iv. 12. Deut. xv. 8 A Ald. compl. Sir. xiii. 4. m 2 Cor. i. 6. iv. 8. vii. 5. 1 Thess. iii. 4. 2 Thess. i. 6, 7. 1 Tim. v. 10 (Matt. vii. 14. Mark iii. 9) only. Ps. cxix. 1. n ch. xiii. 3 only. 3 Kings ii. 26 bis. xi. 39 A (not in B) only. o gen. of pers.: Matt. x. 37 bis, 38. Wisd. iii. 5. see 3 John 6. p = ver. 7 reff. q Matt. xv. 33. Mark viii. 4. 2 Cor. xi. 26 only. Ezek. xxxv. 4.

[Enthal-ms]: om επειρασθ. 2. 43 lectt-8-17 Syr æth $Orig_1$(ins_4) Eus_1 [$Ephr_1$ $Socr_1$] Thl. κακοχουμ. D^3L [m 47 Eus_1: κακοχομ. P]: κακωχ. K.

38. rec (for επι) εν, with DKL rel Clem $Orig_2$ Eus_3: txt Aℵ 17. 71-3. 118 $Orig_1$ Ath_1 $Socr_1$.

is not altogether wanting for its omission. The Syr. omits it, which is of some weight. 2. It has seemed to many critics that some mention of *fire* might well be expected here: so they have conjectured ἐπρήσθησαν, ἐπυράσθησαν, ἐπυρώθησαν, ἐπυρίσθησαν, ἐνεπρήσθησαν, ἐνεπυρίσθησαν. Others, 3. have thought that *mutilation* was more probably intended, and have conjectured ἐπηρώθησαν. Many other conjectures may be seen in Bleek, Lünem., and Delitzsch: ἐπάρθησαν (from πείρω, Beza, edd. 1, 2 al., adopted by Luther in his version: but hardly a legitimate formation), ἐπερδάθησαν (from περδάω (?): Wakefield), ἐσπειράσθησαν or -άθησαν (from σπεῖρα = τροχός: so Alberti), ἐπράσθησαν (*were sold:* Le Moyne), ἐπηρειάσθησαν (Reiske as quoted in Wetst.), ἐπέρθησαν, ἐσφαιρίσθησαν, ἐταριχεύθησαν (but this last only ironically in Matthæi). *If any conjecture is to be made*, I would say that either the omission, or ἐπρήσθησαν, would appear to me the most probable. The former is advocated by Erasm., Calv., Beza, Grot., Hammond, Whitby, Calmet, Storr, Valcknaer, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Delitzsch: the latter by Junius and Piscator: and *some word* indicating death by fire, by Beza, edd. 3, 4, 5, Gataker, Colomesius, Sykes, De Wette, Ebrard, al. As it stands, I do not see how any appropriate meaning can be given to the mere enduring of temptation, placed as it is between being sawn asunder and dying by the sword), **died in the murder of the sword** (i. e. were slain by the sword: see reff. One Prophet only perished by the sword in the kingdom of Judah, viz. Urijah, Jer. xxvi. 23: but under Israel it is said, 1 Kings xix. 10, "they (the house of Omri) have slain thy Prophets with the sword." Perhaps the Maccabæan persecutions may again be before the Writer's mind: see 2 Macc. vii. 4. Chrys. says beautifully, τί ἐστι τοῦτο; τί λέγεις; οἱ μὲν ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας, οἱ δὲ ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον; τί ἐστι τοῦτο; ποῖον ἐπαινεῖς; ποῖον θαυμάζεις; τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο; ναί, φησί, καὶ τοῦτο κἀκεῖνο· δύο γάρ ἐστι τὰ θαύματα τῆς πίστεως, ὅτι καὶ ἀνύει μεγάλα, καὶ πάσχει μεγάλα καὶ οὐδὲν ἡγεῖται πάσχειν): 37 b, 38.] *Examples of those who, though not put to violent death, lived lives of apparent wretchedness in the endurance of faith.*

37 b.] **they wandered about** (τὸ περιῆλθον διώκεσθαι αὐτοὺς δηλοῖ, ἢ ἀστατεῖν. Thl.) **in sheepskins** (μηλωτή, προβάτειος δορά, Etym. Mag. But also, as Hesych., πᾶσα βύρσα, ὅ ἐστι πᾶν δέρμα, μηλωτὴ λέγεται. **μῆλον** was the name for small kine, whether sheep or goats, and the μηλωτή was the skin of such kine with the hair on. The LXX (reff.) use the word for Elijah's garment, to whom the allusion seems principally to be. Clem.-rom. ad Cor. 17, p. 241, says, μιμηταὶ γενώμεθα κἀκείνων, οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοις καὶ μηλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν, κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ χριστοῦ, λέγομεν δὴ Ἠλίαν κ. Ἐλισσαῖον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰεζεκιήλ, τοὺς προφήτας. Clem.-alex. Strom. iv. 17, § 107, p. 610 P., citing this, inserts after μηλωταῖς,—καὶ τριχῶν καμηλείων πλέγμασιν. See more particulars in Suicer, sub voce: and cf. Matt. vii. 15) **and goats' skins** (this, coming after μηλωταῖς, which may mean the same, has surprised some, and has seemed to them a mere gloss on that word. But it is quoted by Clem. and Orig., besides being found in all MSS. and vss. Delitzsch says that "it not only explains the former, but intensifies it: for the (commonly) black goat's skin shewed, even more than the (commonly) white sheepskin, the deep earnestness of one thrust out from the world, and dead to it." Perhaps: but it is more probable that the Writer regarded μηλωτή as merely the sheepskin, and mentioned the other because goats were as often kept and their skin as often worn), **destitute** (reff.), **afflicted** (reff.), **in misery** (cf. ver. 25); 38.] **of whom** (viz. those who wandered about as in ver. 37: for the participial construction is resumed below, and in reference to these same persons. **οὗτοι πάντες** first occurs in the next verse.

καὶ ὄρεσιν καὶ [r] σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς [s] ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς. [39] καὶ οὗτοι πάντες [t] μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως οὐκ [u] ἐκομίσαντο τὴν [u] ἐπαγγελίαν, [40] τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν [v] κρεῖττόν τι [w] προβλεψαμένου, ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν [x] τελειωθῶσιν.

r Matt. xxi. 13 ||. John xi. 38. Rev. vi. 15 only. 3 Kings xviii. 4, 13. 2 Macc. vi. 11.
s James iii. 11 only. Exod. xxxiii. 22.
t ch. vii. 8 reff.
u ch. x. 36 (reff.).
v ch. i. 4 reff.
w here only. Ps. xxxvi. 13 only.
x ch. ii. 10 reff.

39. παντ. μαρτ. bef ουτοι D[·gr]. τας επαγγελιας A 80 Eus_1 Cyr[-p_1] Aug_1.
40. κρειτ. τι bef περι ημ. D^1 B^r [copt] $Orig_1$[txt_2 Eus_1] $Procop_1$.

Of course, Carpzov's reference of ὧν is inadmissible, "quorum indignus malorum erat mundus: id est, tam crudelibus affecti sunt suppliciis, ut illa mundo indigna sint: ut orbem terrarum non deceat, tam horrenda ac φοβερώτατα de eo dici") **the world was not worthy** (the world, by casting them out and persecuting them, proved that it was not fit to have them in it: condemned itself, in condemning them. Cf. Calvin, "Quum ita profugi inter feras vagabantur sancti Prophetæ, videri poterant indigni quos terra sustineret. Qui fit enim ut inter homines locum non inveniant? Sed Apostolus in contrariam partem hoc retorquet, nempe quod mundus illis non esset dignus. Nam quocunque veniant servi Dei, ejus benedictionem, quasi fragrantiam boni odoris, secum afferunt. Sic domus Potiphar benedicta fuit in gratiam Josephi, Gen. xxxix. 5, et Sodoma salva futura erat, si in ea inventi fuissent decem justi homines, Gen. xviii. 32"); **wandering in deserts and mountains and caves, and the chinks of the earth** (the Holy Land was especially calculated, by its geological formation, and its wildernesses, to afford shelter to persecuted persons: so did it to a hundred of the Lord's prophets whom Obadiah hid by fifty in a cave (σπήλαιον), 1 Kings xviii. 4, 13: to Elijah, ib. xix. 9, 13: to Mattathias and his sons, who fled to the mountains, 1 Macc. ii. 28 f., and many others in the wilderness: to Judas Maccabæus, who fled with others εἰς τὴν ἔρημον and there lived ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι like the wild beasts, 2 Macc. v. 27. Cf. also ib. vi. 11; x. 6. Jos. Antt. xii. 6. 2, of Mattathias, καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν μετὰ τῶν τέκνων εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ἐξώρμησε, καταλιπὼν ἅπασαν τὴν αὐτοῦ κτῆσιν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ πολλοὶ ποιήσαντες, μετὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν ἔφυγον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις διῆγον. But τῆς γῆς must not be taken for "*the land*," viz. Palestine, as Böhme: it is general). 39.] **And these all** ('these, every one of them.' πάντες οὗτοι would be 'all these.' All, viz. all that have been named or referred to throughout the chapter: not only, as Hammond, al., those ἄλλοι since ver. 35), **borne witness to by their faith** (the emphasis is on μαρτυρηθέντες, not on διὰ τῆς πίστεως: and the sense is rather '*though* borne witness to,' than '*being*' or '*because*, borne witness to.' On the word and its import see vv. 2, 4, 5), **did not receive the promise** (many promises indeed they did receive, ver. 33: but not THE PROMISE κατ' ἐξοχήν, the promise of final salvation, or as it is called ch. ix. 15, τὴν ἐπαγγ. τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας: the perfection, to which without us they were not to attain. "But," says Delitzsch, "do we not read ch. vi. 15, of Abraham, ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας? Certainly, he has obtained the promise, yet not this side the grave, but, as we there maintained, in his life on the other side the grave: the general and actual salvation of the N. T. is, in their heavenly estate, the joy of the patriarchs. And this view is confirmed by looking forward to ch. xii., where the O. T. believers translated into heaven are called the πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένων, or at all events are included in that designation. And another question arises. It is said of the O. T. saints, that they did not obtain the promise: but is it not plain, from ch. x. 36, that κομίζεσθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν is for us also a thing future? Doubtless, but with a significant difference. For them, final salvation was a thing purely future: for us, it is a thing present as well as future: present, in that it is once for all brought about by Christ's offering of Himself,—future, inasmuch as the unfolding of all the fulness of that which we possess, and the taking possession of it, when unfolded in its fulness, is for us yet to come: cf. ch. ix. 28 with x. 14"), 40.] **God** (Clem.-alex. Strom. iv. § 16, p. 609 P., cites this with τοῦ θεοῦ joined to τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, and so does the liturgy of Chrysostom in some manuscripts. In that case προβλεψαμένου would be in apposition with θεοῦ. But such a connexion is not likely) **having provided** (foreseen from far (ref.): προορᾶν, προϊδεῖν, προϊδέσθαι are more usual words) **concerning us** (περὶ ἡμῶν has the emphasis, as contrasted with οὗτοι πάντες, us, viz. the Writer and his readers, as belonging to the N. T. church) **something**

XII. [1] [y] Τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες [z] περι-

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

y 1 Thess. iv. 8 only. Job xxii 10

z = here (ch. v. 2. Mark ix. 42. Luke xvii. 2. Acts xxviii. 20) only †. τὸ ἔθνος στρατοπέδῳ μὲν πέφρακτο διὰ τὸ περικείμενον πλῆθος......βαρβάρων, Herodian vii. 9. 3.

Chap. XII. 1. for τοσουτον, τηλικουτον ℵ[1].

better (what is this κρεῖττόν τι? The Fathers generally interpret it of the ultimate state of glorious perfection, which shall only then come in, when all the number of the elect shall be accomplished. So Chrys., Ἐννοήσατε . . . . τί ἐστι, καὶ ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ καθῆσθαι, καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, περιμένοντας πότε σὺ τελειωθῇς, ἵνα δυνηθῶσι τότε λαβεῖν τὸν μισθόν. On this view, as Delitzsch says, the κρεῖττόν τι would consist in this, that the history of mankind has not been cut short as it would have been if the ancients had received the promise in this sense, but has been continued for us to partake of our present privileges under the N. T. But, he continues, this eschatological narrow acceptation of the promise, has against it not only what is said of Abraham in ch. vi. 15, viz. ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, but also the whole spirit of the Epistle, which regards final salvation as brought in with the propitiation of Christ, and τὸ ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν as begun with His first Advent. The Writer cannot be ignoring this all-inclusive beginning of the N. T. fulfilment of the promises, in attributing to us κρεῖττόν τι than the O. T. believers had. And consequently we must understand by the expression, something better than they had, viz. the enjoyment, here, of the fulfilment of the promise, which they never had here, and only have there since Christ's descent into Hades and ascension into heaven. It is that κρεῖττόν τι for which the Lord felicitates his disciples, Matt. xiii. 17, the revelation of the Son of God, ch. i. 1, the σωτηρία of ch. ii. 3), that they should not apart from us be made perfect (the design of God in this provision of something better for us was, that they, the O. T. saints, should not be perfected without us, i. e. independently of the N. T. salvation of which we are partakers,—cut off from Christ's universal Church of which we are members. But we read, ch. xii. 23, of them as τετελειωμένοι now. And therefore the Writer implies, as indeed ch. x. 14 seems to testify, that the Advent and work of Christ has changed the estate of the O. T. fathers and saints into greater and perfect bliss; an inference which is forced on us by many other places in Scripture. So that their perfection was dependent on our perfection: their and our perfection was all brought in at the same time, when Christ μιᾷ προσφορᾷ ἐτελείωσεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους. So that the result with regard to them is, that their spirits, from the time when Christ descended into Hades and ascended up into heaven, enjoy heavenly blessedness, and are waiting, with all who have followed their glorified High Priest within the veil, for the resurrection of their bodies, the Regeneration, the renovation of all things. This thought naturally leads on to the opening verses of the next chapter).

Chap. XII. 1—11.] Exhortation, *mixed with reproof, on looking back at all these witnesses, and looking also to Jesus, who has come to glory through suffering, not to faint in the conflict with sin; nor to forget the love of our Father, who visits us with chastisement that we may bring forth the fruit of righteousness.* This exhortation was begun at ch. x. 19, and broken off by the insertion of all those examples of the nature and triumphs of faith. It is now resumed, having, so to speak, accumulated new momentum by the interruption, and is pressed home directly on the readers.

1.] **Wherefore** (τοιγαροῦν is an earnest and solemn inference, only found at the beginning of a sentence. "τοι," says Delitzsch, "affirms the conditions of fact, γάρ grounds on them, οὖν follows thereupon; so that the whole amounts to an earnest *ergo*") **we also** (as well as those just enumerated) **having so great a cloud** (see below) **of witnesses surrounding us** (in order to understand μαρτύρων aright, we must bear in mind both the similitude here used, and the connexion with the preceding chapter. "Hic versus totus constat vocibus agonisticis," says Hammond. And this being so, who can help referring this cloud of witnesses which surrounds us to the agonistic scene which is depicted, and regarding them as lookers on while our race is run? Whoever denies such reference, misses, it seems to me, the very point of the sense. But even thus we have not exhausted the meaning of μάρτυρες. It is improbable, as Delitzsch well observes, that the Writer should have used the word μάρτυρες so closely upon μαρτυρηθέντες, ch. xi. 39, without any reference to that idea. See also ib. vv. 2, 4, 5. So that we can hardly help giving to 'witnesses' a sense not confined to their looking on upon us, but extending to their ethical condition of witnesses for the faith. But we may notice, that De-

κείμενον ἡμῖν [a] νέφος μαρτύρων, [b] ὄγκον [c] ἀποθέμενοι

a here only †. Hom. Il. δ. 274 al. Eur. Hec. 907. Apoll. Rhod. Arg. iv. 398. (al. in Bleek.) b here only †. (see note.) c James i. 21 reff.

litzsch in contending for this double sense, has in fact a triple reference of the word to justify: they are *borne witness to*, they have their μαρτυρία, ch. xi. 5: and by this they become μάρτυρες: and they carry out that office in being witnesses of our conflict here below. Böhme (cited by Del.) remarks, that this manifold reference of the word has been the reason why the Writer has not written μάρτυρες τῆς πίστεως or the like. And now the propriety of the other words used at once appears. **νέφος**, not only an immense multitude (νέφος μιμούμενον τῇ πυκνότητι, Thdrt.: cf. ἅμα δὲ νέφος εἵπετο πεζῶν, ref. Hom.: τοῖον Ἑλλάνων νέφος ἀμφί σε κρύπτει, ref. Eur.), and that number as it were pressing us all around as the spectators did the combatants in the circus (περικείμενον, see reff. τουτέστι, πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς περιέχον, Thl.),—but also fitly compared to a cloud from the fact of its being *above us*, they looking on from that heavenly bliss which they entered at Christ's triumph. So that the words must be taken as distinctly so far implying community between the church triumphant and the church below, that they who have entered into heavenly rest are conscious of what passes among ourselves. Any interpretation short of this leaves the exhortation here tame and without point. If they are merely quasi-witnesses, merely witnesses in a metaphor, the motive, as far as this clause supplies one, is gone. The Greek expositors generally regard μαρτύρων as referring only to their having witnessed for the faith. So Chrys., ἐμαρτύρησαν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ μεγαλειότητι: Thdrt., πλῆθος τοσοῦτον . . . μαρτυρεῖ τῇ δυνάμει τῆς πίστεως: Thdr.-mops., μαρτύρων ἐνταῦθα οὐ τῶν πεπονθότων λέγει, ἀλλὰ τῶν μαρτυρούντων πρὸς τὴν πίστιν. Most of the moderns take this meaning (even Lünemann); others that of martyrs, rejected above by Thdr.-mops.: cf. Acts xxii. 20: Rev. ii. 13 (xi. 3); xvii. 6. **νέφος** is interpreted by the Greek expositors (not Thdrt.) as *affording shade and protection*. So Chrys., περικείμενον κύκλῳ, ἐν μείζονι ἀδείᾳ εἰκότως εἶναι ποιήσει: and Œc., in his altern. more explicitly, νέφος δὲ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς, ἢ ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ὑπὸ καύματος καταφλεγομένων καὶ ὑπεισελθόντων εἰς νεφέλην δροσίζουσαν καὶ παραμυθηθέντων. καὶ γὰρ ἡ τῶν ἁγίων μνήμη τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ καύσωνος τῶν πειρασμῶν ἐκλελυμένους παραμυθεῖται. ἢ ὅτι νοητὴν (spiritual) ἡμῖν, φησί, δρόσον νέμουσιν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὸν θεὸν ἱκετεύοντες. I need not say, that such an idea is completely precluded by the nature of the argument, and the following participial clause in ver. 2. The best note on the whole idea and imagery is that of Schlichting: "Introducit nos veluti in theatrum quoddam amplissimum, in quod magna spectatorum turba confluxerit, quæ, omnibus locis et subselliis repletis, veluti nubes quædam densa in medio certantibus circumfusa videatur. In tantæ multitudinis totque spectatorum veluti oculis certantes nos facit. Quemadmodum autem olim certantibus tanta spectatorum multitudo addebat animos, et ingens erat ad summam vincendi contentionem stimulus: sic et nobis tot testes, qui et ipsi in eodem certamine desudarunt, alacritatem addere debent, ut summis viribus cœptum stadium decurramus. Testes autem eos vocat, non tantum per prosopopœiam quandam alludens ad certaminum spectatores ut dictum est, qui sunt testes quidam virtutis eorum qui certant: sed etiam, idque multo magis, propterea, quod de Deo ejusque bonitate et justitia testentur, et omnes uno veluti dicant ore, esse Deum, et esse remuneratorem eorum qui ipsum quærunt: apud eum, tanquam summum agonothetam, brabeum esse strenue certantibus repositum: veracem illum esse in suis promissionibus: etiam post mortem posse reddere felices eos, qui ipsius causa vitam prodegissent. Testium enim nomine illi imprimis hoc loco sunt intelligendi, qui suo sanguine de Dei fide et bonitate testantur. Unde et κατ' ἐξοχὴν *martyres*, id est, testes, hic appellantur"), **laying aside all superfluous weight** (ὄγκος, according to Buttmann, Lexil., from ἔγκω, from which comes ἤνεγκον,—*any superfluous mass or burden*, as in the case of the pregnant, so Eurip. Ion 15, γαστρὸς διήνεγκ' ὄγκον: or the corpulent, so Ælian, Hist. Anim. ii. 13, σαρκὸς ὄγκος: *a state of being puffed up*, either literally or metaphorically. It is used doubtless here with direct reference to athletes, who before running trained themselves so as to get rid of all superfluous flesh. So Galen, in Epid. Hippocr. iii. 6 (Bl.), καὶ γὰρ δρόμοι ταχεῖς καὶ γυμνάσια τοιαῦτα καὶ σαρκῶν ὄγκον καθαίρει καὶ χυμῶν πλῆθος κενοῖ: see other examples in Bl. But ὄγκος is also used of weight accessory from without, as well as of weight carried on the person. So Xen. Venat. viii. 8, διὰ τὸ βάθος τῆς χιόνος καὶ διὰ τὸ κάτωθεν τῶν ποδῶν λασίων ὄντων προσέχεσθαι αὐτῷ ὄγκον πολύν. So that the word may be taken, as in E. V., of every weight of every kind which may

d here only †. (see note.)
e Rom. viii. 25.

πάντα καὶ τὴν [d] εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, [e] δι' ὑπομονῆς

weigh down the runner; though, on account of what follows, I should understand it rather of weight *of* the person than weight *on* the person. See below. Some, as Castellio, Heinsius, Bengel, interpret it "*fastus*," haughtiness or pride, which it may be, but the sense does not seem to belong here) **and sin which is ever besetting us** (εὐπερίστατος, being an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in all ancient Greek literature, has been very variously interpreted. Its sense must be sought purely from derivational usage, and the requirements of the context. Some have taken it actively, from the sense of περιΐστημι 'to circumvent:' so Carpzov, "*dolosum, seducens;*" Schulz, "which hems us in on all sides." But against this is the fact that though verbals in -τος are often active, no case has been adduced of any such verbal derived from ἵστημι or its compounds being active: they are all intransitive or passive: e.g. στατός, ἄστατος, ἀνάστατος; διάστατος, ἀδιάστατος; εὐκατάστατος, δυσκατάστατος; ἀμετάστατος, εὐμετάστατος; ἀσύστατος; ὑπόστατος: and so περίστατος and ἀπερίστατος: and thus our word might be taken passively,—'which can easily be avoided,' lightly evaded: cf. περιΐστασο 2 Tim. ii. 16: Titus iii. 9, and Hammond here: or, 'which can be easily circumvented,' and so conquered. Thus in the interpretation which Chrys. prefers before the active one: his words are, εὐπερίστατον, ἤτοι τὴν εὐκόλως περιϊσταμένην ἡμᾶς, ἢ τὴν εὐκόλως περίστασιν δυναμένην παθεῖν, λέγει· μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦτο· ῥᾴδιον γάρ, ἐὰν θέλωμεν, περιγενέσθαι τῆς ἁμαρτίας: so Ps.-Athanas. quæst. 130 de Parabol. Scripturæ, vol. iv. p. 280, εὐπερίστατον εἶπε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐπειδὰν μόνιμον στάσιν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ ταχέως τρέπεται καὶ καταλύεται: Hesych., εὔκολον, εὐχερῆ: Suidas, μωρόν, ταχέως περιτρεπόμενον: D-lat, "*fragile:*" Le Clerc, al., "*quæ facile circumvenitur, vincitur.*" But to this there are two objections. First the word περιΐστασθαι does not seem ever to have this meaning, *overcoming:* and then that it would be exceedingly out of place thus to describe sin, and especially that sin against which the Writer considers it necessary to warn his readers, by one single epithet, as a thing lightly to be got rid of. Just as unnatural would be the sense given by Wetst., "peccatum vestrum .... non in occulto potest committi et latere, non magis quam lapsus cursoris, sed conspicietur ab omnibus." Another passive sense is given by Ernesti after Hemsterhuis, "a spectatoribus circumdatus," "surrounded by men who look on:" so Isocrat. de Permut., θαυματοποιΐαις ταῖς .... ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνοήτων περιστάτοις γενομέναις, which Suidas interprets περὶ ἃς κύκλῳ ἵστανται οἱ θεώμενοι: Jambl. Vit. Pyth. v. 7, εὐθὺς δὲ περίβλεπτος καὶ περίστατος ἐγένετο: and so ἀπερίστατος is used of a man whom others do not gird around, one void of friends: so Phocyl. 24, σῶσον δ' ἀπερίστατον ἄνδρα. And thus Ernesti here would have us understand εὐπερίστατος of sin as being *very popular*, having many friends and frequenters. This sense Bleek thinks has much to be said for it, both as to analogy and as fitting the context. I own I do not feel that the analogy of εὖ in composition quite justifies it. But he prefers the ordinary acceptation of the word here, and in this I fully agree. Taking περιΐσταμαι as a middle, to *place itself around, be around*, and hence to *surround*, we should have, *sin which easily surrounds us*. And so the former of the alternatives in Chrys. (see above), which he does not prefer in his homily on this passage, but adopts in several other places: e. g. Hom. on Ps. xlviii. § 3. 4, vol. v. p. 227 (Migne), ταύτην οὖν δέδοικα τὴν ἀπατῶσάν με ἁμαρτίαν, τὴν κυκλοῦσάν με. διὸ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος αὐτὴν εὐπερίστατον καλεῖ, τὴν συνεχῶς περιβάλλουσαν δηλῶν, τὴν εὐκόλως, τὴν ῥᾳδίως. And on 2 Cor. Hom. ii. vol. x. p. 402, εὐπερίστατον γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία, πάντοθεν ἱσταμένη, ἔμπροσθεν, ὄπισθεν, καὶ οὕτως ἡμᾶς καταβάλλουσα. And so the vulg. "*circumstans:*" the E. V., "which doth so easily beset us:" and by far the greater part of expositors, some with, some without the sense of active hostility. Thus Syr., "quod omni tempore paratum est nobis:" Ps.-Anselm, "quod nos inique impellit et circumvallat:" Castellio, "nos ambiens, sicut arbores hedera:" Valcknaer, "quod ad cingendum et irretiendum promptum est:" Bugenhagen, "semper oppugnans nos peccatum:" Erasm.(par), "quod nos undique complectitur:" al. The word being thus taken, the various acceptations of the similitude intended are well summed up by Bleek: we must understand ἁμαρτίαν either as our inner propensity to sin, which clings fast to us and will not part from us (Erasm.(vers. and not.), Luther, Vatabl., Calv., Gerhard, Seb. Schmidt, Calov., Ernesti: cf. ch. v. 2, περίκειται ἀσθένειαν): or as a cumbersome garment girding us round and hindering us from running (Jac. and Lud. Cappell., Schlichting,

[f] τρέχωμεν τὸν [g] προκείμενον ἡμῖν [fh] ἀγῶνα, 2 [i] ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως [k] ἀρχηγὸν καὶ [l] τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν,

f πολλοὺς πολλάκις ἀγῶνας δραμέονται περι σφέων αὐτέων οἱ Ἕλληνες, Herod. viii. 102. τὸν ὑπὲρ τ. ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα τρέχει, Dion. Hal. vii. 48 (al. in Bl.). g ch. vi. 18. 2 Cor. viii. 12. Jude 7 only. Lev. xxiv. 7 al. ἀγῶνος μεγίστ. προκειμένου. Herod. ix. 60. h = 1 Tim. vi. 12. 2 Tim. iv. 7 (Phil. i. 30. Col. ii. 1. 1 Thess. ii. 2) only. Isa. vii. 13. Wisd. iv. 2. i here only †. (see note.) k (=) Acts iii. 15. v. 31. ch. ii. 10 only. (Isa. xxx. 4.) 1 Macc. x. 47. l here only †. (no Gr. author.)

Wittich, Braun, Wakefield, al.), or personified, as an adversary, who surrounds us on all sides and waylays us to make us his prey (Beza, Cramer); or generally, as something which lies about us and is ever ready to catch us (De Dieu, and Syr. above): or which is ever from all sides standing in the way so as to entangle and impede our course (Grot., Limborch, Baumgarten, Bretschn., al., and recently Delitzsch). [But the connexion with ἀποθέμενοι, which evidently Del. feels, seems to me fatal to his view, and indeed to all views except that which makes ἁμαρτία to lie about us, as a garment,] or beset us, as an inward propensity. Of both these ἀποθέσθαι may be said; of the former literally, of the latter figuratively. And in choosing between these two, I have no hesitation in choosing the former. The Writer is speaking of our race: and having expected us to lay aside all superfluous weight of body, which the athletes did, he passes to their other lightening for the race, viz. *stripping naked*, and exhorts us to put off sin, which lies so easily about us. And thus we have a strict analogy with the imagery in Eph. iv. 22, 24, ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον,—and with Col. iii. 9, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ. Most likely **the sin** alludes especially, though it need not exclusively, to apostasy. There does not seem to be any allusion to the different sins which may, in the sense now so common, and originally derived from this passage in E. V., "*beset*" various persons: though, of course, such an *application* of the passage is quite admissible. The above note, as to its enumeration of opinions, is principally gathered from Bleek and Delitzsch, both of whom have gone into the matter at far greater length. Various other shades and subtleties of meaning will be found discussed by them), **let us through** (not merely "*with*," but as *the state in, by means of which*: cf. 2 Cor. v. 7, διὰ πίστεως περιπατοῦμεν) **endurance run the race** (see reff. and add Statius, Theb. iii. 116, "Quisque suas avidi ad lacrymas miserabile currunt certamen;" and Eurip. Orest. 869, ἀγῶνα θανάσιμον δραμούμενον) **set before us** (reff., and Lucian, Anachars. 15, κοινός τις ἀγὼν . . τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς πολίταις πρόκειται: Cicero pro Flacco, 37 (92), "magnum ei erat certamen propositum"); **2.] looking unto** (so E. V. very exactly. ἀφορᾶν εἰς, or πρός τι, is an ordinary word for to direct the gaze upon any thing. So, of the outward eye, Jos. Antt. iv. 4. 7, Ἀαρὼν . . . θνήσκει, τοῦ πλήθους εἰς αὐτὸν ἀφορῶντος: of the inward eye, Arrian, Epictet. iv. 1, εἰς ταῦτα ἀφορᾷ τὰ παραδείγματα: Jos. B. J. ii. 17. 2, μάλιστα δὲ ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον στρατηγοῦντα: Arrian, Epict. ii. 19, εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἀφορῶντας ἐν παντὶ μικρῷ καὶ μεγάλῳ. See many more examples in Bleek. There does not appear to be in the preposition ἀφ-, any intimation of looking *off from every thing else unto*, as sometimes asserted. It merely implies direction from the person acting, or the place from which he acts, as in the similar compounds ἀπιδεῖν, ἀποβλέπειν (ch. xi. 26), ἀφορμᾶσθαι (εἰς), ἀφικνεῖσθαι, &c.) **the Leader** (one who precedes others by his example, they following him: [or rather **Author**:] see the note on ch. ii. 10, where the meanings of **ἀρχηγός** are classified) **and Perfecter** (**τελειωτής**, only found here, is variously interpreted. Chrys. says, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτήν. τί ἐστι τοῦτο; τουτέστιν αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν ἐνέθηκεν, αὐτὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν δέδωκεν (John xv. 16). . . . . εἰ δὲ αὐτὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡμῖν ἐνέθηκεν, αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ τέλος ἐπιθήσει. And so Œc. and Thl., Primas., Erasm.(par., "quod cœpit in nobis consummabit"), Jac. Cappell., Wittich, Braun. Another view is that He perfects the faith by bringing it to an end in the capacity of βραβευτής, giving it its final reward: so Schlichting, Grot., Limborch, Calmet, al. Again Bl., De Wette, Ebrard would understand merely that He exhibited faith in perfection in his own example. And so nearly Bengel ("fidei princeps et consummator dicitur, quia ipse fidem Patri ab initio ad exitum præstitit"): and Thdrt., when he says, κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀμφότερα τέθεικεν. And doubtless this meaning must not be excluded; but neither must it be held exclusively. He ἐτελείωσεν (τὴν) πίστιν, inasmuch as He perfected faith in his own person and example: but He ἐτελείωσεν τὴν πίστιν also, inasmuch as He became the Author of perfect salvation to them that obey Him.

m = ver. 16. Matt. xvii. 27. xx. 28.
n = Matt. xxv. 21.
o = ch. x. 32 reff.
p Heb., here only. elsw., Gospp. & P. (only) passim.
q Rev. iii. 18 reff.
r Matt. vi. 24 ‖ L. Rom. ii. 4. 1 Tim. iv. 10. 2 Pet. ii. 10 al. Prov. xiii. 13.
s ch. viii. 1.
t ch. i. 3 reff.

ὃς [m]ἀντὶ τῆς [s]προκειμένης αὐτῷ [n]χαρᾶς [o]ὑπέμεινεν [p]σταυρόν, [q]αἰσχύνης [r]καταφρονήσας, [st]ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ [s]θρόνου

ADKLℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

2. ins τον bef σταυρ. D[1] Cyr-jer[1].

His going before us in faith has made faith possible for us: His perfecting faith in his own person and example, has made faith effectual for us) **of the faith** (viz. that faith of which we have been speaking through ch. xi.: and thus rather '*the faith*' than "*our faith*," which latter is liable to the mistake so often made in English, viz. to being taken as if it = *faith in us*, so that Jesus should be said to be "author and finisher" of each individual Christian's faith which he has within him. We may render merely 'faith' without the art.; but seeing that πίστις has been anarthrous before (ch. xi. 1) when it was abstract, it would seem most probable that the art. here is intended to have a definite force. Besides which, the ascription of faith to our Lord is so plain in our Epistle (cf. ch. ii. 13; iii. 2) that we must not seem to exclude this sense in our rendering, which we certainly do by "*our faith:*" whereas '*the faith*' includes both, and satisfies that which follows, in which His own example of endurance in prospect of triumph is set before us), **(even) Jesus, who for the joy set before Him (ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ** χαρᾶς has been otherwise interpreted both by ancients and moderns. The Syr., Nazianz. in Œc., Beza, al. take it to mean, "*instead of the joy which He had before His incarnation.*" ᾧ ἐξὸν μένειν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας δόξης τε καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν ἄχρι τῆς δούλου μορφῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν. Naz. But this, though more according to the common meaning of ἀντί, seems to me doubly objectionable. First, which many have noticed, χαρά which He already had could not well be designated as προκειμένη: and then, which I have not seen noticed, χαρά can hardly be used of a state of bliss in which one already is, a quiescent or præ-existent joy, but more naturally applies to joy prompted by some cause of active rejoicing. Then another modification of this same view is found in Chrys., τουτέστιν, ἐξῆν αὐτῷ μηδὲν παθεῖν, εἴπερ ἐβούλετο. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ δόλος εὑρέθη ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· καθὼς καὶ αὐτός φησιν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις· ἔρχεται δ' τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων, καὶ οὐκ ἔχει ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐδέν. προὔκειτο τοίνυν αὐτῷ, εἴπερ ἐβούλετο, μὴ ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν σταυρόν· ἐξουσίαν γὰρ ἔχω, φησί, θεῖναι τὴν ψυχήν μου, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν. And so Œc., Thl., Luther (da er wohl hätte mögen Freude haben, duldete er u.s.w.), Calvin ("Significat enim, quum integrum esset Christo se eximere omni molestia, vitamque felicem et bonis omnibus affluentem degere, ipsum tamen ultro subiisse mortem acerbam et plenam ignominia"), al. But this again, though it might satisfy προκειμένης, falls short of the above sense maintained for χαρᾶς. Another kindred meaning is found in Erasm.(paraphr., "contemtis hujus vitæ gaudiis, subit mortem"), Wolf, Raphel, Carpzov, Wetst., Paulus, Bretschn. This makes χαρά = ἡδονή, besides giving a low and unworthy sense to ἡ προκειμένη αὐτῷ χαρά, in making it to mean the pleasures of this life. The sense given above, 'for the joy set before Him,' i. e. as in comparison with, as in exchange for, the joy which was to come after, in the day of His triumph, is adopted by Thdrt. (but interpreting the χαρά of the salvation of men, —χαρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ σωτηρία· ὑπὲρ ταύτης τὸ πάθος ὑπέμεινε), Primasius, Corn. a-Lap., Justiniani, Schlichting, Grot., Hammond, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Limborch, Bengel, Winer, Böhme, De Wette, Kuinoel, Bleek, Tholuck, Ebrard, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. And it is fully borne out both by usage, and the context. For thus we have ἀντί in reff., and in Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 6, ὀργιζόμενος τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀνθ' ὧν ἐπεπόνθει: Aristoph. Plut. 434, ἢ σφὼ ποιήσω τήμερον δοῦναι δίκην ἀνθ' ὧν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτον ἐνθένδ' ἀφανίσαι. See Winer, § 47. a) **endured crucifixion (σταυρόν**, anarthrous and put after the verb; and thus representing rather in the abstract, the kind of death, than in the concrete, "the cross" on which He was crucified), **despising shame** (or, "*the shame:*" when an anarthrous noun comes before a verb in the place of emphasis, it is not so easily determined whether it is definite or indefinite. But from the analogy of σταυρόν before, it is most probable that this is indefinite also,—every kind of shame, even to that of the shameful death which He died), **and** (τε is used as a copula, apart from καί, *once* by St. Matt. (xxviii. 12), *once* by St. Mark (xv. 36), *twice* by St. John (iv. 42; vi. 18), *four* times by St. Paul (Rom. ii. 19; xvi. 26: 1 Cor. iv. 21:

τοῦ θεοῦ [t] κεκάθικεν. [3] [u] ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην [o] ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν [v] ἀντιλογίαν, ἵνα μὴ [w] καμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν [x] ἐκλυόμενοι. [4] οὔπω [y] μέχρις αἵματος [z] ἀντικατέστητε πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρ-

u here only †. 3 Macc. vii. 7. Ps. lxxvi. 6 Symm. (see note.)
v ch. vi. 16. vii. 7. Jude 11 only. Prov. xvii. 11. (-λέγειν, Luke ii. 34. John xix. 12.)
w James v. 15 (Rev. ii. 3 rec.) only. Job x. 1 (w. ψυχ.). Wisd. xv. 9 only.
x here bis. Matt. xv. 32 ‖ Mk. Gal. vi. 9 only. 1 Kings xiv. 28. 1 Macc. iii. 17. ἐξελύετο τῇ ψυχῇ, Polyb. xxix. 6. 14 al.
y = Phil. ii. 8. 2 Tim. ii. 9. (2 Macc. xiii. 14.) μέχ. αἱμ. στάσις, Heliod. vii. 8. Wetst.
z here only. Deut. xxxi. 21. Josh. v. 7. Mic. ii. 8 A (only?).

om του θεου ℵ. rec εκαθισεν: txt ADKL[P]ℵ rel.
3. om τον D[1]. for υπο, απο D[1]. rec (for εαυτον) αυτον, with D[3]KL rel [Chr Damasc]: αυτους ℵ[3] 17 [Euthal-ms] Thdrt: εαυτους D[1]ℵ[1]: *semetipsos* am(with fuld[1] harl) [(Syr)]: *in vobis* D-lat: txt A[P Damasc-ms]. εκλελυμενοι D[1].
4. aft ουπω ins γαρ D[1][-gr] L o vulg(with demid, agst am fuld) coptt arm. μεχρι D[1]. αντεκατεστητε L[1] d k l m 17 Chr-ms Thdrt [Damasc-ms] Thl-ms: αντεστητε K: αντεκατε (sic) o.

Eph. iii. 19): but *seventy-nine* times by St. Luke: and in this Epistle four times (i. 3; vi. 5; ix. 1; xii. 2) **is set down** (so E. V. rightly, reading the perfect as in text. The aor. would express the fact, as it happened: the perf. gives it as it now endures, having happened. So that the latter is more real and graphic as concerns the readers) **on the right hand of the throne of God** (i. e. on the throne of God, at His right hand: see on ch. viii. 1, and cf. Rev. iii. 21). **3.] For** (q. d. and there is reason in what I say; ἀφορῶντες &c., for He like yourselves had much and continual conflict with the sinners of His day. **γάρ** is not as Lünem., "*Yea*," merely strengthening the imperative: I heartily concur with the dictum of Hermann, cited here by Delitzsch: "γάρ semper reddit rationem antecedentis sententiæ vel expressæ vel intellectæ") **compare** (with yourselves. **ἀναλογίσασθε** is very difficult to express in English. It is as Bengel, "comparatione instituta cogitare," "to think on, by way of comparison." So Plato, Theæt. p. 186 A, ἀναλογιζομένη ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὰ γεγονότα καὶ τὰ παρόντα πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα (*comparing*): Diod. Sic. xx. 8, τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ διείργοντος πελάγους ἀναλογιζόμενοι, τὴν σωτηρίαν ἀπεγίνωσκον (*reputantes*, bethinking themselves of, comparing with their power to cross it). So here it is, consider Him as set in comparison with yourselves. If the word to '*ponder*' had any trace left of its primitive meaning, it might serve; but it has now become equivalent to '*meditate*') **Him who hath endured** (perf. part. again, to set before them Christ as not merely a character of the past, but one ever present) **such contradiction** (**ἀντιλογία** need not be confined to *words*: see note on ch. vi. 16, and cf. ref. John, ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι. Œc. says, ἀντιλογίαν δέ φησι τὸν γέλωτα, τὰς πληγάς, τὰς χλευασίας, καὶ ὅσα ἀντέλεγον τοῖς αὐτοῦ δόγμασι καὶ διδάγμασι, καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ Πιλάτου κραυγάς. And so Chrys. and Thl. Lünemann in vain denies this sense of ἀντιλογία and ἀντιλέγειν: see reff., and Bleek's and Delitzsch's notes) **by the sinners against Himself** (i. e. by those who sinned against Him. Whether ἑαυτόν or αὐτόν be read, the sense will be the same. Beware of Ebrard's strange interpretation, given below on τὴν ἁμαρτίαν: "All mankind would be opposed to Christ as *the sinners* (the *class* of sinners); but the enemies of the gospel could not be opposed to the readers of the Epistle as *the sinners*, seeing that those readers themselves were sinners." All such notions of οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί arise from wrongly connecting εἰς ἑαυτόν, which follows ἁμαρτωλῶν and not ἀντιλογίαν. So ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν Luke xv. 18, 21. See also Luke xvii. 4: Acts xxv. 8), **that ye weary not** (reff.), **fainting in your souls** (**ταῖς ψ. ὑμῶν** may be joined either with κάμητε or with ἐκλυόμενοι. In ref. Job, we have κάμνων τῇ ψυχῇ μου: and ἐκλύεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ is found in Polyb. ref., and xx. 4. 7, οὐ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἐξελύθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς. So also in Diod. Sic. xx. 1, διὰ τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὴν ἀκαιρίαν τοῦ συγγραφέως ἐκλυθέντες τὰς ψυχάς. And this latter is preferable, on account of the rhythm, and the improbability of the participle standing thus alone at the end of the sentence). **4.]** Bengel's remark, which De Wette charges with pedantry, "a cursu venit ad pugilatum, ut Paulus, 1 Cor. ix 26," is nevertheless a just one. **Not yet have ye resisted** (so ἀντικαθίστασθαι absolutely, Thuc. i. 62, εἶδον τοὺς ἐναντίους παρασκευαζομένους εἰς μάχην, ἀντικαθίσταντο καὶ αὐτοί: and 71, ταύτης

τίαν [a] ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι, [5] καὶ [b] ἐκλέλησθε τῆς [c] παρακλή- σεως, [d] ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς [e] διαλέγεται, [f] Υἱέ μου, μὴ [g] ὀλιγώρει [h] παιδείας κυρίου, μηδὲ [x] ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ [i] ἐλεγχόμενος. [6] ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ κύριος [j] παιδεύει· [k] μασ-

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

a here only †. b here only †. Ps. xii. 2 Symm. τῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ βίας ἐξελανθάνοντο, Polyb. v. 48. 6. c = Acts xiii. 15. xv. 31. 1 Tim. iv. 13 al. L.P.H. 1 Macc. x. 24. d = ch. viii. 5 reff. e Acts xvii. 2, 17. xviii. 4. Exod. vi. 27. f Prov. iii. 11, 12. g here only. 1. c. only. h here &c. 4 times. Eph. vi. 4. 2 Tim. iii. 16 only. Prov. xv. 10. i = Rev. iii. 19. Prov. ix. 7, 8 al. j = Luke xxiii. 16, 22. 2 Cor vi. 9. 2 Chron. x. 11. Prov. xix. 18. k Matt. x. 17. xx. 19 ‖. xxiii. 34. John xix. 1 only. = Ps. lxxii. 5. Job xxx. 21 al.

5. εκλελυσθε K a[1] 106-8-14 Chr(τοῦτ' ἔστι παρήκατε τὰς χεῖρας, ἐξελύθητε) [Euthal-ms]. ins παρα bef της παρακλησεως D[1][-gr]. om μου (*as LXX*) D[1](and lat) a m Clem$_1$ [Antch$_2$ Damasc-ms Orig-int$_2$]. ελενχομενος bef υπ' αυτου D[-gr Orig-int$_1$].

μέντοι τοιαύτης ἀντικαθεστηκυίας πόλεως, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, διαμέλλετε. See below) **unto blood** (many take this to mean, have not yet sacrificed your lives. So Chrys., ὃ δὲ λέγει, τοῦτό ἐστιν· οὔπω θάνατον ὑπέστητε· μέχρι χρημάτων ὑμῖν ἡ ζημία, μέχρι δόξης, μέχρι τοῦ ἐλαύνεσθαι. And Thl., οὔπω, φησίν, ἄχρι θανάτου ἐφθάσατε, ἀλλὰ ἄχρι διωγμῶν, ἄχρις ἁρπαγῆς· ὁ δὲ χριστὸς ἄχρι θανάτου ἦλθεν. And this may be so: but I would rather abide by the idea of the pugilistic figure being intended, and apply *μέχρις αἵματος* to the figure, not to the interpretation. Cf. Seneca, Ep. i. 13, "Non potest athleta magnos spiritus ad certamen afferre, qui nunquam suggillatus est. Ille qui vidit sanguinem suum, cujus dentes crepuerunt sub pugno, ille qui supplantatus adversarium toto tulit corpore, nec projecit animum projectus, qui quoties cecidit contumacior resurrexit, cum magna spe descendit ad pugnam." For the expression, cf. reff., and Niceph. Hist. a. 741, ἐνωμότους αὐτῷ συνθήκας δεδώκεσαν, ὡς μέχρις αἵματος ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀνελέσθαι τὸν κίνδυνον. On the relation of such passages as this to the date of the Epistle, see in the Prolegomena, § ii. 29 ff.), **contending against** (πρός, of the direction towards which the athlete's force was directed: cf. *μάχεσθαι πρὸς Τρῶας*, Il. ρ. 471: Matthiæ, § 591, and Winer, § 49, h. *a.*) **sin** (personified, as an adversary: not to be limited in its meaning to sin in themselves, or to sin in their persecutors, but understood of both. Delitzsch, who would confine it to the latter, says that it was not sin in themselves which would *shed* their blood, but rather, which would *spare* its being shed. Yes, and for this very reason the *resisting* that sin of unfaithfulness which would lead them to *spare* their blood, would if carried far enough, lead to the shedding of it. Similarly, the sin in their persecutors, which they were to resist, would, if yielded to, spare their blood by seducing them into apostasy. The joining πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν with ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι is even more certain than the similar connexion in ver. 3, seeing that ἀντικατέστητε has already had its qualifying clause in *μέχρις αἵματος*. And so almost all Commentators, except Bengel). **5.] And ye have completely forgotten** (**ἐκλανθάνεσθαι**, more usually ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι, is seldom found. See in reff.: Il. π. 602, οὐδ' ἄρ' Ἀχαιοὶ ἀλκῆς ἐξελάθοντο. It is perhaps chosen here, as Del. suggests, not without some reference to the sound of ἐκλυόμενοι before and ἐκλύου following. See var. readd.

There is a great difference among Commentators as to whether these words are to be read affirmatively or interrogatively. The former view is taken by all the ancient expositors, and many moderns, among whom are Wittich, Surenhusius, Wolf, Bengel, Kuinoel, Klee, Tholuck, De Wette, Ebrard. The interrogative view is taken by Calvin, Beza (b), Braun, Böhme, Lachmann, Bleek, De Wette, Bisping, Lünemann, Delitzsch. The ground on which this latter is defended is that, if declarative, the words would be too severe for the general tenor of the passage. I own I cannot see this. The fact of their having thus forgotten the exhortation is surely assumed below, in vv. 7—11: and from this point forward the Writer takes up the tone of reproof, which comes to its height in vv. 16, 17. And not only this. The interrogative form would surely be most unnatural, coupled closely as it would be with an assertion of fact, οὔπω .... ἀντικατέστητε) **the exhortation** (**παράκλησις**, as elsewhere in N.T. and especially in St. Luke (reff.), unites the ideas of exhortation and consolation. See on ch. vi. 18, and on παρακαλεῖν, ch. iii. 13), **the which** (that kind of exhortation, of which the following is a specimen: such seems to be the force of ἥτις instead of ἥ) **discourses with you** (so **διαλέγεσθαι** in the Acts, of opening a discourse with any one: see reff.) **as with sons, My son** (υἱέ in LXX: see digest), **despise not** (**ὀλιγωρέω** is not uncommon in the classics,

τιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν [l] παραδέχεται. [7] εἰς [g] παιδείαν

l Mark iv. 20. Acts xv. 4. xvi. 21. xxii. 18. 1 Tim. v. 19 only. Exod. xxiii. 1. (= προσδ., Ezek. xx. 40, 41. xliii. 27. Mal. i. 8.)

7. rec (for εις) ει, with rel [Euthal-ms Thl]: txt ADKL[P]א l[1] m o 17 [47 Syr coptt æth arm] Chr(*see note*) Procop$_1$ Damasc$_2$ Œc, *in disciplina* vulg Orig-int$_1$, *in disciplinam* fuld D-lat.

and with a genitive, as here) the chastening of the Lord, nor faint, when corrected by Him (Heb., "and have no aversion to His correction"): **6.]** for whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth (ἐλέγχει, LXX-B; Aא have as text: in ref. Rev., both are combined, ἐγὼ ὅσους ἂν φιλῶ, ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω), yea, and (the δέ throws out the new feature into a climax) scourgeth every son whom He receiveth ("In the Heb. this clause according to the present punctuation is וּכְאָב אֶת־בֵּן יִרְצֶה, 'and (that) as a father the son in whom he delighteth.' The LXX, instead of וּכְאָב, have expressed וְכָאֵב, the Pihel of כָּאַב 'to feel pain,' and have taken it as = 'to cause pain,' as the Hiphil הִכְאִיב occurs sometimes, e. g. Job v. 18, of God's chastisement of men. Certainly by this rendering the parallelism with the first hemistich, and the whole expression, gain in completeness, whereas according to the Masoretic punctuation there is an appearance of lameness about it." Bleek: who thinks, as does Del., that the LXX have expressed better the sense of the Writer than the Masoretic punctuators. "For the translation of כָּאֵב by *μαστιγοῦν, to scourge, to whip,* instead of generally *to punish,* cf. Ps. xxxii. (xxxi.) 10, *μάστιγες* for מַכְאוֹבִים: and for the use of the Greek verb for divine chastisement (reff.), Tobit xi. 14 [AB (not א)], *ἐμαστίγωσας κ. ἠλέησάς με*: xiii. 2 (5, 9), *αὐτὸς μαστιγοῖ κ. ἐλεεῖ*: Judith viii. 27, *εἰς νουθέτησιν μαστιγοῖ κύριος τοὺς ἐγγίζοντα αὐτῷ*."

ὃν παραδέχεται, see reff., whom He takes to him as a veritable son, receives in his heart and cherishes). **7, 8.]** *Application of the passage of Scripture to the readers.* **7.]** First, as to the reading. As between εἰς and εἰ, the case stands thus: εἰ is found in "*minuscc. multis ut videtur,*" Tischdf. (edn. 7 [8]): in Chrys. (but more than doubtful: see below), in Thdrt. (also doubtful), in Thl. (certain). This is really all the authority that can be cited for it. εἰς is found in the six uncial MSS. which contain the passage, in about thirty cursive mss., in all the ancient versions (apparently): in all the Fathers who cite and explain the words: e. g. Chrys. (in whose text in this Homily (xxix.) the *εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε* is evidently a correction to the later reading: for, after quoting the text as in rec., his sentence runs, *εἰ παιδεύει, ἄρα εἰς διόρθωσιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς κόλασιν, οὐδὲ εἰς τιμωρίαν, οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ κακῶς παθεῖν*: where it must be obvious to any one that *εἰ παιδεύει* ought to be *εἰς παιδείαν*, or the sentence is without coherence. In the Catena, this appears still more decisively: where he says, *εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, φησίν· οὐκ εἰς κόλασιν, οὐδὲ εἰς τιμωρίαν*),—Thdrt. (in all probability: his present text runs thus: *εἰ παιδείαν ὑπομένετε· εἰ φέρετε γενναίως τὰς ἐπιφερομένας παιδείας*. But it is hardly possible that *εἰ φέρετε γενναίως* should be the exposition of *εἰ ὑπομένετε*, in the sense which the verb must bear in the rec. text, and it is here again to be suspected, as even Bleek confesses, that the *εἰ* has been a correction to the rec.),—Œc. (*ὑπομένετε, φησί, τὴν παιδείαν*). Of modern critical editors, Matthæi regards *εἰς* as the right reading, Griesbach puts it in his inner margin, Lachmann of course adopts it, and Tregelles: also Tischendorf edd. 7, 8, but in his 2nd edn. he retained the rec.: as do Bleek, Tholuck, and Lünem.: and among ourselves, Dr. Bloomfield, who tries to explain the (angebliche) correction into *εἰς* by saying that *εἰ* "*seldom begins a sentence.*" In the N. T., where *εἰ* stands alone without *μή*, it begins a sentence at least nine times out of ten. See Brüder. εἰς is adopted and strongly defended, by Ebrard and Delitzsch. And it seems to me the only defensible reading. The mere fact that *εἰ* appears at first sight to yield a better sense, should never be allowed to weigh against the almost unanimous consent of antiquity. And if we examine closer this supposed better sense, we shall find it fail us. For first, the verb *ὑπομένειν* is not one which will bear the mere accidental sense thus given to it. The sense which we want, with *εἰ*, is, 'If ye are suffering chastisement:' asserting a mere matter of fact. *παιδείαν ὑπομένειν* can only signify, '*patiently to endure* chastisement.' Then, taking this only possible meaning, what have we? 'If ye patiently endure chastisement, God is dealing with you as with sons:' i. e. 'your method of endurance is a sign of God's method of treatment:' a sentence which stultifies itself. Next, what is the sense with εἰς? I see no reason for departing from that given by Chrys. in the Catena (see above): "It is for chastisement that

m ver. 2. n = here only ‡. · πάντα τρόπον ὡς πολεμίοις προσεφέροντο, Jos. B. J. vii. 8. 1 al. (Plato, Philo al. in Bl.) o ch. i. 9 reff. p here only †. Wisd. iv. 3 only. q Mark iv. 17 al. Job xii. 2 (only ?). r = ch. v. 7 reff. s Rom. ii. 20 only. Hos. v. 2. Sir. xxxvii. 19 only. t = Matt. xxi. 37 ‖. Luke xviii. 2, 4 (1 Cor. iv. 14. 2 Thess. iii. 14. Tit. ii. 8) only. Exod. x. 3. u ver. 25. Xen. Anab. ii. 3. 13.

[m] ὑπομένετε, ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν [n] προσφέρεται ὁ θεός· τίς γάρ [ἐστιν] υἱός, ὃν οὐ [j] παιδεύει πατήρ; [8] εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε [h] παιδείας, ἧς [o] μέτοχοι γεγόνασιν πάντες, ἄρα [p] νόθοι καὶ οὐχ υἱοί ἐστε. [9] [q] εἶτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς [r] σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας εἴχομεν [s] παιδευτὰς καὶ [t] ἐνετρεπόμεθα· οὐ [u] πολὺ

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

υπομεινατε D¹. om εστιν A[P]ℵ¹ vulg sah [æth Bas₁] Orig[-int₁]: ins DKLℵ³ rel [Syr copt arm Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Antch₁ Damasc₂].

8. νοθροι A. rec 2nd εστε bef κ. ουχ υιοι, with D²KL[P] rel Syr Mac Chr Thdrt Damasc: txt AD¹·³ℵ m 17 latt Chr-3-mss [Euthal-ms Orig-int₁].

9. rec πολλω, with D³KL rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc₂]: txt AD¹ℵ 17 [Euthal-ms Damasc-ms. (P def.)] aft πολυ ins δε D¹[-gr] ℵ³.

ye are enduring, not for punishment, not for any evil purpose." "Your ὑπομονή, like His ὑπομονή, will not be thrown away. He had joy before Him, you have life (καὶ ζήσομεν, ver. 9) before you." Or if we please we may take ὑπομένετε, as Œc. above, imperatively: "Endure with a view to chastisement:" which sense however is not so good nor so natural, nor is it so likely, from the collocation of the words: for thus ὑπομένετε would come first, and it would probably be εἰς τὸ παιδεύεσθαι.

It is for chastisement that ye are enduring: as with sons, God is dealing with you (**προσφέρεσθαι**, see reff., united with οὕτως, τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ, βέλτιον, φιλικῶς, and similar adverbs, is common in good Greek of all ages. Bleek brings forward several passages very similar in construction to this: αἷς ἐὰν ὡς μιᾷ προσφέρῃ . . . . . ἐὰν δὲ ὡς πολλαῖς κ.τ.λ., Plato, Rep. p. 435 A: Πυθαγόρας ἐρωτηθείς, πῶς δεῖ ἀγνωμονούσῃ πατρίδι προσφέρεσθαι, εἶπεν· ὡς μητρί, &c., Stobæus, c. 39). **For what son is there** (two other ways of taking the words are possible: 1. as Luther, adopted by Delitzsch, to make τίς the subject and υἱός the predicate, "who is a son?" 2. as Böhme, to make υἱός the subject and τίς the predicate, "of what sort is a son?" Both of these are bad: the former, from the exceeding harshness and oddity of the question, "what man is a son, whom, &c.?" the second, from the forcing of τίς, where its natural sense serves, and from the absence of the art. before υἱός. As usually rendered, the question is exactly like τίς [ἐστιν] ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος; Matt. vii. 9; xii. 11. See also 1 Cor. ii. 11, τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων;) **whom a father** (possibly, 'his father:' for πατήρ (not υἱός) is one of those words which, from their being singular in their kind, often lose the article) **chasteneth not?**

8.] **But if ye are without** (separate from, no partakers in) **chastisement, of which all** (God's sons: or those above mentioned, ch. xi., which is better, on account of the perfect verb) **have been made partakers** (**μέτοχος**, see reff. and note), **then ye are** (**ἄρα**, the inferential particle, in late and N. T. Greek, is found at the beginning of a clause: but never in classical Greek. Delitzsch compares two examples, one from Lucian, Jup. Tragœd. § 51, εἰ εἰσὶ βωμοί, εἰσὶ καὶ θεοί· ἀλλὰ μὴν εἰσὶ βωμοί, εἰσὶν ἄρα καὶ θεοί, the other, the well-known "cogito, ergo sum;" which in later and modern Greek is στοχάζομαι, ἄρα εἰμί (εἶμαι). He proceeds to say that Klotz's view, that ἄρα is not properly syllogistic but only expresses "*leviorem* et liberiorem quandam ratiocinationem," is not confirmed by N. T. usage, nor indeed by classical, cf. Plato, Phædo § 26, οὐχ ὁρατόν· ἀειδὲς ἄρα) **bastards** (**νόθος**, ὁ μὴ γνήσιος υἱός, ἀλλ' ἐκ παλλακίδος, Phavorinus. But it is only one side of the similitude which is brought out. So Philo, De Confus. Ling. 28, vol. i. p. 426, speaking of the υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων who built Babel, says that they were τῶν ἐκ πόρνης ἀποκυηθέντων οὐδὲν διαφέροντες, οὓς ὁ νόμος ἐκκλησίας ἀπελήλακε θείας. Chrys. explains it well: ὁρᾷς ὅτι ὥσπερ ἔφθην εἰπών, οὐκ ἔνι μὴ παιδευόμενον εἶναι υἱόν; ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις τῶν νόθων καταφρονοῦσιν οἱ πατέρες, κἂν μηδὲν μανθάνωσι, κἂν μὴ ἔνδοξοι γένωνται, τῶν δὲ γνησίων ἕνεκεν υἱῶν δεδοίκασι μήποτε ῥᾳθυμήσωσι, τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος. εἰ τοίνυν τὸ μὴ παιδεύεσθαι νόθων ἐστί, δεῖ χαίρειν ἐπὶ τῇ παιδείᾳ, εἴγε γνησιότητος τοῦτό ἐστιν), **and not sons.**

9.] **Then again** (**εἶτα** brings in a fresh argument: "furthermore," as E. V. "deinde considerare debemus," Primas. It is taken interrogatively here by Raphel, al., as in Plato, Apol. Socr. p. 28 B, εἶτ' οὐκ αἰσχύνει, ὦ Σώκρατες κ.τ.λ.; But, 1. this would be only admissible in the case of strong indignation being expressed, which is not so here: and, 2. it would certainly

[u] μᾶλλον [v] ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν [w] πνευμάτων καὶ [x] ζήσομεν; [10] οἱ μὲν γὰρ [y] πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς [z] ἐπαίδευον· ὁ δὲ [a] ἐπὶ τὸ [b] συμφέρον, [c] εἰς

v Luke ii. 51. Rom. viii. 7, 20. Eph. v. 21, 24. James iv. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 13 al. Ps. lxi. 1.
w = ch. i. 14. Job iv. 15. x ch. x. 38. Rom. viii. 13 al. y = Luke viii. 13. 1 Cor. vii. 5. James iv. 14 al. z vv. 6, 7. a = Luke xxiii. 48. Matt. iii. 7. Winer, § 49. l. 3. d. b = Acts xx. 20. 1 Cor. xii. 7. Deut. xxiii. 6. c ch. vii. 25 reff.

10. for οι, ο ℵ[1]. επαιδ[ευεν (*sic*)] ημας και τα δοκουντα αυτοις D[1]: *erudiebant nos secundum voluntatem suam* D-lat. om εις το ℵ[1].

require καὶ οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.),—**we once had** (imperfect, of a state of former habit) **the fathers of our flesh** (see below) **as chastisers** (**τοὺς πατ.** is the object, **παιδευτάς** the predicate: not as E. V., "*we have had fathers of our flesh who corrected us*" (πατέρας μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν εἴχομεν τοὺς παιδεύοντας)) **and reverenced them** (reff.: **ἐντρέπομαι** is found in classical Greek with a gen. of the object, e. g. τί βαιὸν ἐντρέπει σῆς συμμάχου; Soph. Aj. 90: but in later (e. g. LXX, Polyb., Dionys., Diod. Sic., Plutarch, al.) and N. T. Greek with an accus.): **shall we not much rather be in subjection** (so the E. V. well expresses the subjective force of the fut. pass.) **to the Father of spirits** (or, '*of our spirits*,' understanding ἡμῶν again. But (see also below) the other is more majestic, and more in accord with the text which probably was before the Writer's mind, Num. xvi. 22, θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός, and again xxvii. 16) **and live** (viz. in life eternal, as in reff.)? An enquiry arises out of the **πατέρας τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν** and **πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων** here, in what sense our earthly fathers are said to be the fathers of our flesh, and God the Father of (our) spirits. To deal with the latter first: several explanations have been given. Understanding ἡμῶν, some have taken it as, the Creator of human souls. So Primasius ("creator animorum"), Thl. (as Chrys. below, but preferring this), and among the moderns, Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappell., Estius, Justiniani, Wetst., Heinrichs, Ernesti, al., and more recently Delitzsch, as a proof of the doctrine of Creationism (the direct creation of every man's soul by God) against Traducianism (the derivation of our souls *ex traduce* from parent to parent). Some again, as the *originator of spiritual life*: so Seb. Schmidt, Calov., Cramer, Grotius, Hammond(par.), Limborch, Corn. a-Lapide, and more recently Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Ebrard. Others, not understanding ἡμῶν, take it as *the Father of the spirit-world*, *of* spiritual existences. So Erasm. Schmid, Bretschn. (lex.), al. All these three meanings are enumerated by the ancient expositors: by Chrys. without deciding between them, τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων· ἤτοι τῶν χαρισμάτων λέγει, ἤτοι τῶν εὐχῶν (read ψυχῶν), ἤτοι τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων: so Œc.: Thl. says, πατέρα δὲ πνευμάτων ἢ τῶν χαρισμάτων ἢ τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων· ἤ, ὅπερ καὶ οἰκειότερον, τῶν ψυχῶν· πρὸς γὰρ ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν σαρκικῶν πατέρων εἶπε τὸν πνευματικόν. Thdrt. takes the meaning, Author of spiritual life, alone: πατέρα γὰρ πνευμάτων τὸν πνευματικὸν πατέρα κέκληκεν, ὡς τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων πηγήν· δι' ἐκείνων δὲ ἡμῖν δέδωκε τὸ τῆς υἱοθεσίας ἀξίωμα. Others understand by πατέρα not the *originator*, but the *upholder, cherisher*: so Morus, Dindorf, Kuinoel, Böhme ("quorumlibet hominum tanquam immortalium pater, i. e. patronus, tutor, sospitatorque"), Bretschn. (lex. under πατήρ, "qui animum castigat, docet, emendat"). But, though this latter sense must not be excluded, being as it is manifestly operative in inducing present submission, to remember present dependence, so neither must the idea of origination be excluded, for it is from that fact that all a father's rights and loving-kindnesses spring. In endeavouring to decide between these meanings, one safe standing-place may, I think, be gained, by getting free from that class of meanings which understands ἡμῶν, any further than it is necessarily involved in all spirits. τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας, and τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων without ἡμῶν, are widely and surely purposely distinct. He is described here as the Father of spirits, not as the Father of our spirits. And therefore I would understand the expression as an exalted contrast of God, a Spirit Himself, and the Creator of spirits, His like, to men, flesh themselves, and the progenitors ("creatores, quod ad similitudinem attinet") of fleshly bodies, their like. On the consequence, as regards Creationism and Traducianism, I will not here enter. It would require far more comparison of other passages and more deliberate estimation how far this one propounds a further truth than the argument requires, to be included in a mere note. Cf. Delitzsch's argument here. **10.**] The a fortiori is strengthened, by bringing out the difference between the two chastisements as to their *character*. **For they indeed** (our

d ch. vi. 7 reff. e 2 Cor. i. 12 only †. 2 Macc. xv. 2 only. f ver. 5, &c.

τὸ [d] μεταλαβεῖν τῆς [e] ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ. [11] πᾶσα δὲ [f] παι- ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

11. for 1st δε, μεν [P]ℵ[1] 17. 21 D-lat [Orig-int$_1$] : om D[1][-gr] 31. 109 lect-19 [æth] arm Chr-3-mss.

earthly parents) **for a few days** (see the meaning below. **πρός** as in reff. mainly temporal, but also indicating reference: 'during, and with a view to.' See below) **chastised us** (imperf. as above, ver. 9) **after their own pleasure** (according to that which seemed good to them: their standard and rule of action in the matter was at best their own view of what was right, and too often their own caprice or temper, ἡδονὴν πληροῦντες πολλάκις, Chrys.), **but He in order to** (**ἐπί**, of the contemplated direction of the result) **that which is profitable, in order to our partaking of His holiness** (**ἁγιότης**, except in the two places in reff., no where found in Greek literature. It is a more complete abstract than ἁγιωσύνη, which is rather inherent and attributive. The becoming partakers of God's holiness is manifestly to be taken subjectively: becoming holy like Him. So Thl. partly after Chrys.: τῆς ἁγ., τουτέστι, τῆς καθαρότητος αὐτοῦ· ὥστε, φησί, γενέσθαι ἡμᾶς δεκτικοὺς τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν· ἄρα οὖν ἡ παιδεία μετάληψις ἁγιότητός ἐστι, καὶ εἰκότως· συστρέφει γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον θεόν, μὴ ἐῶσα αὐτὴν πρὸς ἀνθρώπινόν τι ῥέμβεσθαι). Two questions arise regarding this verse: 1. what is the intended reference of **πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας**? 2. what are the clauses opposed to one another? The former of these questions in fact involves the latter. **πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας** has been understood by many of the *duration of our natural life*, as the term to which the chastisement of our natural parents had reference, whereas that of our Heavenly Father regarded eternity. So Calv., Estius, Justiniani, Corn. a-Lap., Calmet, Schlichting, Limborch, Bengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, al. But this cannot be the meaning of the Writer. For in the first place it is not true that all earthly correction had regard only to the present life. And in the next, there is not one word in the latter clause expressing the eternal nature of God's purpose, which surely there would have been. The other interpretation, 'during and in reference to the time of our being subject to their chastisement,' is certainly the right one. So Œc. (ἡ γὰρ θάνατος τοῦ πατρός, ἢ αὔξησις τοῦ παιδός, ἵστησι τὴν παιδείαν), Thl., Schol.-Matthæi, vulg. ("in tempore paucorum dierum"), D-lat., Erasm. (par.), Luth., Jac. Cappell., Grot., Wetst., Böhme, Kuinoel, Bleek, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. Then we come to the second question, how the antitheses are to be arranged. Some, as Wetst., Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, and Bleek, have thought that πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας is to be supplied in the second member of the sentence also: seeing that the divine chastisement, like the human, lasts for a few days only, i. e. for the term of this time of trial. Others again would supply in the second member some *contrast* to πρὸς ὀλ. ἡμ. So Œc. (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀεὶ παιδεύων τελείους ποιεῖ), Thl., Jac. Cappell., al. Delitzsch takes the antithesis thus: The second pair of contrasts, with which he begins, is κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον. The other is, πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, and εἰς τὸ μεταλ. τ. ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ. As in πρός the meanings of duration and intention are mingled, so in εἰς the meanings of intention and result. But I cannot think that Delitzsch is right. Both order of words, and correspondence of meaning, are against him. Surely the true antithesis is that pointed out by the order of the clauses themselves, and by their correspondence: 1. πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας and ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον: 2. κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and εἰς τὸ μεταλ. τ. ἁγ. αὐτοῦ. In (1), we have set over against one another, —the short time during which, the temporary reference with which, their chastisement was inflicted,—and the great purpose, implied as eternal from its very expression as τὸ συμφέρον for an immortal being, for which He chastises us: and in (2), are opposed,—their purpose and standard of action, to satisfy their own seeming, be it good or bad,—and His purpose, to make us partakers of His holiness, which holiness, absolute and pure, is His rule of acting, and no mere δοκοῦν αὐτῷ. Thus all is straightforward, and no clause need be supplied.

11.] Recurrence to the common ground of ver. 8, in describing the attribute of *all* chastisement, divine as well as human. That this reference of the verse is right, I am fully persuaded. Delitzsch's view, that divine chastisement only is intended, confuses the logical sequence, and would certainly require, after what has gone before, some distinctive mark to indicate such restriction of the sense. The sequence of οἱ μὲν .... ἐπαίδευον .... ὁ δὲ ... (παιδεύει) ..... πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία could not be otherwise interpreted than by taking πᾶσα as including the οἱ μέν and the ὁ δέ. It is true that in asserting what he does of πᾶσα παιδεία, the Writer lets

δεία [y] πρὸς μὲν τὸ [g] παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ [h] χαρᾶς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ [h] λύπης· ὕστερον δὲ [ik] καρπὸν [l] εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι᾽ αὐτῆς [m] γεγυμνασμένοις [n] ἀποδίδωσιν [k] δικαιοσύνης. [12] Διὸ τὰς [o] παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ [p] παραλελυμένα γόνατα [q] ἀνορ-

g so Thuc. ii. 22 al. fr. neut., here only. h gen., ch. x. 39 reff. i = Rom. xv. 28. Gal. v. 22. Eph. v. 9.

k Phil. i. 11. James iii. 18. Prov. xi. 30. l James iii. 17 only. Deut. xxiii. 6 al. m ch. v. 14 reff. n Matt. xxi. 41. Rev. xxii. 2. Lev. xxvi. 4. o = here (Luke xi. 42) only. 2 Kings iv. 1. Zeph. iii. 16. Sir. ii. 12, 13. iv. 29. (Isa. xxxv. 3.) p Luke v. 18, 24. Acts viii. 7. ix. 33 only. l. c. Jer. vi. 24. Ezek. vii. 27 al. q Luke xiii. 13. Acts xv. 16 only. Ps. xvii. 36.

δι᾽ αυτοις D[1][-gr].

fall out of view the capricious nature and uncertain result of human chastisement, and regards it more as a type and representative of that which is divine: all παιδεία properly so called, and answering its proper purpose. This is brought out in the second clause: the first is equally true of every sort of παιδεία. **Now** (exactly gives the δέ, which resumes the general from the particular, introducing an axiom to which all will assent) **all chastisement for the time present** (πρός, as before, ver. 10, 'during and in respect of:' our '*for*' exactly gives it. Cf. ref. Thucyd., ὁρῶν αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸ παρὸν χαλεπαίνοντας) **seems** (καλῶς εἶπεν· οὐ δοκεῖ. οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι λύπης ἡ παιδεία, ἀλλὰ μόνον δοκεῖ. Chrys.) **not to be matter of joy** (χαρᾶς is the gen. of category, and requires no ellipsis supplied: see on ch. x. 39, and cf. Thuc. iii. 70, βουλῆς ὤν), **but of grief: but afterwards it yields** (see reff. and Herod. i. 193, ἐπὶ διηκόσια μὲν τὸ παράπαν ἀποδιδοῖ) **peaceable fruit of righteousness** (the gen. is one of apposition; the righteousness is the fruit, the παιδεία being the tree. The words are otherwise taken, making δικαιοσύνης a gen. subjecti, and righteousness that which yields the fruit, by Thl. (making δικαιοσύνη to be God's righteousness: δίκαιος ὢν ὁ θεός, τοὺς ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ λυπηθέντας ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύει), Jac. Cappell. (Calv. in Bleek, but he says, "Fructus justitiæ dicitur timor Domini:" which is rather the other way), Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, al., who make δικαιοσ. an attribute not of God, but of the men spoken of: as in ref. Phil., πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, and in Liban. Decl. i. p. 198 B, μηδὲ τοῦτ᾽ ἄδηλον, πότερον ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης καρπὸς ἢ τῆς πονηρίας ἀμείνων. But seeing that παιδεία καρπὸν ἀποδίδωσιν, it must be its own fruit, and not that belonging to righteousness, that it yields. And thus Estius, Schlichting, Calov., Bengel, Storr, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. And this fruit, thus considered, is the practical righteousness which springs from faith, not the forensic righteousness which comes by faith (as in Rom. v. 1). And this fruit is called εἰρηνικός, in contrast to the ἀγών by which it is won: it is, as Tholuck expresses it, "fruit of righteousness to be enjoyed in peace after the conflict." This is far better than to understand it 'salutaris' because שָׁלוֹם, peace, is used also for salvation (so Castellio, Michaelis, Storr, Ernesti, Dindorf, Schleusner, Wahl, Bretschn., Kuinoel): or with Primas., Grot., Wittich, Braun, Lamb. Bos, to take it as = "gratissimum atque acceptissimum." The same sounding words occur together in ref. James, but the reference is different: see note there) **to those who have been exercised by it** (viz. παιδείας. The **γεγυμνασμένοις** is a clear reference to the conflict alluded to in the former verses. τί ἐστι, τοῖς δι᾽ αὐτῆς γεγυμν.; τοῖς ἀνασχομένοις ἐπὶ πολὺ καὶ καρτερήσασιν. ὁρᾷς πῶς καὶ εὐφήμῳ ὀνόματι κέχρηται; ἄρα γυμνασία ἐστὶν ἡ παιδεία, τὸν ἀθλητὴν ἰσχυρὸν ἐργαζομένη καὶ ἀκαταγώνιστον ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι καὶ ἄμαχον ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις. Chrys.).

12—17.] ***Further exhortation, rather to promote the running the Christian race, and to take care, following peace and holiness, that there be no bitter root of sin among them, which, as in Esau's case, might deprive them of the promised blessing.***

12.] **Wherefore** (connects with the reasoning, and also with the imagery, of the foregoing verses: because suffering chastisement is the part of God's sons—because the running the race successfully brings joy and peace. And so Chrys., ὡς πρὸς δρομεῖς καὶ πύκτας καὶ πολεμιστὰς διαλέγεται· ὁρᾷς πῶς αὐτοὺς καθοπλίζει, πῶς αὐτοὺς ἐπαίρει; and I see no reason with Bleek to doubt this. He does so mainly because ver. 14 would come in abruptly on the other view. But of that see below) **put straight again** (into their proper places) **the relaxed hands** (**παρειμένος**, not far from παραλελυμένος in sense—unstrung by infirmity, so as to be incapable of healthy motion. The two words are frequently joined together: in ref. Isa., with the same substantives as here, but ἀνειμέναι for παρ-: ἰσχύσατε χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα: in Sir. xxv. 23, the very same words, χεῖρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα

r Prov. iv. 26. ib. ver. 11.
s here only. Prov. as above & ii. 15. v. 6, 21 only.

θώσατε· [13] καὶ [rs] τροχιὰς [rt] ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ [u] χωλὸν [v] ἐκτραπῇ, ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον. [14] [w] εἰρήνην [wx] διώκετε [wy] μετὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸν [z] ἁγιασμόν,

ADKLP ℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

t Acts xiv. 10 only. u = here only. (elsw. lit., Gospp. & Acts only.) see 3 Kings xviii. 21. v 1 Tim. i. 6. v. 15. vi. 20. 2 Tim. iv. 4 only. Amos v. 8 only. w 2 Tim. ii. 22. x = Rom. ix. 30. 1 Pet. iii. 11 (from Ps. xxxiii. 14) al. y = Rom. xii. 18. z Paul (Rom. vi. 19, 22. 1 Cor. i. 30. 1 Thess. iv. 3 al[4].) only, exc. here and 1 Pet. i. 2. 2 Macc. xiv. 36.

13. ποιειτε ℵ[1][P 17].

παραλελυμένα: in Deut. xxxii. 36, εἶδε γὰρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς . . . . . . καὶ παρειμένους. And so Polyb. i. 58. 9, τήν τε δύναμιν παρελέλυντο καὶ παρεῖντο. In ref. 2 Kings, we have ἐξελύθησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῖς κ. πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες Ἰσραὴλ παρείθησαν. See other examples in Bl.) **and the paralyzed knees** (**παραλελυμένος** is a word confined to St. Luke elsewhere in the N. T. It is used generally, of lameness, by the LXX and later writers: cf. reff., and Arrian, Epict. ii. 18, πῶς σου τὰ σκέλη παραλύεται;): 13.] **and make straight tracks for your feet** (Carpzov appears first to have noticed that these words, καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν, constituted an hexameter line. They are quoted in substance from Prov. iv. 26, ὀρθὰς τροχιὰς ποίει σοῖς ποσίν. **τροχιά** is properly the mark left by the τροχός, the rut or wheel-mark, indicating a track or road. See reff. **τοῖς ποσίν** is best taken dative, '*for* your feet,' not ablative (Schulz, Thol., Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., al.) "*with* your feet" as instrumental: see on the following clause. And the meaning seems to be, Let your walk be so firm and so unanimous in the right direction, that a plain track and highway may be thereby established for those who accompany and follow you to perceive and walk in. Cf. Isa. xxxv. 8), **that that which is lame be not turned out of the way, but rather be healed** (**τὸ χωλόν** indicates that part of the church which was wavering between Christianity and Judaism: answering to the ἀσθενεῖς of the Epistle to the Romans. If the whole congregation, by their united and consistent walk, trod a plain and beaten path for men's feet, these lame ones, though halting, would be easily able to keep in it, and by keeping in the τροχιὰ ὀρθή, would even acquire the habit of walking straight onward, and so be healed: but if the tracks were errant and confused, their erratic steps would deviate more and more, till at length they fell away out of the right way altogether. This connexion between the clauses only subsists entire when τοῖς ποσίν is taken as dative: if as ablative, with your feet, it is not easy to say what sequence there would be between the making of such tracks and the healing of the lame without a very harsh ellipsis between the two clauses, 'in which others may walk,' or the like. **ἐκτραπῇ** is rendered by many of the ancient and some modern expositors, "*be dislocated.*" So Œc. (ἵνα μὴ τὸ ἐναρχθὲν κακόν, τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ χωλόν, εἰς ἀνήκεστον ἔλθῃ, μᾶλλον δὲ διορθωθῇ), Thl. (ἔτι προσπλάγητε καὶ ἐκτραπῶσιν οἱ πόδες ὑμῶν, τουτέστι παντελῶς στρεβλοὶ γένωνται), Schlichting, Grot., Wolf, Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Ernesti, Schleusner, Heinrichs, Bretschn., Klee, De Wette, Stuart, al. But against this there are two objections: 1. the common usage of the word; which (see Wetst. on 1 Tim. i. 6, and reff.) is, *to be turned aside:* and even in the place quoted from Galen by Carpzov to justify the other meaning, it far more likely has this one: τῆς ὑγιεινῆς ἔργον, τὸ κατὰ μικρὰ τὴν εἰς τὸ παρὰ φύσιν ἐκτροπὴν (deviation) ἐπανορθοῦσθαι: 2. the **μᾶλλον δέ**, introducing the second clause, which seems to shew, that more is contained in the contrast than was in the member with which it was contrasted, and thus fully justifies the falling short in the meaning of ἐκτραπῇ from that of ἰαθῇ: q. d. 'should not be turned out of the way; nay rather than suffer any the least increase of its infirmity, should be healed of it.' It should be noticed that the Writer has still the image of a race before him. The making a beaten track for all is, that they may not miss the way and lose the prize). 14.] **Follow peace with all** (**μετὰ πάντων** belongs to **εἰρήνην**, not to the verb. Some have understood πάντων to refer not only to the brethren, but to unbelievers also. So Œc. (μεθ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων· πολὺ γὰρ τὸ πλάτος τοῦ μετὰ πάντων), Thl. (οὐ μόνον πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐχθροὺς εἰρηνεύειν παραινεῖ), Jac. Cappell., Grot., Calov., al., and Böhme, Lünem., al. But thus taken the exhortation would lose much of its proper force here. For it is introduced by a caution that the lame be not turned out of the way, and followed by taking heed that none fail of the grace of God: and between these two an exhortation to follow peace with all mankind would come in very flat and disjointed. It is clearly the brethren who are here meant by πάντων: and this is further shewn by the collocation of the

οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς [a] ὄψεται τὸν κύριον, 15 [b] ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις [c] ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς [d] χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, μή τις [e] ῥίζα [f] πικρίας [g] ἄνω [h] φύουσα [i] ἐνοχλῇ, καὶ διὰ ταύτης [k] μιαν-

a = Matt. v. 8. ch. ix. 28. 1 John iii. 2. b here [1 Pet. v. 2] only †. Esth. ii. 11 al. c ch. iv. 1 reff. w. ἀπό, here only. Eccl. vi. 2. Sir. vii. 34. d = Tit. ii. 11. 2 Cor. vi. 1. e Deut. xxix. 18. = 1 Tim. vi. 10. Sir. i. 20. 1 Macc. i. 10. f Acts viii. 23. Rom. iii. 14. Eph. iv. 31 only. Deut. l. c. xxxii. 32. g John xi. 41. Acts ii. 19. h = here (pass., Luke viii. 6, 8) only. Sir. xiv. 18. Iliad. ζ. 149. i Luke vi. 18 only, l. c. AB1 [not Ed-vat.]. Gen. xlviii. 1. 1 Kings xix. 14 al. (Xen. Plato in Wetst.) k John xviii. 28. Tit. i. 15 bis. Jude 8 only. Ezek. xxiv. 13.

15. aft επισκ. ins ινα D[1]. for χαριτος, δοξης K. δι' αυτης A[P] k 17 [47] Clem$_1$ Chr-comm$_1$ [Euthal-ms] : txt DKLℵ rel [Chr$_2$] Thdrt Damasc.

words, which on the other view would more naturally be εἰρήνην μετὰ πάντων διώκετε. The sentiment thus is the same as in Rom. xiv. 19, ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν, καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους), **and sanctification** ("The connexion of **καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν** is much as in ver. 1; ch. xi. 38: the Writer uses the art., when he appends the particular to the general." Delitzsch. **ἁγιασμός** is not = ἁγιότης, but is the putting on of it and becoming ἅγιοι. Many Commentators, misled by the peculiar contextual reference of the word in 1 Thess. iv. 3, have restricted the meaning here to *chastity*. So Chrys. (τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τί φησι; τὴν σωφροσύνην καὶ τὴν κοσμιότητα τὴν ἐν γάμῳ), Thdrt., Œc., Thl., Jer., Aug., and Jac. Cappell., Bengel, al. But the wider meaning, as a rule, must always be kept where the context does not require a narrower. And thus understood, the reference of it is well given by Limborch: "ne, dum paci studeat, nimis aliis obsequendi studio quidquam contra sanctimoniam Christianam delinquat"), **without (apart from) which** (χωρίς seems to be put after its case for rhythm's sake. In Palm and Rost's art. on χωρίς, this arrangement is quoted frequently from the poets and tragedians, but does not seem to occur often in prose) **none shall see the Lord** (whether κύριον is to be applied to Christ, or to the Father, is uncertain. The article determines nothing. ὁ κύριος is clearly the Father in ch. viii. 2: as clearly the Son in ch. ii. 3. But here it would seem that the Father is intended. For we know, Matt. xxiv. 30: Rev. i. 7, that every eye shall see the Son, even in His glory: whereas we have our Lord using, in an ethical sentence not much unlike this one, the expression αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται):

15.] **looking well** (**ἐπισκοποῦντες**, τουτέστιν, ἀκριβῶς ἐρευνῶντες, ἐπισκεπτόμενοι, καταμανθάνοντες, Chrys. τουτέστιν, ἀκριβῶς προσέχοντες καὶ ἐρευνῶντες, Œc. The word is found in Plato, e. g. Cratyl. 399 c, ὧν ὁρᾷ οὐδὲν ἐπισκοπεῖ, al.: in Xenophon, e. g. De Laced. Rep. 3. 1, ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ ταῦτα ἐπισκοπείσθω, al. freq.), **lest any one falling short of the grace of God** (on ὑστερέω, see on ch. iv. 1. It is here explained by Chrys., καθάπερ ὁδόν τινα μακρὰν ὁδευόντων ἐν συνοδίᾳ πολλῇ, βλέπετε, φησί, μή τις ἀπέμεινεν: and so Thl. In that case **ἀπό** must mean 'far from' the grace of God, as the goal to which the journey is being made. But it is far more probably in its ordinary sense, and ἀπό as in reff., and as Œc.: μή τις εἴη ἀπολελειμμένος τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ. The whole sentence is imitated from Deut. xxix. 18, μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνὴ ἢ πατριὰ ἢ φυλή, τινὸς ἡ διάνοια ἐξέκλινεν ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, πορευθέντες λατρεύειν τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκείνων· μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ. And perhaps to this the ἀπό may be due, as Delitzsch suggests. But however this may be, the *form* of this sentence may certainly be inferred from observing that one. It is broken off at τοῦ θεοῦ in order to take up the second clause of that, μή τις ῥίζα κ.τ.λ. So that we need not understand ᾖ after the participle here, as generally done, even by Thol. and Ebrard, but may pass on to the next clause, finding a common verb to both subjects in ἐνοχλῇ below. And so Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Delitzsch), **lest any root of bitterness** (not = ῥίζα πικρά, but πικρία is the origin and the ingrained character of the root, not its mere attribute. So Chrys. well, οὐκ εἶπε πικρά, ἀλλά, πικρίας· τὴν μὲν γὰρ πικρὰν ῥίζαν ἐστὶ καρποὺς ἐνεγκεῖν γλυκεῖς, τὴν δὲ πικρίας ῥίζαν καὶ πηγὴν καὶ ὑπόθεσιν οὐκ ἐστὶ ποτὲ γλυκὺν ἐνεγκεῖν καρπόν· πάντα γάρ ἐστι πικρά, οὐδὲν ἔχει ἡδύ, πάντα πικρά, πάντα ἀηδῆ, πάντα μίσους καὶ βδελυγμίας γέμοντα. And similarly Œc. and Thl. and several moderns) **springing up** (**φύω** intrans., see reff.) **trouble you** (it is remarkable that the LXX [as edited] (see above) in Deut. l. c. has not ἐνοχλῇ, but ἐν χολῇ, as the Heb.: and Delitzsch supposes that the Writer followed the sound of ἐν χολῇ and substituted for it ἐνοχλῇ: as in Jude 12 the ἀπάταις of 2 Pet. ii. 13 is changed into ἀγάπαις (or vice versa). But this is hardly likely, especially when we find that

θῶσιν οἱ πολλοί· [16] μή τις [l] πόρνος ἢ [m] βέβηλος ὡς Ἠσαῦ, ὃς [n] ἀντὶ [o] βρώσεως μιᾶς [p] ἀπέδετο τὰ [q] πρωτοτόκια ἑαυτοῦ. [17] [r] ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ [s] μετέπειτα θέλων [t] κληρονο-

C μη τις ... ACDKL PℵN a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

l 1 Cor. v. 9, 10, 11. vi. 9. Eph. v. 5. 1 Tim. i. 10. ch. xiii. 4. Rev. xxi. 8. xxii. 15 only †. Sir. xxiii. 16, 17 only. m 1 Tim. i. 9. iv. 7. vi. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 16 only. Lev. x. 10 al. (-λοῦν, Acts xxiv. 6.) n = ver. 2. o = here only. (John iv. 32 al.) 3 Kings xix. 8. p = Acts v. 8. vii. 9 only. Gen. xxv. 33. q here only. Gen. l. c. r James i. 19 reff. s here only †. Judith ix. 5. 3 Macc. iii. 24. t = ch. i. 4 reff.

rec om οι, with DKL[P] rel [Chr_3 Damasc]: ins Aℵ 17 [47] $Clem_1$ [Euthal-ms] Thdrt.
16. om ος D[1][-gr]. rec απεδοτο, with DKL[P]ℵ rel: txt AC. rec αυτου, with D[1]KL[P]ℵ[3] rel: txt ACD[2·3]ℵ[1].
17. for θελων, λεγων D[1][-gr].

the Alexandrine copy of the LXX, with which our Writer so often agrees, has ἐνοχλῇ [as has also B[1]]. Delitzsch indeed supposes that this reading crept in after our Epistle was written: and strengthens his view by the superfluous and unintelligible καὶ πικρίᾳ following the word in the alex. text. But clearly that is no reason: nor is it probable that such correction should have been only one of four which are found in the mss. in Holmes, the other three being εν οχλῃ, ενοχῃ, εν ω χολῃ. The fact of ἐνοχλεῖν, ref. Luke, ὀχλεῖν Acts v. 16, παρενοχλεῖν Acts xv. 19, being all in St. Luke, does not make for Delitzsch's view: all men (taking his hypothesis of the authorship by St. Luke) are more free in quoting sayings where their own favourite words occur), **and by its means the many** (the whole congregation: see Gal. v. 9 quoted below) **be polluted** (how? by intercourse, by compromise, by over-persuasion, by imitation. The kind of pollution he explains in the next verse to arise from fornication and profanity. Thl. says, ὁ δὲ ἀλλαχοῦ γράφει· μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ (Gal. v. 9), τοῦτο καὶ ἐνταῦθά φησι· μή τις πονηρὸς εἰς λύμην πλειόνων εἶναι συγχωρείσθω): 16.] **lest (there be)** (this is a far more probable filling up of the construction, as an independent elliptic sentence, than to suppose it to furnish another subject to ἐνοχλῇ) **any fornicator** (to be taken literally, not as alluding to spiritual fornication, cf. Deut. xxxi. 16: Exod. xxxiv. 15 f.: for as Del. observes, this sense is foreign to the N. T. except in the Apocalypse: and it is very unlikely that the Writer should have used a meaning lying so far from the context, and not suggested either by the passage of Deut. to which he was before alluding, or by the history of Esau which he is now introducing. Nearly connected with the question of the sense of πόρνος, is that of the punctuation: whether by a comma after it we are to sever it from connexion with Esau, or not. Most Commentators join it with what follows. So Thdrt., Schol.-Matthæi, Isidor.-pelus., Primas., al., and explain it partly of the gluttony of Esau, partly of his having wedded strange women, partly by the character of a fornicator which is given him by later Jewish tradition: cf. numerous testimonies in Wetst. But others divide πόρνος from what follows. So Chrys., Joh. Damasc. (ἐνταῦθα στίξαι δεῖ, ἵνα ᾖ τελεία διάνοια, καὶ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον· καὶ βέβηλος ὡς Ἠσαῦ, cited in Wetst. var. readd.), Thl. (οὐ τοῦτό φησι, ὅτι πόρνος ἦν Ἠσαῦ, ἀλλ' ἄχρις αὐτοῦ στῆσον, μή τις πόρνος ἐν ὑμῖν ἤτω. εἶτα ἀπ' ἄλλης ἀρχῆς εἶπε· μηδὲ βέβηλος ὡς Ἠσαῦ κ.τ.λ.): and so Calvin, Seb. Schmidt, Sykes, Cramer, Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, Bisping, Lünem. It seems hardly possible to decide. The character of Esau, from Scripture as well as tradition, will very well bear the designation πόρνος: and the balance of the sentence is better preserved by applying both to him, than by leaving πόρνος insulated. The objection, that the relative clause, ὃς ἀντὶ κ.τ.λ., applies only to βέβηλος, does not amount to much: for as Bengel remarks, "libido et intemperantia cibi affines." On the other hand Delitzsch's argument, that had πόρνος been intended to be separate, it would have stood μή τις πόρνος ᾖ, ἢ κ.τ.λ., is not sound: for the ellipsis might just as well stand in both clauses, as in one. He notices that in Philo, Quæst. in Gen. xxvii. 11, lib. iv. § 201 Potter's Appendix, p. 404, "Pilosus intemperatus libidinosusque est") **or profane person** (τουτέστι, γαστρίμαργος, κοσμικός, τὰ πνευματικὰ βεβηλῶν καὶ καταπατῶν, Thl.: a man of low views, who has no appreciation of any high or divine thing: ὃς τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τιμὴν ταύτην διὰ τῆς οἰκείας ῥᾳθυμίας ἀπέδοτο, καὶ μικρᾶς ἡδονῆς χάριν τὴν μεγίστην τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀπώλεσε, Chrys.) **as Esau, who for** (on ἀντί, see on ver. 2) **one meal sold** (the use of ἀποδίδομαι, middle, for *to sell*, is common in good Greek) **his own birthright** ('rights of primogeniture:' τὰ πρωτοτόκια or -εῖα is the usual word in the LXX for the Heb. בְּכוֹרָה or מִשְׁפַּט הַבְּכוֹרָה, see Gen. xxv. 31—34: 1 Chron. v. 1: Deut. xxi. 17.

μῆσαι τὴν [u]εὐλογίαν [v]ἀπεδοκιμάσθη· μετανοίας γὰρ [w]τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν, [x]καίπερ [y]μετὰ δακρύων [z]ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.

u ch. vi. 7 reff. v Matt. xxi. 42 ‖ and 1 Pet. ii. (4) 7 (from Ps. cxvii. 22). Luke ix. 22 ‖ Mk. xvii. 25 only. Jer. vi. 30. w = Acts xxv. 16. Rom. xv. 23. Wisd. xii. 10. x ch. v. 8 reff. y Acts xx. 19, 31. ch. v. 7. z ch. xi. 6. Luke xi. 50, 51. Acts xv. 17. Rom. iii. 11. 1 Pet. i. 10 only. Eccl. i. 13.

The Greeks use for it *ἡ πρεσβεία* or *τὸ πρεσβεῖον*: Josephus has this last in this narrative, Antt. ii. 1. 1, and the LXX in Gen. xliii. 33. The reflexive *ἑαυτοῦ*, which must be read, may seem to be superfluous; but it serves to intensify the unworthiness of the act). **17.**] **For** (the *γάρ* gives a reason for the caution, from the terrible result in Esau's case) **ye know** (*ἴστε* is not imperative, as the vulg. ("*scitote*") and Luther, but indicative. It was a fact of which no Hebrew could be ignorant) **that when he afterward on his part** (*καί* brings out this: *he* dishonoured his inheritance, but was in his turn rejected from the blessing) **wished to inherit** (see on this wide sense of *κληρονομέω*, ch. i. 4) **the blessing, he was rejected** (some supply *παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*, some *παρὰ τοῦ πατρός*. But there is no reason why both should not be joined. His father's blessing was God's blessing; his father's rejection was God's rejection. And so Thl., *ἢ . . . . παρ' ἀμφοτέρων· δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ κατὰ θεὸν ἀπεδοκίμασεν αὐτόν*); **for he found not place of repentance** (*whose* repentance—*his own*, or *his father's?* The former is held by all the Greek expositors: by Luther, Calvin, Zeger, Grot., Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, Hofmann, Delitzsch, al. The latter, by Beza, Jac. Cappell., Schlichting, Raphel, Wolf, Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, Stuart, Lünem., and most moderns except those named above. But the former I believe to be the only admissible sense. It is no mean argument for it, that the Fathers thought not of the other, though it would have been so useful to them in the Novatian controversy. Theodore of Mops. (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxv. p. 968), though he wrests the passage from those who wished *τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀνελεῖν*, never hints at any other meaning. And his explanation is surely the right one: *οὐχὶ συγχωρήσεως ἁμαρτημάτων μετανοήσας οὐκ ἔτυχεν ἐκεῖνος, οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο ᾔτει τότε, ἀλλ' εὐλογίαν, ἣν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ τρόπου τῷ ἀδελφῷ δοθεῖσαν ἀφαιρεθῆναι αὖθις οὐδαμῶς οἷόν τε ἦν καὶ δοθῆναι αὐτῷ πάλιν*. It would surely be a most unnatural use of the phrase **μετανοίας τόπον εὗρεν** (cf. ref. Wisd., *κρίνων δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ ἐδίδους τόπον μετανοίας*: Clem.-rom. ad Corinth. 7, p. 225, *μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν*: Liv. xliv. 10, "pœnitentiæ relinquens locum:" Plin. Ep. x. 97. 10, "ex quo facile est opinari, quæ turba hominum emendari possit, si sit pœnitentiæ locus:" and other examples in Bleek), to understand by *μετανοίας*, repentance not in the subject of *εὗρεν*, but in some one else. And thus referred to Esau himself, it will mean much as Thdr.-mops. above, that he found no way open to reverse what had been done, by repentance: the sin had been committed and the consequence entailed, irrevocably. He might change, but the penalty could not, from the very nature of the circumstances, be taken off. So that *μετάνοια*, in its full sense, had no *τόπος*. And such is the meaning of the 'locus pœnitentiæ,' wherever occurring. We do not mean by it an opportunity to repent in a man's own bosom, to be sorry for what he has done, for this may be under any circumstances, and this might have been with Esau: but we mean, *a chance, by repenting, to repair*. So when a condemned criminal has a 'locus pœnitentiæ' allowed him, we do not mean that he may die penitent, but that he is reprieved. I see not how else to understand this, and what follows: and thus understood nothing can be plainer), **although he earnestly sought** (reff.) **it** (*what?* not *εὐλογίαν*, as Thl., *τινές* in Œc., Calvin, Bengel, C. F. Schmid, Bleek, and even Delitzsch: for this would be, as Ebrard characterizes it, most unnatural, *εὐλογίαν* being separated from *αὐτήν* by a whole intervening clause, which will not bear parenthesizing, because *ἐκζητήσας* immediately takes up *εὗρεν*—he found it not, though he sought it. Regarding *μετανοίας* then as the only admissible antecedent for *αὐτήν*, the explanation will be very simple. *μετανοίας τόπος* is, in fact, *μετάνοια*. He found no place for *μετάνοια*: if he had found one, *μετάνοια* would have been secured: this was what he sought. So, when *μετανοίας τόπον* is taken up again, the mere secondary *τόπος* disappears, and it is *αὐτήν*, not *αὐτόν*, agreeing with the great thing really sought. This as against the arguments alleged in Delitzsch, al., who taking *μετάνοια* merely subjectively, maintain that it was not what Esau sought) **with tears** (Gen. xxvii. 38. It is obvious, that our passage, rightly understood, cannot by any means favour the exclusion of any sinner from repentance. In Esau's case the *μετανοίας τόπος* (see above) was closed, by circumstances themselves: the blessing had been given and could not be

18 Οὐ γὰρ [a] προσεληλύθατε [b] ψηλαφωμένῳ, καὶ [c] κεκαυμένῳ [c] πυρί, καὶ [d] γνόφῳ καὶ [e] ζόφῳ καὶ [f] θυέλλῃ, καὶ

a = ch. xi. 6 reff. Deut. iv. 11. b Luke xxiv. 39. Acts xvii. 27. 1 John i. 1 only. Gen. xxvii. 12. c Deut. iv. 11. v. 23, also ix. 15. Rev. xxi. 8. d here only. Deut. l. c. Zeph. i. 15 al. (-φώδης, Exod. xix. 10.) e 2 Pet. ii. 4, 17. Jude 6, 13 only †. Symm., Ps. x. 2. xc. 6. f here only. Deut. l. c. v. 22. Exod. x. 22 only.

18. rec aft ψηλαφ. ins ορει (*to supply the sense as below, ver* 22), with D[-gr] KL[P] rel [vulg-ed arm] Ath, Ps-Ath, Thdrt Damasc Œc [Orig-int$_1$]: bef ψηλαφ. m 116 [Chr$_2$]: om ACℵ 17 [47] am(with demid fuld harl tol F-lat) D-lat Syr coptt æth Chr-comm(τί τὸ ψηλαφώμενον πῦρ πρὸς τὸν ἀψηλάφητον θεόν;) Thl [Euthal-ms Orig-int$_1$] Primas. om 1st και D[1][-gr] 67[2] harl coptt arm. for κεκαυμ., κεκαλυμμενω D[1][-gr] Ps-Ath. rec (for ζοφω) σκοτω (*from Deut* iv. 11; v. 22), with D[2.3]Lℵ[3] rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt ACD[1][P]ℵ[1] 17 [Euthal-ms].—om και ζοφω K.

recalled. And this is our warning. It may be so, in many cases, with us. That it is always so, is not even hinted: but warning is given us that a path is not safe where even such a possibility may be encountered. See Prov. i. 24—32).

18—29.] Connected with what has preceded by **γάρ**. *Take heed that there be not such* (as in vv. 15, 16) *among you: for* (*not only have we the solemn warning of Esau, but*) *we are not under the law with its terrors, but under the gospel with its promises,—hearing one who speaks for the last time, who speaks from heaven—and receiving a kingdom which shall not be moved.* 18.] **For** (see above) **ye have not drawn near to** ('in your approaching unto God (reff.), it has not been to, &c.' The E. V. "ye are not come unto" omits the approach to God implied in προσέρχεσθαι) **that which was being touched** (understand ὄρει, which is expressed below with Σιών, and hence has come in as a gloss here. From the seeming difficulty of this, and from all who omit ὄρει here having taken the two dative participles as agreeing with πυρί, and in consequence giving no adequate sense, many even of our critical editors and expositors have here forsaken the testimony of antiquity, and inserted the ὄρει. But if we suppose Σιὼν ὄρος to have been before the Writer's mind from the first, there is no difficulty in his deferring the ὄρος so long. **ψηλαφωμένῳ** has been variously interpreted. Some, as Schöttgen, Kypke, Bengel, al., and Bretschneider, and even Palm and Rost, Lex., understand it, "*touched* by the fire of God," cf. Ps. ciii. 32, ὁ ἁπτόμενος τῶν ὀρέων καὶ καπνίζονται. But this seems hardly consistent with the present part., nor indeed at all with the sense of the word itself, which is to touch by feeling about, as a blind man does, *contrecto, palpo*—Isa. lix. 10, ψηλαφήσουσιν ὡς τυφλοὶ τοῖχον: Gen. xxvii. 12, μήποτε ψηλαφήσῃ με ὁ πατήρ: ib. 21, 22: Judg. xvi. 26, ἄφες με καὶ ψηλαφήσω τοὺς κίονας: Deut. xxviii. 29, καὶ ἔσῃ ψηλαφῶν μεσημβρίας, ὡσεί τις ψηλαφήσαι τυφλὸς ἐν τῷ σκότει: Job v. 14, τὸ δὲ μεσημβρινὸν ψηλαφήσαισαν ἴσα νυκτί: xii. 25, ψηλαφήσαισαν σκότος καὶ μὴ φῶς: Exod. x. 21, γενηθήτω σκότος . . . ψηλαφητὸν σκότος. And this sense will I believe fit our passage very well. Mount Sinai was a material mountain, which not only *might* be *touched*,—as many (Knapp, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bisping, al.), identifying ψηλαφώμενον with ψηλαφητόν,—but *was being touched*, would have been touched by the people had it not been forbidden. So that the part. pres. (or imperf.) is in that peculiar sense of incompletion in which we so often find the imperf. itself, inviting after it an εἰ μή in Greek, or a '*ni*' in Latin. Unless we bear this in mind, we are open to the objection that, while it was forbidden to be touched, it yet was touched. The other objection, brought by Delitzsch, that the Writer mentions this fact of *touching* below in other terms, with θιγγάνειν, is readily answered, that he is there using the very words of the prohibition in Exodus, whereas here he is giving scope to the graphic and rhetorical style of the passage. For the whole, cf. Exod. xix. 12, 13, where οὐχ ἅψεται αὐτοῦ χείρ leads very naturally to ψηλαφώμενον), **and which was burnt with fire** (cf. the same expression in reff. Deut., where nearly the same words, σκότος, γνόφος, θύελλα, following, put it beyond all doubt that πυρί is used here ablatively, not as a dative with κεκαυμένῳ, as Erasm., Calv., Beza, Bengel, Knapp, and more recently Delitzsch. (Such a connexion is perfectly allowable, against Ebrard, who ventures here one of his rash assertions: "κεκαυμένῳ cannot be an attribute of πυρί: for to designate a fire as 'a burning fire' would be superfluous, unless a burning fire is to be contrasted with a painted fire, which is not the case here." And this in the face of πῦρ διαπαντὸς καυθήσεται ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, Levit. vi. 13: see numerous other examples in Bleek.) The perfect participle, in either case, is somewhat startling. The present would

[g] σάλπιγγος [h] ἤχῳ, καὶ [i] φωνῇ [i] ῥημάτων, [19] ἧς οἱ ἀκούσαντες [j] παρῃτήσαντο μὴ [k] προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον· [20] οὐκ [l] ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ [m] διαστελλόμενον, [n] Κἂν θηρίον [o] θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους, [p] λιθοβοληθήσεται· [21] καί, οὕτως

g Exod. xix. 16. Matt. xxiv. 31. 1 Thess. iv. 16 al. h = Acts ii. 12. Luke iv. 37 only. Ps. cl. 3. see Luke xxi. 25. i Deut. iv. 12. j ver. 25 bis. Luke xiv. 18, 19. 1 Tim. iv. 7 al. Esth. iv. 8. constr., here only. k Deut. v. 25. xviii. 16. = Gal. iii. 19. l = Rom. ix. 22. m Matt. xvi. 20. Mark v. 43 al4. Acts xv. 24 only. Ezek. iii. 18. n Exod. xix. 12, 13 (freely). o Col. ii. 21. ch. xi. 28 only. Exod. l. c. only. p Matt. xxi. 35. Acts vii. 58, 59 al. Exod. l. c. viii. 25 al.

M βολῃθησεται ... ACDKL MPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

19. om μη ℵ¹[P Chr-2-mss₁]. προσθειναι A.
20. rec at end ins (*from* LXX) η βολιδι κατατοξευθησεται, with o(but aft κ. ουτως ver 21): om ACDKLM[P]ℵ rel [vss Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc Thl Œc-comm].
21. rec ουτω, with Aℵ¹ rel: ου D¹: txt CD²·³L[MP]ℵ³ k l m.

seem the more natural. But if in the case where it is taken with πυρί it is rendered *'kindled'* (see Del.), there can be no reason why it should not in the other be rendered *'lit up.'* *'Consumed'* would be κατακεκαυμένῳ: cf. Exod. iii. 2, ὅρα ὅτι ὁ βάτος καίεται πυρί, καὶ ὁ βάτος οὐ κατεκαίετο), **and to blackness and darkness and tempest** (cf. reff. Deut.), **and to sound of trumpet** (see ref. Exod. The Writer avoids the φωνή there used, having so soon to use φωνὴ ῥημάτων. As regards the method of declining ἦχος, see Winer, § 9, Remark 2. This form, which is blamed by Thomas Magister, is very commonly used by the classics. When Delitzsch states that it is the only form known to common Greek, he is as wrong the other way: see Aristoph. Av. 215: Plato, Rep. vii. p. 435: Herod. ix. 34: Callim. Hymn. in Jov. 53: Pind. Ol. 14. 29. Cf. Palm and Rost's Lex.) **and the voice of words** (ref.),

19.] **which they who heard** (ἧς, referring to φωνῇ, is governed by ἀκούσαντες, not as Storr, by λόγον) **entreated** (παραιτεῖσθαί τι = αἰτεῖσθαί τι παρά τινος, in all senses, but more usually in the deprecatory sense. Hence simply to *deprecate* (Thuc. v. 63, ὁ δὲ παρῃτεῖτο, μηδὲν τούτων δρᾶν): hence further, to *refuse* or *forbid*, as in Acts xxv. 11, and even more directly in ver. 25 below) **that** (more) **discourse should not be added to them** (αὐτοῖς might agree with τοῖς ῥήμασιν, but much more probably agrees with τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, from the form of construction in Deut. l. c., where they say that they should die, ἐὰν προσθώμεθα ἡμεῖς ἀκοῦσαι (A, προσθῶμεν ἀκοῦσαι ἡμεῖς) τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἔτι. Calvin explains the sense, "Cæterum quod dicit populum excusasse, non ita debet accipi quasi populus renuerit audire Dei verba, sed deprecatus est, ne Deum ipsum loquentem audire cogeretur. Persona enim Mosis interposita horrorem nonnihil mitigabat"): **20, 21.**] *Parenthetical, explaining the reason of this horror on the part of the hearers.*

20.] **for they could not bear that which was commanded** (Œc. and Thl. take this as an independent sentence, said of the general fearful character of the commands: τουτέστι τὸ διαλαλούμενον παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἠδύναντο τοῖς ὠσὶ στέγειν ὡς φοβερόν. And so Schlichting. But this would be exceedingly harsh, and finds no justification in the reason assigned by Schlichting, viz. that thus "sequentia verba tanquam per se posita, ad exaggerandum magis spectaculi illius terrorem pertinebunt." It is manifest, from the retention of the future λιθοβοληθήσεται, that the words are a citation, and this clause the introduction of it. But among those who agree thus far, there is another wide difference about the *voice* of the participle, as to whether διαστελλόμενον is middle or passive. Storr, Heinrichs, Schulz, Delitzsch, take it middle, in an active sense, "that which ordered:" viz. the divine voice. But surely this is, if admissible grammatically (see Mark vii. 36 and viii. 15, where only διεστέλλετο is found, all the other cases having the 1 aor. διαστείλασθαι, which stands on its own ground), yet contextually most improbable: 1. that God, or the voice of God, should be thus described by a neuter part.: 2. that with τὸ φανταζόμενον just below, in strict parallelism, τὸ διαστελλόμενον should signify any thing but that which was commanded), **Even if a beast** (much more if a man) **touch the mountain, it shall be stoned** (an abbreviation of Exod. xix. 12, 13, καὶ ἀφοριεῖς τὸν λαὸν κύκλῳ, λέγων, Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ ἀναβῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ θιγεῖν τι αὐτοῦ· πᾶς ὁ ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὄρους θανάτῳ τελευτήσει. οὐχ ἅψεται αὐτοῦ χείρ· ἐν γὰρ λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται· ἐάν τε κτῆνος ἐάν τε ἄνθρωπος, οὐ ζήσεται):

21.] **and** (this clause is diversely punctuated. Before Beza, there was no comma at καί, and the sense was read straight on, "and so terrible was the sight, (that) Moses said," as in E. V. So the Fathers: so some MSS. of the vulg. So Mill, Bengel, Michaelis, and Lachmann. And thus, as Bl. well observes, should we

q φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ r φανταζόμενον, Μωυσῆς εἶπεν s t Ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ tu ἔντρομος. 22 ἀλλὰ v προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει, καὶ πόλει w θεοῦ ζῶντος Ἰερουσαλὴμ x ἐπουρανίῳ, 23 καὶ y μυριάσιν, ἀγγέλων z πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκ-

ACDKL cdefg hklmo 17. 47

q ch. x. 27, 31 only. Deut. i. 19 al.
r here only †. Wisd. vi. 16. Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 5 only. (-τασμα, Matt. xiv. 26.)
s Mark ix. 6 only. Deut. ix. 19. 1 Macc. xiii. 2 A ℵ only. (-βεῖν, 2 Cor. x. 9.)
t 1 Macc. xiii. 2.
u Acts vii. 32. xvi. 29 only. Ps. xvii. 7.
v ver. 18.
w ch. iii. 12 reff.
x ch. iii. 1 reff.
y Luke xii. 1. Acts xix. 19. xxi. 20. Jude 14. Rev. v. 11 bis, ix. 16 only. Deut. xxxiii. 2. Dan. vii. 10.
z here only. Ezek. xlvi. 11. Hos. ii. 11. ix. 5. Amos v. 21 only.

[for ηυ, η ℵ[1] 17.] om ειμι ℵ[1]. εκτρομος D[1][ℵ].
22. for αλλα, ου γαρ A. om 1st και D[1](and lat) [æth Eus$_1$ Hil$_1$]. επουρ. bef ιερ. D[1.3](and lat).
23. for μυριασιν, μυριων αγιων D[1] [μυριασιν αγιων D[2]: txt D[3]], *multitudinem angelorum frequentem* D-lat, *multorum millium angelorum frequentiam* vulg Jer. ACLM[P 17. 47] a b d h k l m o vulg Orig$_2$ Eus$_{saepe}$ place a stop at πανηγ.

have punctuated in an Epistle of St. Paul, who is full of those broken constructions. But nothing can be more different than the style of this Epistle, which is weighed and rhetorically balanced with constant care. There can be little doubt in any who take this style into account, that the punctuation which began with Beza is right, viz. the setting a comma at καί, and regarding οὕτως φοβ. ἦν τὸ φαντ. as a parenthesis. καί must not, with Carpzov, Cramer, al., be taken for "*even*," for thus we should have an asyndeton: and it is too far separated from Μωυσῆς),—**so fearful was that which was revealed** (which appeared to them as a vision of the glory and majesty of Jehovah: φανταζόμενον δ' εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ αὐτὸν ἑώρων τὸν τῶν ὅλων θεόν, ἀλλά τινα φαντασίαν τῆς θείας ἐπιφανείας, Thdrt.),—**Moses said, I am in great terror and in trembling** (no such saying of Moses at this time is to be found in the sacred narrative. In ref. Deut. he says, καὶ ἔκφοβός εἰμι, which εἰμί should be ἤμην, and refers to the time when Moses went up to the mount after he had broken the tables. Our Writer probably transfers these words from that time to this, indicative of the terror which Moses felt at the divine presence on Sinai. Some have supposed that the saying is taken from some tradition: but none has been found to justify the idea. Others, as Calvin, suppose that "hæc communis totius populi querimonia; sed Moses inducitur, qui fuit veluti commune os omnium." But if so, where would be any climax, as there manifestly is in this verse?): **22—24.**] *Contrast to the above negation, in setting forth that to which they are come.* There is apparently no studied logical order in the following clauses: and Bl. supposes there must have been some ancient inversion of them in our copies, seeing that πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων would most naturally follow after μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων. But see on the several clauses, and the general concluding note. **22.**] **but ye have drawn near** (both congregations drew near, cf. Deut. iv. 11, καὶ προσήλθετε καὶ ἔστητε ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος: the difference is in that, to which. So that Chrys. misses the mark, when he says, ἐκεῖνοι οὐ προσῆλθον, ἀλλὰ πόῤῥωθεν εἱστήκεισαν, καὶ ὁ Μωυσῆς· ὑμεῖς δὲ προσεληλύθατε: and Thl., when he adds, ὁρᾷς τὴν ὑπεροχήν) **to Mount Sion** (here at length ὄρει is expressed: see above. Böhme and Kuinoel would take the following ἐπουρανίῳ as an epithet belonging to all three, ὄρει, πόλει, and Ἰερουσαλήμ: and so apparently did Œc.: ἀντὶ τοῦ Σινᾶ ὄρους, φησί, ἐνταῦθά ἐστιν, ὁ οὐρανός· τοῦτον γὰρ καλεῖ Σιὼν ὄρος καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ. ὅθεν ἐπάγει ἐπουρανίῳ. But the form of the sentence will not allow this. Mount Sion, the abode of God which He loved and where He will abide continually, is used to signify, not its mere representative, which men know by that name, but the reality, God's own abode in heaven. See Ps. lxxviii. 68; cx. 2; cxxxii. 13 ff.: Isa. ii. 2 f.; xxviii. 16: Joel ii. 32: Micah iv. 1 f.: Obad. 17 al. And so Thl., ἀντὶ τοῦ Σινᾶ ἔχομεν Σιὼν ὄρος νοητὸν καὶ πόλιν νοητὴν Ἰερουσαλήμ, τουτέστιν αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν. See Delitzsch's long note) **and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem** (as the earthly Jerusalem, situate on Mount Sion, was the πόλις τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, Matt. v. 35, so in a more blessed sense is that heavenly city the city of the living God. He is its maker and builder, ch. xi. 10: nor only so, but also evermore dwells in it with the light of His presence, cf. Rev. xxi. 22—24): **23.**] Before rendering this verse, the difficult question of its punctuation must be dealt with. I extract in substance Delitzsch's note. The following varieties are possible, and occur, not only as proposed by Commentators, but as set down in MSS. and editions:—

κλησίᾳ [a] πρωτοτόκων [b] ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ

a ch. i. 6. Rom. viii. 29 al. = here only. see Num. iii. 40—43. b Luke ii. 1, 3, 5 only. Judg. viii. 14 A. Prov. xxii. 20 only. 3 Macc. iv. 14. (-γραφή, Acts v. 37.)

rec *εν ουρανοις* bef *απογεγρ.*, with K rel [Cosm$_1$] Damasc: txt ACDLM[P]ℵ m 17 [47] latt Syr coptt [æth arm] Clem$_1$ Orig$_3$[int$_2$] Eus$_4$ Chron$_1$ [Euthal-ms Cosm$_1$].

I. *καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, καὶ . . .*

a. *καὶ μυριάσιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, καὶ . . .*

b. *καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει, καὶ . . .*

II. *καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει καὶ . . .*

III. *καὶ μυριάσιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει καὶ . . .*

According to I., which is found in most uncial MSS., &c., and is adopted by Erasmus, and by Tischendorf, the inner relation of the words of which the clause consists is left uncertain: all is undefined, for we punctuate as if it were *καὶ μυρίων* as in D[1], or as it might certainly be, *καὶ μυριάδων ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει*. This inaccuracy precludes both I. a (Griesbach, Knapp, Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tholuck), as making *μυριάσιν* in apposition with *ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει*,—and I. b (Œc. (*πανηγύρει ἐν μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων ὑπερεχούσῃ*), Thl. (*ἡ πανήγυρις οὖν αὐτὴ ἐν μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων συνίσταται*), Syr. ("*ad cœtus myriadum angelorum*"), D-lat. ("*et multitudinem angelorum frequentem*"), Ambr. (below), Jerome ("*et multorum millium angelorum frequentiam*"): E. V. ("*to an innumerable company of angels*"), and so in A, C, and many cursive mss.), which makes *πανηγύρει* in apposition with *μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων*. The former of these two has nothing against it except that one cannot see any reason for *μυριάσιν* standing first so isolated: the latter is condemned by the unmeaning *πανηγύρει* lagging at the end. According to II. (Elzev., Beza, Jo. Gregor., Matthæi: also Calov., Kypke, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Storr, De Wette (transl. 2nd edn.)), a new clause begins with *πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ*: for which arrangement Lünemann and Hofmann have decided, the former remarking, that *πανήγυρις* assembles the company of the firstborn in feast and jubilee, while *ἐκκλησία* binds them together in unity; the latter, that *πανήγυρις* and *ἐκκλησία* answer to the Heb. עֲצָרָה and קָהָל, the one denoting an assembly for worship, the other an assembly politically ordered. But it is difficult to see why the coupling of clause to clause by *καί*, which prevails through the sentence, should thus be broken through: and while the former of these Hebrew words is only once (ref. Amos) rendered *πανήγυρις* by the LXX, the two words never occur together in the O. T. We have then left III. (Bengel, C. F. Schmid, Ernesti, Schulz, Vater, Lachm., De Wette (transl. 3rd edn.), Theile), for which Bleek also decides, remarking rightly, that only on this view is the beginning of the sentence by the simple word *μυριάσιν* explained. The Writer begins with it, in order afterwards to say *per partes* of what these myriads consist, as in the O. T. also we read of רִבְבוֹת both of angels, ref. Deut., and of the congregation, Num. x. 36. *πανήγυρις* is the complete, multitudinous, above all, jubilant, festal and blissful assembly: thus Ambrose renders "et decem millibus lætantium angelorum," and Aug. "exultantium." Adopting then this arrangement, the verse will stand,—**and to myriads** (reff.: commonly used of the angelic company surrounding Jehovah), **the festal host of angels and the assembly of the firstborn which are written in heaven** (who are these? Why are they put with the angels? Why does the Writer place *κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων* between the assembly of the firstborn and the spirits of just men made perfect? These, says Delitzsch, are three closely connected questions, and among the very hardest in our Epistle. The answers to them are very various. Many understand them of the first-fruits of the Christian church (*ἀπαρχή*, Rev. xiv. 4: see also 2 Thess. ii. 13 v. r.): so De Wette, "those who are fallen asleep in the faith of Christ, and possibly also glorified by martyrdom, who have entered earlier than others, as it were the firstborn, into blissful union with God and Christ." As Del. observes, if we hold them to be martyrs, the following words, *καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων*, might have a certain propriety from Rev. vi. 9 f., where the souls of the martyrs under the altar cry, *ἕως πότε . . . . οὐ κρίνεις καὶ ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;* But this view seems altogether to fail when we attempt to explain by it *ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*. Those of whom our Lord says, Luke x. 20, *χαίρετε ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, are *yet living on earth*. According to St. Luke's manner of speaking, the firstborn are hereby designated as enrolled (see reff. Luke) in the heavenly roll: and Scripture usage seems to demand that we consider one thus described, as not yet in possession of everlasting life in the fullest

[c] κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων, καὶ [de] πνεύμασιν [ef] δικαίων [g] τετε-

ACDKL MPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

c = James iv. 12 reff. d = Luke xxiv. 37, 39. Acts vii. 59. 1 Pet. iii. 19. 46. Wisd. iii. 1. e Cant. Tr. Puer. 63. f = Matt. xxv. 37, g ch. ii. 10 reff. xi. 40.

πνευματι D[1](and lat) [demid Cosm,]. for δικαιων τετελειωμενων, τελιων δεδικαιωμενοις ℵ[1].—τεθεμελιωμενων D[1], *funditorum* D-lat, *fundatorum* Hil.

sense, but as destined to life (cf. Isa. iv. 3: Acts xiii. 48). This would forbid us from thinking of the 144,000 whom St. John saw with the Lamb on the heavenly Sion, who bore on their foreheads the name of the Lamb and of the Father. For this sealing was among the insignia of their eternal glorification: whereas the being enrolled in the book of life is the token to us, while here below, of our heavenly citizenship, and seems to lose all its significance, as soon as we have entered the heavenly city and need no assurance of our citizenship either for ourselves or for others. So that though we are tempted, both by the fact of their being classed with the angels, and by their being πρωτότοκοι (cf. ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχή, Rev. xiv. 4), to identify these with the χιλιάδες seen by St. John, we must give up the parallel, these ἀπογεγραμμένοι ἐν οὐρανοῖς being not yet citizens of heaven who have taken up their full citizenship by passing through death, but persons to whom their citizenship is assured, they being as yet here below. Add to which, that they are distinguished from the spirits of just men made perfect, by the term ἐκκλησία: and that it would be difficult or rather impossible, on this hypothesis, to give any account of the sense or arrangement of the two following clauses. Just as inadmissible is it, or even more so, to understand, with Lünem., by the πρωτότοκοι the patriarchs and saints of the O. T., and then by πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελ., not, as De W., the O. T. but the N. T. saints. So that, to say nothing of other varieties of interpretation not worth mentioning, there is no way left but to see, in the ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων, THE CHURCH BELOW. And this view, far from being a last refuge, is justified by every consideration. For, 1. thus ἐκκλησία is explained, which every where when used of men and not of angels, Ps. lxxxviii. 5, designates the assembly of saints on earth: 2. the adjunct ἀπογεγρ. ἐν οὐρ. is accounted for, indicating as it does the heavenly charter of the church below, the invisible side of their sonship and citizenship (cf. 1 John iii. 2), with which in this description of heaven we are mainly concerned: 3. we get an explanation of the choice of the term πρωτοτόκων to describe Christian believers. The Writer having given the warning example of Esau, who for a morsel of meat sold his birthright, has prepared the way for such a designation, while at the same time, as Knapp rightly remarks, the long sentence beginning at ver. 18 aims at this, "ut Christiani contra ἀπιστίαν muniantur et bona sua (τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτῶν) nosse discant." There is no distinction between firstborn and later-born Christians, but, as Hofmann also acknowledges, all Christians as such are called πρωτότοκοι because of their heritorship of the heavenly inheritance. We may also remark that thus the analogy with the firstborn of Israel is completely fulfilled. They were dedicated to God specially as his priests (Exod. xiii. 1, 2, 11—15), and royal succession was in the firstborn: so that in πρωτότοκοι we have that which St. John says: ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. This primogeniture, which belonged to Israel as such (Exod. iv. 22), belongs to Christians as such, and to every one of them: they are enrolled not merely in an earthly register, cf. Num. iii. 42, but in the book of life in heaven. We also thus, 4. obtain an explanation of the juxtaposition in the sentence of the myriads of angels and the myriads of the firstborn: the key to it being found in ch. i. 14, where God is said to have apportioned the angels as λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα to minister to the *heirs of salvation*. Thus we have the heavenly spirits and the firstborn whose names are in heaven, the jubilant choir above and the militant church below, ranged together. But, 5. we also get, what we find on no other hypothesis, an explanation of the sequence of κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων on ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων, and of that of πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων on κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων. The key to the words is in ch. x. 30, κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. The church militant here below brings to mind those enemies and persecutors, for deliverance and righting from whom she looks to the righteous judgment of God. And he who is in fellowship (1 John i. 7) with the great Judge has no judgment to fear, but is δεδικαιωμένος; thereby leading on to the πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων which follows. Thus, according to Delitzsch's note, which in the main I have here followed, the connexion between the clauses is established, and the arrangement justified: and I own this interpretation seems to me the only one which in any way fulfils those requirements. A summary of other interpreta-

λειωμένων, 24 καὶ [h] διαθήκης [hi] νέας [k] μεσίτῃ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ

[h] here only. (see note.) i Luke v. 39. 1 Cor. v. 7. Col. iii. 10. Lev. xxiii. 16. k ch. viii. 6 reff.

24. μεσιτης D[1][-gr] 109.

tions may be seen in Bleek and Lünemann. There is a monograph by Mosheim, De Ecclesia Primogenitorum in Cœlo adscriptorum ex Hebr. xii., Helmst. 1733, which I have not seen. He takes them, in common with Bleek, De W., al., as the first converts to Christianity already entered into glory. Estius most nearly approaches the interpretation given above. His whole note is very good; the conclusion especially so: "Sensus igitur hujus partis est: aggregati estis et adscripti in societatem eorum qui præ cæteris mortalibus electi sunt a Deo et ab aliis separati, tanquam primogeniti, et in cœlis, tanquam beatitudinis cœlestis hæredes, conscripti. Hæc vero dicens significat et ipsos esse primogenitos et conscriptos in cœlis"), **and to God the judge of all** (not, as many moderns,—Erasm.(annot. appy.), Hermann de Wall, Bengel, Wetst., Cramer, Michaelis, C. F. Schmid, Storr, Knapp, Dindorf, Vater, Paulus, De Wette, Bleek, Stuart, Lünem., Delitzsch,—"to the (a) judge, the God of all." For, 1. the order of the words in the clause is the natural one where a predicate is brought out into prominence for any reason, whether to be affirmed, or made the subject of attention: cf., for the first, 1 Thess. iv. 6, διότι ἔκδικος κύριος περὶ πάντων τούτων, and for the second James i. 5, παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν: 2. all the Greek expositors, and the ancients without exception, took the words so, e. g. as Thl., πάντων γάρ, οὐχὶ Ἰουδαίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πιστῶν ἐστι κριτής: 3. if they meant, "to a judge, the God of all," surely they would have been otherwise expressed,—κριτῇ (τῶν) πάντων θεῷ or the like: 4. thus only, by uplifting the universal right judgment of God, does the clause fit the context, coming between the mention of the elect, written in heaven, and the spirits of the *just*, shewing that the ἀπογραφή is no arbitrary selection,—the δικαίωσις no unreasonable procedure. It is not improbable that the Writer may have had in view Abraham's question Gen. xviii. 25, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" I only stop to protest, even for those who adopt the θεῷ πάντων view, against the idea of Delitzsch, al., that πάντων is neuter. God could not be said to be θεὸς πάντων in the neuter sense of πάντα. He is ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, Rom. ix. 5, which is widely different: δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, ch. ii. 10, which again is widely different: He is θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός: but He is not θεὸς τοῦ κόσμου, nor θεὸς τῶν πάντων (neut.). He is God of πάντες, but not of πάντα; the God not of the dead, but of the living. Primas., Œc., Thl., Faber Stap., Braun understand this of Christ: but it is a characteristic of this Epistle that all judgment is formally, and in words, referred to God the Father: see ch. iv. 11 f.; x. 30 f.; ver. 29; ch. xiii. 4), **and to the spirits of just men who have been perfected** (i. e. the whole number of the just who have passed into their rest, from righteous Abel downwards; not yet δικαίοις τετελειωμένοις, because they are as yet disembodied and awaiting the resurrection, but πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων. This τελείωσις has been through sufferings, through trials, through running and having ended their race. All is accomplished, their probation, their righteousness, God's purposes respecting them. They are not sleeping, they are not unconscious, they are not absent from us: they are perfected, lacking nothing, except, and that is our defect because we are as yet imprisoned in an unspiritual body, communion with us: their spirits are perfect, and therefore not suspended from the spirit life, but waiting only for bodily perfection also. The exposition of this clause has been much disturbed by the mistaken views taken of the former ones. It has been variously explained; of the N. T. saints only (Grot., Mosh., Bengel, Sykes, Baumgarten, C. F. Schmid, Storr, al.), of the O. T. saints (Corn. a-Lap., Schlicht., Wolf, Schulz, Bleek, De W., Ebrard). It is understood as above by Knapp, Böhme, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch. The Greek expositors also give it a general reference: e. g. Thl., τουτέστι, ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν εὐδοκιμησάντων καὶ τελείων φανέντων παρὰ θεῷ, διὰ πίστεως δηλαδή, ὡς ἀπέδειξεν. This perfection of the just is the result of the (anticipated) just judgment of God, and thus aptly follows κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων),

24.] **and to the mediator of the latter covenant** (νέας, not = καινῆς. νέος is *recens*: καινός, *novus*: νέος, the more objective word, καινός, the more subjective. But this must not be taken exclusively. νέος carries with it the freshness of youth, and is the livelier, more graphic word. See reff., esp. Col. In ch. ix. 15 our Lord is characterized as διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης), **Jesus** (the mention of the δίκαιοι τετελειωμένοι at once introduces that of Him who was Himself τετελειωμένος, ch.

l p Pet. i. 2 only †. Num. ix. 9, &c. Zech. xiii. 1 A (not F.) ℵ3b only. (-τίζειν, ch. ix. 13.) q ch. ii. 3 reff.

αἵματι [l] ῥαντισμοῦ [m] κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι [n] παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ. 25 [o] βλέπετε μὴ [p] παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα. εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ [p] ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς [q] παραιτησάμενοι τὸν

ACDKL MPℵ a b c d e f g b k l m o 17. 47

m ch. i. 4 reff. n ch. ix. 23 reff. o ch. iii. 12 reff. p ver. 19 reff.

rec κρειττονα, with 17 [47 Thdrt Cosm$_1$]: txt ACDKLM[P]ℵ rel.

25. aft λαλουντα ins υμιν D[1] harl[1] [sah æth], *in vobis* D-lat. rec (for εξεφ.) εφυγον, with D[3]KLMℵ[3] rel Thdrt Damasc, εφυγαν D[1]: txt AC[P]ℵ[1] 17 Chr$_1$ Cyr$_1$ Damasc-comm, *effugerunt* vulg(and F-lat) D-lat. rec ins της bef γης, with Cyr [Damasc]: om ACDKLM[P]ℵ rel [arm Chr$_1$ Euthal-ms Cyr$_1$ Thdrt]. rec τον bef επι γης παρ., with KL[P]ℵ[3] rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt ACDMℵ[1] m 17 [Euthal-ms] Cyr$_1$.

ii. 10, and who is the τελειωτὴς τῆς πίστεως, ver. 2. Cf. ch. vii. 22. Our Writer especially loves to use the name Jesus. To *Christ*, all that is predicated of our Lord belonged officially: but when it is predicated of Jesus, it becomes personal fact, realized in one whom we know and who loves us. That Christ is the mediator of the new covenant, is a theological truth: that Jesus is, is a glorious token of God's love manifested to us men), **and to the blood of sprinkling** (naturally following on the mention of διαθήκη, for no διαθήκη is consecrated without blood, ch. ix. 18, 22. And if Moses had blood wherewith to sprinkle the people, much more Jesus, of whom Moses was a shadow. And therefore the Writer, enumerating the great differences of our Sion from their Sinai, though he has not recounted their blood of sprinkling, as not being worthy of mention in the face of the terrors of God's law, mentions ours, by which we were redeemed unto God, and assigns it a place in the heavenly city, next to, but separate from, Jesus Himself in His glorified state. If we come to enquire how this can be, we enter on an interesting but high and difficult subject, on which learned and holy men have been much divided. Our Lord's Blood was shed from Him on the Cross. And as His Body did not see corruption, it is obvious to suppose, that His Blood did not corrupt as that of ordinary men, being as it is so important a portion of the body. Hence, and because His resurrection Body seems to have been bloodless,—see Luke xxiv. 39: John xx. 27, and notes,—some have supposed that the Blood of the Lord remains, as it was poured out, incorruptible, in the presence of God. On such a matter I would neither affirm nor deny, but mention, with all reverence, that which seems to suit the requirements of the words before us. By that Blood we live, wherever it is: but as here it is mentioned separately from the Lord Himself, as an item in the glories of the heavenly city, and as "yet speaking," it seems to require some such view to account for the words used. Bengel has here a long excursus on the point, in which he takes strongly the above view. Chrys. also seems to have done so, Hom. xxxiii. on Heb. xiii., vol. xii. p. 229, where the text is in some confusion, but Mutianus seems to have expressed the sense (p. 447): "Foris quippe passus est, sed ad cœlum sanguis sublatus est" (εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ αἷμα ἀνηνέχθη). The blood of Christ is called αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, inasmuch as, like that sacrificial blood of old materially, it is spiritually sprinkled on the conscience of those who come unto God by Him, cf. ch. ix. 13 ff.; x. 22; xiii. 12) **speaking better** (κρεῖττον adverbially: as in 1 Cor. vii. 38, κρεῖσσον ποιεῖν is opposed to καλῶς ποιεῖν. And the adverb refers not to the *manner* of the speaking (as Thdrt., διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων φθεγγόμενον: Chrys., τοῦτο γὰρ πάντας ἐκάθηρε, καὶ φωνὴν ἀφίησι λαμπροτέραν καὶ εὐσημοτέραν, ὅσῳ μείζονα τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἔχει τὴν διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων: and Schol.-Matthæi, τὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Ἄβελ ᾄδεται μόνον, τοῦτο δὲ ἐνεργεῖ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν. This accords with their understanding of λαλεῖ above in ch. xi. 4), but to the matter spoken. So, after Cyr.-alex. de Adorat. in Spir., and ver. xv., vol. i. p. 528, Œc., τὸ μὲν γὰρ Ἄβελ αἷμα κατακεκράγει τοῦ φονευτοῦ, τὸ δὲ χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν λαλεῖ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα: "ille flagitabat ultionem, hic impetrat remissionem," Erasm.(par.). And so most later Commentators. Delitzsch unites both views) **than Abel** (not, "*than that of Abel:*" for in ch. xi. 4, it is Abel himself who speaks, in his blood: see note there).

25.] This voice of the blood of sprinkling, just mentioned, leads naturally to the *caution not to despise that voice, nor put it by as they of old did the φωνὴ ῥημάτων from Sinai.* **Take heed** (more forcible without any inferential particle such as οὖν) **that ye decline not** (see above on ver. 19) **him that speaketh** (i. e. God in Christ, see below). **For if they did not escape** (how? in one of two senses: either, 1. they did not escape hearing the voice on account of this their παραίτησις: or, 2., which seems more probable, they did

[r] χρηματίζοντα, [s] πολὺ [s] μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ᾽ οὐρανῶν [t] ἀποστρεφόμενοι· [26] οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν [u] ἐσάλευσεν τότε,

r = ch. viii. 5 reff. s ver. 9. t = Matt. v. 42. 2 Tim. i. 15. Tit. i. 14. Wisd. xvi. 3. u Acts iv. 31. xvi. 26 al. Judg. v. 5. Ps. cxiii. 7.

rec πολλῳ, with D³KLM[P] rel [Chr Euthal-ms Cyr, Thdrt Damasc]: txt ACD¹א 17. υμεις C 43[-7. ουρανου Mא [b c d f h k l] Chr₁].

not escape God's vengeance in punishment: the Writer taking this their παραίτησις of the divine voice as a sort of sample of their disobedient and unbelieving spirit), **declining as they did** (not 'who declined,' οἱ παραιτ.) **him who spoke** (χρηματίζειν, see on ch. viii. 5, of an oracular command given by the Deity: and here the χρηματίζων is God, see below) **on earth** (on Mount Sinai. The construction is a trajection not unusual with our Writer: cf. ch. ix. 15, 16, and ver. 11), **much more we (shall not escape), who are turning away from** (ἀποστρεφόμενοι, '*aversantes*:' so we have an accusative after ἐκστῆναι, ὑπεκστῆναι, ὑπεκτρέπεσθαι, ἐκτρέπεσθαι, ἀφίστασθαι, &c. See Kühner, § 551, Anm. 3. Cf. ἐξαναχωρεῖν τὰ εἰρημένα, Thuc. iv. 28) **him** (who χρηματίζει) **from (the) heavens** (we now come to the somewhat difficult question, the answer to which we have taken for granted in the rendering of this verse: viz. *who are intended by* the various objects, τὸν λαλοῦντα, τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζοντα, τὸν ἀπ᾽ οὐρανῶν. Let us take the second of these first, as furnishing the key to the others. τίνα λέγει; (says Chrys.) ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, Μωυσῆν. And so Œc., Carpzov, al. But this cannot well be. For παραιτησάμενοι manifestly refers back to ver. 19: where it was not Moses, but God, whom they παρῃτήσαντο. It must be laid down then as certain, that ὁ ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζων is God. Then if so, who is ὁ ἀπ᾽ οὐρανῶν, or in other words who is ὁ λαλῶν, for these two are manifestly the same? Clearly, not Jesus: for by οὗ ἡ φωνή, which follows, the voice of this same speaker shook the earth at the giving of the law: and it can by no ingenuity be pretended, that the terrors of the law proceeded from the Son of God; especially in the face of the contrast drawn here, and in ch. ii. 2 ff. And it would be against all accuracy and decorum in divine things, to pass from the speaking of the God of Israel to that of our Lord Jesus Christ in the way of climax as is here done, with πολὺ μᾶλλον, 'much more shall we not escape.' Add to which, that, if Christ is to be understood as the subject of vv. 26 ff., we shall have Him uttering the prophetic words ἔτι ἅπαξ κ.τ.λ., whereas both from our Writer's habit of quoting prophecy (cf. ch. i. 1; iv. 7; vi. 13; viii. 8; xi. 11) and from the context of the prophecy itself, they must be attributed to the Father. How then are these difficulties to be got over? Simply by taking as above, the speaker in both cases to be GOD: in the first, as speaking from Mount Sinai by His Angels: in the second, as speaking from His heavenly throne through His exalted Son. Thus it is true we lie open to one objection, viz. that the giving of the law is ever regarded in the O. T. as a speaking from heaven: so Exod. xx. 22, ὑμεῖς ἑωράκατε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λελάληκα ὑμῖν: cf. Deut. iv. 36: Neh. ix. 13. But this objection, though at first sight weighty, is by no means decisive. The οὐρανός spoken of is surely nothing but the material heaven, as apparent to the Israelites in the clouds and darkness which rested on Sinai, and totally distinct from the οὐρανός here, the site of our blessed Lord's glorification, who is spoken of, ch. iv. 14, as διεληλυθὼς τοὺς οὐρανούς. Thus the words have been explained from early times: e.g. by Theodoret (παρακελεύεται αὐτοῖς μὴ ζηλῶσαι τὴν ἐκείνων παχύτητα, μηδὲ παραπλησίως ἐκείνοις καταλιπεῖν τὸν δεσπότην, καὶ πρὸς τὸν οἰκέτην δραμεῖν, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Μωυσέα λαβεῖν, καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν καινῶν προσμεῖναι τοῖς παλαιοῖς. καίτοι, φησίν, οὐκ οὐρανόθεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τῷ Σινᾷ ὄρει τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἐδίδου· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἀπ᾽ οὐρανῶν ἐπιφάνειαν προσδεχόμεθα τοῦ δεσπότου, καὶ διδάσκων ὡς αὐτὸς καὶ τούτων κἀκείνων νομοθέτης γεγένηται, ἐπήγαγεν: where it is true in the last clause he seems rather to incline to believe that the Second Person of the Trinity is throughout spoken of), Calvin, Schlichting, Owen (in the main: "God himself, or the Son of God"), Grot. ("Utrovis modo legas, τόν quod hic legitur et quod sequitur, non distinguit eum cui parendum sit, sed modum quo is se revelavit"), Limborch, Bengel, Peirce, Carpzov, Wetst., Baumgarten, al., Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al.); **26.] whose voice** (see on last verse) **shook the earth then** (ὅτε, φησί, ἐνομοθέτει ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Σινᾷ. So in ref. Judg., in Deborah's Song, γῆ ἐσείσθη ... ὄρη ἐσαλεύθησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου Ἐλωΐ, τοῦτο Σινᾶ ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Cf. ref. Ps. In Exod. xix. 18, where the E. V. has after the Heb.,

νῦν δὲ [v] ἐπήγγελται λέγων [w] Ἔτι [x] ἅπαξ ἐγὼ [y] σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν. [27] Τὸ δὲ ἔτι [x] ἅπαξ

ACDKL MPℵab cdefg hklmo 17. 47

v perf. act., Rom. iv. 21 (pass., Gal. iii. 19) only. 1 aor., James i. 12 al. w Hag. ii. 6, 7 (freely). x ch. vi. 4 reff. y Matt. xxi. 10. xxvii. 51. xxviii. 4. Rev. vi. 13 only. Job ix. 6.

26. εγω bef απαξ D¹(and lat). rec σειω, with DKL[P] rel Ath-2-mss Chr_1 [$Quæst_1$ Euthal-ms Damasc] Thdrt : txt ACMℵ 17 [47] vulg Syr coptt [æth] Ath_1 Cyr_1 $Cosm_1$ $Andr_2$ $Areth_2$. add λεγει D¹(and lat).

"the whole mount quaked greatly," the LXX render, *καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα*: reading, perhaps, with some Hebrew mss., הָעָם instead of הָהָר. *σαλεύειν* is intransitive as well as transitive in the classics (e.g. Soph. Œd. Tyr. 23), but in Hellenistic Greek transitive only: see reff. Some take this shaking of the earth to be meant of a figurative excitement of men's minds: so Justiniani ("Ait Apostolus divinam vocem tunc movisse terram, cum angeli opera tam multa signa in monte Sinai edidit, quæ non modo ingentem admirationem pepererunt, sed non exiguum incusserunt terrorem: nonnullam etiam lætitiam attulerunt bonis, quod legem ab ipso Deo immortali accíperent"), Estius. But there can be little doubt, that the material explanation is the true one. The so-called pentameter, *οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε*, could hardly have been observed, but by one whose eye was quicker than his ear), **but now** (*νῦν*, not only *ut res nunc se habent*, but here in a more temporal sense, as opposed to *τότε*: *now*, under the prophetic revelations since the captivity,—under the N. T. dispensation in which those prophecies will find their fulfilment) **hath He** (God: see above) **promised** (perf. pass., in middle sense, see ref. and Winer, § 39. 3. Cf. also Acts xiii. 2; xvi. 10; xxv. 12: Exod. iii. 18 al. Böhme and Vater would render it passive, "hath it been promised:" but *λέγων* following, though it might suit the style of the Apocalypse, will not agree with the careful precision of our Epistle), **saying, Yet once (more), and I will shake not only the earth, but also the heaven.** The prophecy in Haggai is uttered, like the whole of his prophecies, with reference to the second temple, which was then rising out of the ruins of the first, smaller indeed and poorer, but destined to witness greater glories. It was to be the scene of the last revelation of Jehovah to His people: and the house of David, then so low, was to rise above the ruins of the thrones of the earth, and endure as the signet on God's right hand (Hag. ii. 21—23). It is this ruin of earthly powers, this antitypical shaking of the earth and all that is in it, after the typical material shaking at Sinai, of which the Prophet speaks. And the result of this shaking was to be, that the best treasures of all nations (not to be understood personally of Christ, but as LXX, *ἥξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν*), should be brought to adorn that temple. The expression here (as in LXX) rendered *ἔτι ἅπαξ κ.τ.λ.* is in the Heb. עוֹד אַחַת מְעַט הִיא, i. e., as in E. V. (see Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erfüll. i. 330, and Hitzig in loc.), "Yet once, it is a little while, and:" i. e. the period which shall elapse shall be but one, not admitting of being broken into many; and that one, but short. Thus the prophecy seems to point to the same great final bringing of all the earth under the Kingdom of God, which is spoken of in Zechariah xiv. when the Lord shall come and all his saints with Him, the great antitype of Sinai (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 2), so often the subject of ancient prophecy. See this more fully entered upon in Hofmann, as above, and in Delitzsch's note here. It is clearly wrong, with some interpreters, to understand this shaking of the mere breaking down of Judaism before the gospel, or of any thing which shall be fulfilled *during* the Christian œconomy, short of its glorious end and accomplishment. The *οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καί*, which the Writer has substituted for the simple *καί* of the LXX, is adopted for the sake of bringing out the point which is before him, the earth, and the speaking from the earth, on the one hand, the heaven, and the speaking from the heaven, on the other. But the *οὐρανός* here, that is to be shaken, is the material heaven stretched above this earth.

27.] **But (now) this yet once (more)** (Hengstenberg's idea that the Writer lays no stress on *ἔτι ἅπαξ*, but, in citing these words, means in fact the whole of the prophecy ("this, *ἔτι ἅπαξ κ.τ.λ.*"), is evidently absurd. It is *on these words* that the Writer's argument depends, there being nothing in the following words of the prophecy to imply this removing, but only in the *ἔτι ἅπαξ*. Still as Delitzsch well argues, the argument does not stand and fall with the *ἔτι ἅπαξ* of the LXX. The great final shaking which is to introduce the accomplished kingdom of God is at all events that after

[z] δηλοῖ τὴν τῶν [u] σαλευομένων [a] μετάθεσιν ὡς πεποιημένων, ἵνα [b] μείνῃ τὰ μὴ [u] σαλευόμενα. 28 διὸ [c] βασιλείαν

z ch. ix. 8 reff. a ch. vii. 12 reff. b = ch. x. 34 reff. c Dan. vii. 18. v. 31. Herod. ii. 120. iii. 66 (al. in Bl.).

27. rec των σαλ. bef την, with D[3]KL[P] rel Ath[1] [Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]: om την D[1]M: ins in both places ℵ[3]: txt ACℵ[1] 17 [Cosm[1]]. om ινα μεινη τα μη σαλ. A.

which there shall be no other. At this the words ἔτι ἅπαξ point: but it does not rest on them for its proof) **indicates** (see ch. ix. 8, note) **the removal of the things shaken, as of things which have been made, in order that the things which are not** (i.e. cannot be, which the μή hints at) **shaken may abide** (three ways of taking this sentence are grammatically and philologically possible. 1. That given above, to the consideration of which I will presently return. 2. We may join ἵνα &c., not with the fact pointed at, the μετάθεσις τῶν σαλευομένων, as its purpose, but with πεποιημένων, 'as of things which have been made in order that the things which cannot be shaken may remain:' i.e. the scope of Creation has been, the establishing of the kingdom of Redemption: that it, the transitory and baseless, may pass away when its work is fulfilled, and give place to that which shall never pass away. This view is strongly taken by Delitzsch, after Grotius, Bengel, Tholuck, al. Before discussing it, we may notice and dismiss (3), which is a mere variety of it, and consists in taking μένειν in the sense of "to await," or "wait for," "as of things which have been made in order that they should wait for the things which cannot be shaken." So Paul Bauldry in 1699 (see Wolf, Curæ, p. 795, h. l.), Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee. But, though μένειν does undoubtedly occur in this sense in Acts xx. 5, 23, yet the usage of this Epistle is for the other sense, cf. ch. vii. 3, 24; x. 34; xiii. 14. And another objection to this meaning seems to me to be, that in this case it would not be the aorist μείνῃ, indicating the final purpose as expressed once for all, but the present μένῃ, indicating the continuous attitude of expectancy. So that, although the sense would thus be good, and altogether according to St. Paul in Rom. viii. 18—25, we must pass this by, for the *absolute* sense of μείνῃ, may abide, endure: cf. Acts xxvii. 41, ἔμεινεν ἀσάλευτος: and Isa. lxvi. 22, ὃν τρόπον ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινή, ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, μένει ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ κ.τ.λ. Nor again can I accede to (2), beautiful as is the thought, and strictly true, that Creation was made but to subserve Redemption: the things removeable, to give place to the things unremoveable. For, α. the word μείνῃ will thus have an exceedingly awkward elliptic sense, "that the things which cannot be shaken may remain," i.e. "may come into the place of those removed, and thus abide for ever:" for things which cannot be shaken *remaining* merely, would be a matter of course. This is confessed by Grot.: "nam in id facta est hæc quam videmus machina, ut olim alteri meliori et non immutandæ locum faciat." But certainly this does not lie in the word μείνῃ. β. The logical propriety as well as the rhythm of the sentence is thus destroyed. For we should on this rendering have the ἵνα clause entirely subordinated to the πεποιημένων, and indicating, not the purpose of the main action of the sentence, but that of the creation, a matter lying quite out of the present record. Certainly, if this were the meaning, we should have had the part. πεποιημένων introduced with a καί, as is generally done when an outlying circumstance is taken into account by the way: as e.g. in 1 Pet. ii. 8, οἳ προσκόπτουσιν, τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες, εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν. Besides which, I should have expected in this case the aor. part., not the perf., the ἵνα of purpose relating to the time when the Creation took place, rather than to its subsistence since then. So that it seems to me, we must fall back on (1), viz. the making ἵνα belong to μετάθεσιν, the action of the sentence. This, it is true, is not without difficulty. For, α. even thus we must go some little out of our way for a sense for μείνῃ, though not so far as in the other case. μείνῃ must then mean, *may remain over*, when the σαλευόμενα are gone: may be permanently left: to which sense there is no objection in Greek any more than in English, but it does not exactly fit the requirements of the sentence: β. if πεποιημένων be taken absolutely, "as of things which have been made," we might be met by the ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ in the citation from Isa. lxvi. 22 above, to shew that the new heavens and the new earth are also πεποιημένα: see also Isa. lxv. 17, 18. The answer to this must be, though I own it is not altogether a satisfactory one, that the ποιεῖσθαι is not the same in the two cases: that this word carries rather with it χειροποίητος, ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, as that word is explained ch. ix. 11: whereas the other ποιῶ rests in the almighty power of God, by which

d ἀσάλευτον e παραλαμβάνοντες e ἔχωμεν e χάριν, δι' ἧς f λατρεύωμεν g εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ h μετὰ i εὐλαβείας καὶ k δέους· 29 καὶ γὰρ l ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ m καταναλίσκον.

ACDKL MPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

d Acts xxvii. 41 only. Exod. xiii. 16. Deut. vi. 8. xi. 18 only. e = Luke xvii. 9. 1 Tim. i. 12. 2 Tim. i. 3. 2 Macc. iii. 33. f ch. viii. 5 reff. g here only †. (-τος, ch. xiii. 21. -τεῖν, ch. xi. 5, 6.) h = ch. iv. 16 reff. i ch. v. 7 (reff.) only. k here only †. 2 Macc. iii. 17, 30 al3. l Deut. iv. 24. ix. 3. m here only. Deut. l. c. Zeph. i. 18 al.

28. εχομεν K[P]ℵ a c d e[3] f k m 17 vulg(and F-lat, not demid) D-lat æth Ath_1 Cyr_1 $Antch_1$ [$Cosm_1$]: Chr[-txt]-mss vary. λατρευομεν KM[P]ℵ rel Ath_1 Chr-3-mss [Euthal-ms] Thl Œc: txt ACDL f l 17 [Chr_1 Cyr_1 Thdrt $Cosm_1$ Damasc-comm], *serviamus* vulg(and F-lat) D-lat. for ευαρεστως, ευχαριστως D[-gr[1]] f 52-6. [μετ' D $Cosm_1$]. rec (for ευλ. κ. δεους) αιδους κ. ευλ., with KL rel Chr_1 [Thdrt ($Cosm_1$) Damasc]: ευλ. κ. αιδους D[2.3]M[P]ℵ[3a], *metu et verecundia* D-lat, *metu et reverentia* vulg(and F-lat): txt ACD[1]ℵ[1(3b)] 17 coptt[(appy) Syr arm $Chr\text{-}ms_1$ Euthal-ms].

29. for και, κυριος D[1](and lat).

the spirit-world as well as the world of sense was called into existence. See by all means, on the whole, Luke xxi. 26).

28.] **Wherefore** (διό gathers its inference, not from the whole preceding paragraph, but from the yet once more shaking and consequent removing of earthly things before those things which shall remain) **receiving as we do a kingdom which cannot be shaken** (the pres. part., with the slightly ratiocinative force. παραλαμβάνοντες, not, as Calvin, "Modo fide ingrediamur in Christi regnum;" and so Schlichting, Limborch, Bengel, Semler; nor does the participial clause belong to the exhortation: but it indicates matter of fact, from which the exhortation sets out, and means (as in Dan. vii. 18, καὶ παραλήψονται τὴν βασιλείαν ἅγιοι ὑψίστου, which probably was in the Writer's mind,—and in other reff.) being partakers of, coming into possession of, βασ. or ἀρχὴν παραλαμβάνειν, 'regnum capessere.' The participle then will be descriptive of our Christian state of privilege and expectation: proleptically designating us as in possession of that, whose firstfruits and foretastes we do actually possess), **let us have thankfulness** (τουτέστιν, εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ θεῷ, Chrys.: τουτέστι μὴ ἀλγῶμεν μηδὲ δυσπετῶμεν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἤδη δόντι καὶ μέλλοντι δώσειν, Thl. And so Elsner, Wolf, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, Ebrard, Delitzsch. Others render, "let us hold fast grace." So Syr., Beza, Jac. Cappell., Est., Schlichting, Grot., al. But this is impossible: ἔχωμεν would be κατέχωμεν (ch. iii. 6, 14; x. 23) or κρατῶμεν (ch. iv. 14), and the words would probably be in inverted order; besides that χάριν would hardly be anarthrous. On the sense see Ps. l. 23, "whoso offereth me thanks and praise, he honoureth me;" and on χάριν ἔχειν, besides reff., Jos. Antt. vii. 9. 4: Polyb. v. 104. 1: Xen. Mem. i. 2. 7; ii. 6. 21; iii. 11. 2, and many other examples in Bleek), **by which** (thankfulness) **let us serve** (the indicative readings, ἔχομεν and λατρεύομεν, are weakly supported, and do not suit the sense nor the inferential διό. And λατρεύωμεν cannot be taken, as in E. V., "by which *we may serve*," but must be hortatory like the other) **God well-pleasingly** (the dative τῷ θεῷ belongs to the verb, not to εὐαρέστως as Valcknaer) **with reverent submission and fear** (see on ch. v. 7 for εὐλάβεια. The rec. reading has *against* it, 1. the frequent conjunction in ordinary Greek of αἰδώς and εὐλάβεια, of which Bleek gives many examples, and, 2. the fact that δέος occurs no where else in the N. T. or LXX).

29.] **For moreover our God is a consuming fire** (καὶ γάρ, as in ch. iv. 2; v. 12, and in Luke xxii. 37, introduces the reason rendered by γάρ as an additional particular not contained in what went immediately before,—answering to the Latin '*etenim*.' It is quite impossible that the Writer should have meant, "For *our God also*, as well as the God of the Jews:" as even Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, and Bisping make him say. Besides the utter incongruity of such a mode of expression with any thing found in our Writer or in the N. T., this would certainly have been expressed καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός. The words are taken from Deut. iv. 24, ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστί, θεὸς ζηλωτής. Cf. ib. ix. 3. And thus the fact that God's anger continues to burn now, as then, against those who reject his Kingdom, is brought in; and in the background lie all those gracious dealings by which the fire of God's presence and purity becomes to his people, while it consumes their vanity and sin and earthly state, the fire of purity and light and love for their enduring citizenship of his kingdom).

XIII. [1] Ἡ [n] φιλαδελφία [o] μενέτω. [2] τῆς [p] φιλοξενίας μὴ [q] ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, διὰ ταύτης γὰρ [r] ἔλαθόν τινες [s] ξενίσαντες [t] ἀγγέλους. [3] [u] μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν [v] δεσμίων ὡς [w] συνδεδεμένοι· τῶν [x] κακουχουμένων, ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες [y] ἐν

n Rom. xii. 10. 1 Thess. iv. 9. 1 Pet. i. 22. 2 Pet. i. 7 bis only †. (-φος, 1 Pet. iii. 8.) o = 1 Cor. xiii. 13 al. p Rom. xii. 13 only †. (-νος, 1 Pet. iv. 9.) q ch. vi. 10 reff. r constr., here only ‡. (Mark vii. 24. Luke viii. 47. Acts xxvi. 26. 2 Pet. iii. 5, 8 only. Job xxviii. 21.) in Gr., passim. s = Acts x. 6, &c. (xvii. 20.) xxi. 16. xxviii. 17 (1 Pet. iv. 4, 12) only †. Sir. xxix. 28 (2 Macc. ix. 6) only. t Gen. xviii. 1. xix. 1, 2. u = 1 Cor. xi. 2. 2 Tim. i. 4. Prov. xxxi. (xxiv.) 7. (see Gal. ii. 10. Col. iv. 18.) μιμν., ch. ii. 6 (from Ps. viii. 4) only. v ch. x. 34. Eph. iii. 1. iv. 1 al. Lam. iii. 34. w here only. = 1 Kings xviii. 1 A (B def.). x ch. xi. 37 (reff.(only. y 2 Cor. v. 6. xii. 2, 3.

Chap. XIII. 2. την φιλοξενιαν ℵ[1].
3. for δεσμιων, δεδεμενων D[1]. κακοχουμενων D[3]KLM[P] d m [Euthal-ms Antch[1]]; κακωχουμενων C.

Chap. XIII. 1—16.] *Various exhortations to Christian virtues: more especially to the imitation of the faith of their leaders who had departed in the Lord: to firmness in the faith: and following of Jesus, who suffered outside the camp to teach us to bear His reproach.* 1.] **Let brotherly love** (**φιλαδελφία** in the classics, the love of brothers and sisters for one another: in the N. T., the love of the Christian brethren. In ref. 2 Pet. it is expressly distinguished from ἀγάπη, the more general word) **remain** (we learn from the Acts,—on the hypothesis of this Epistle being addressed to the church at Jerusalem (on which however see Prolegg.),—how eminent this brotherly love had been in that church, and, without any hypothesis as to the readers, we see from our ch. x. 32 ff. that the persons here addressed had exercised it aforetime, and from ch. vi. 10, that they still continued to exercise it. Let it then remain, not die out. And it is put first, as being the first of the fruits of faith. The exhortations in ch. iii. 12 f.; x. 24 f.; xii. 12 ff., point the same way). 2, 3.] **φιλαδελφία** is now specifically urged in two of its departments, hospitality, and care of prisoners. 2.] **Forget not hospitality to strangers** (so in ref. 1 Pet., after recommending ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ εἰς ἑαυτούς, he proceeds φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους. Cf. also ref. Rom., and Titus i. 8: 1 Tim. iii. 2. Bleek remarks that the notices found in the writings of the enemies of Christianity shew how much this virtue was practised among the early believers: and refers to Julian, Ep. 49, and Lucian de Morte Peregrini, ch. 16): **for thereby** (by exercising it) **some unawares entertained angels** (viz. Abraham, Gen. xviii., Lot, Gen. xix. Certainly it would appear at first sight from the former account, that Abraham regarded the "three men" from the first as angels: but the contrary view has nothing against it in the narrative, and was taken by the Jewish expositors: cf. Philo de Abr. § 22, vol. ii. p. 17, θεασάμενος τρεῖς ὡς ἄνδρας ὁδοιποροῦντας, οἱ δὲ θειοτέρας ὄντες φύσεως ἐλελήθεισαν: and Jos. Antt. i. 11. 2, θεασάμενος τρεῖς ἀγγέλους . . . . καὶ νομίσας εἶναι ξένους, ἠσπάσατό τε ἀναστάς, καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ καταχθέντας παρεκάλει ξενίων μεταλαβεῖν. On the motive propounded, Calvin remarks, "Si quis objiciat rarum illud fuisse, responsio impromptu est, non angelos tantum recipi, sed Christum ipsum, quum pauperes in ejus nomine recipimus." He further notices, "In Græcis elegans est allusio (ἔλαθον and ἐπιλανθάνεσθε) quæ Latine exprimi non potest." On **ἔλαθον ξενίσαντες**, Chrys. says, τί ἐστιν ἔλαθον; οὐκ εἰδότες φησὶν ἐξένισαν: and Thl., ἀντὶ τοῦ ἠγνόησαν ὅτι ἄγγελοι ἦσαν οἱ ξενιζόμενοι, καὶ ὅμως φιλοτίμως αὐτοὺς ἐξένισαν. Cf. Herod. i. 44, οἰκίοισι ὑποδεξάμενος τὸν ξεῖνον φονέα τοῦ παιδὸς ἐλάνθανε βόσκων. The vulg. rendering, "latuerunt quidam angelis hospitio receptis," has led some R.-Cath. expositors mentioned in Estius to imagine that Lot's escape by the men of Sodom being smitten with blindness is alluded to. Bleek refers to, and with reason, a very beautiful sermon of Schleiermacher's, vol. i. p. 645, "Ueber die Christliche Gastfreundschaft." He there sets forth, how the motive, though no longer literally applying to us, is still a real one, inasmuch as angels were the messengers of God's spiritual purposes, and such messengers may be found in Christian guests, even where least expected). 3.] **Remember** (cf. ch. ii. 6) **them that are in bonds, as if bound with them** (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 26: as fully sympathizing with them in their captivity: not, as Böhme, al., "quippe ejus naturæ et conditionis homines, qui ipsi quoque pro captivis sint, nimirum in ecclesia pressa degentes," which is travelling too far from the context): **those in distress** (**κακουχουμένων** is the general idea, including captives and any other classes of distressed persons: as Œc. and Thl., ἢ ἐν φυλακαῖς ἢ ἐν λιμῷ ἢ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ θλίψει), **as also yourselves being in the body** (i. e. as in reff., bound up with a body which has the same capacity of

σώματι. 4 [z] τίμιος ὁ [a] γάμος [b] ἐν πᾶσιν, καὶ ἡ [c] κοίτη [d] ἀμίαντος· [e] πόρνους γὰρ καὶ [f] μοιχοὺς [g] κρινεῖ ὁ θεός.

ACDKL MP**א** a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

z = Acts v. 34. 1 Cor. iii. 12. (so Rev. xvii. 4 al.) 1 Pet. i. 19. Prov. iii. 15. a = here only (see note). Wisd. xiv. 24, 26. b = 1 Tim. iii. 11. 2 Tim. iv. 5. Tit. ii. 9, 10 al. c Luke xi. 7. Rom. ix. 10. xiii. 13 only. = Gen. xlix. 4. d ch. vii. 26 reff. e ch. xii. 16 reff. f Luke xviii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 9 only. Job xxiv. 15. g = ch. x. 30.

4. rec (for γαρ) δε, with CD³KL rel Syr æth-rom [arm] Clem₁ Cæs₂ [Eus₁ Ephr₁ Epiph₁] Did₁ Amphil₁ Chr Thdrt, *autem* F-lat Ambr: txt AD¹M[P]א copt [Euthal-ms] Primas, *enim* vulg D-lat.

suffering. The words have been differently rendered. Calvin says, "Refero ad ecclesiæ corpus, ut sit sensus, Quandoquidem estis ejusdem corporis membra, communiter vos affici decet alios aliorum malis:" and so Braun, al. But this cannot be extracted from the words **ἐν σώματι**, without the article. Beza renders, "ac si ipsi quoque corpore adflicti essetis:" and says, "ἐν σώματι prorsus videtur illud declarare quod in vernaculo sermone dicimus *en personne*:" in other words, says Bleek, as Philo expresses it, De Spec. Legg. ad 6. 7, § 30, vol. ii. p. 326, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἑτέρων σώμασιν αὐτοὶ κακούμενοι. But this is equally out of the question: and there can be no doubt that the simple meaning is the true one. So Œc. (εἰ γάρ τις ἀναλογίσαιτο, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ὁμοιοπαθὲς ἐκείνοις σῶμα, ἐλεήσει μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς διά τε τὴν συμπάθειαν καὶ διὰ τὸν φόβον μὴ τὰ ὅμοια ἐκ τῆς ἀπανθρωπίας πάθῃ), Thl., and most Commentators).

4.] *Exhortation to chastity.* **Let your marriage** (**γάμος**, elsewhere in N.T. in the sense of a *wedding*, here has its ordinary Greek meaning) **be (held) in honour in all things** (see below) **and your marriage bed be undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God shall judge.** There are several debateable matters in this verse. First, is it a command or an assertion? The latter view is taken in Syr. "Honourable is marriage among all, and their bed is undefiled:" Beza, Grot., our E. V., al. And so Chrys. (πῶς τίμιος ὁ γάμος; ὅτι ἐν σωφροσύνῃ, φησί, διατηρεῖ τὸν πιστόν), Œc., Thdrt. (apparently). But against this is the following clause, **καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος**: for it is impossible to keep to the same rendering in this case: cf. Syr. above: the E. V. has evaded this difficulty by rendering, "and the bed undefiled," leaving it, as its guide Beza does, uncertain whether "undefiled" is an epithet, as usually taken by English readers, or a predicate, as the Greek absolutely requires. For had the meaning been, "Marriage is honourable among all, and the (an) undefiled bed," certainly the article could not have stood before κοίτη without standing also before ἀμίαντος: it must have been καὶ κοίτη ἀμίαντος or καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἡ ἀμίαντος. So that the indicative supplement, ἐστιν, must be dismissed, as inconsistent with the requirements of the latter clause; and, I might add, with the context: in which, besides that the whole is of a hortatory character, the very same collocation of words immediately follows in ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος, where no one suggests ἐστιν as our supplement. The imperative view has accordingly been taken by very many Commentators: as e. g. by Thl. (see below), and the great mass of moderns. Delitzsch holds that no supplement is wanted, the clause being an exclamation carrying with it a hortatory force. But surely this is equivalent to supplying ἔστω. The next question respects **ἐν πᾶσιν**, whether it is to be taken as masculine, 'among all men,' or as neuter, 'in all things.' The doubt was felt as early as Thl., who thus expresses it: ἐν πᾶσιν οὖν, μὴ ἐν τοῖς προβεβηκόσι μέν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς νέοις οὔ, ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσιν. ἢ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τρόποις καὶ ἐν πᾶσι καιροῖς, μὴ ἐν θλίψει μέν, ἐν ἀνέσει δὲ οὔ, μὴ ἐν τούτῳ μὲν μέρει τίμιος, ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὔ, ἀλλ' ὅλος ἐν ὅλῳ τίμιος ἔστω. The masculine is taken by Erasmus, Cajetan, Luther, Calvin, Beza, and most Commentators, especially Protestants, and in later times by Schulz, Böhme, De Wette, Wahl, Kuinoel, Tholuck. And it is variously interpreted: either, α. as by Luther, that all should keep marriage in honour, by not violating it; β. as by Böhme, Schulz, al., that the unmarried should not despise it, but it should be *held* in honour by all; or, γ. as Calvin, al., that it is allowed to all conditions of men, not denied to any, as e. g. it is to the Romish priesthood. But it is altogether against the masculine sense, 1. that **ἐν πᾶσιν** would not be the natural expression for it, but **παρὰ πᾶσιν**: cf. Matt. xix. 26 (bis), and ‖: Acts xxvi. 8: Rom. ii. 13: 2 Thess. i. 6: James i. 27 (ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ): and, 2. that our Writer uses ἐν πᾶσιν in this very chapter for 'in all things,' ver. 18. See also reff., and Col. i. 18: Phil. iv. 12. So that the neuter view is to be preferred: and so Œc., Corn. a-Lap., Calmet, the R.-Cath. expositors generally, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. For the phrase **κοίτη ἀμίαντος**, Wetst. quotes from Plutarch de Fluviis, p. 18, ὑπὸ τῆς μητρυιᾶς φιλούμενος, καὶ μὴ θέλων μιαίνειν τὴν

[h] ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ [i] τρόπος, [k] ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς [l] παροῦσιν. αὐτὸς γὰρ εἴρηκεν [m] Οὐ μή σε [n] ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε [o] ἐγκαταλείπω· [6] ὥστε [p] θαῤῥοῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν [q] Κύριος ἐμοὶ [r] βοηθός, [καὶ] οὐ φοβηθήσομαι· τί ποιήσει μοι ἄνθρωπος; [7] [s] Μνημονεύετε τῶν [t] ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, [u] οἵ-

h 1 Tim. iii. 3 only†. i = here only‡. 2 Macc. v. 22. Herod. iv. 28. vii. 128. Xen. Cyr. ii. 2. 9, ἐγέλασαν, τὸν τρόπον εἰδότες αὐτοῦ. al. in Bleek. (constr., Rom. xii. 9.) k & constr., Luke iii. 14. 1 Tim. vi. 8 (Matt. xxv. 9 al.)‡. 2 Macc. v. 15. w. ἐπί, 3 John 10. l = here only. Gr., freq. Xen. Symp. iv. 42 al. in Bl. m Josh. i. 5 (also Gen. xxviii. 15. 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Deut. xxxi. 6, 8. see note). n Acts xvi. 26. xxvii. 40. Eph. vi. 9 only. LXX, as above, Deut., 1 Chron. o ch. x. 25 reff. LXX, as above (m). p (-ῤῥ-) elsw. Paul (2 Cor. v. 6, 8. vii. 16. x. 1, 2) only. Prov. i. 21 (xxxi. 11 [ℵ] Ald.) only. q Psa. cxvii. 6. r here only. Isa. i. 7 al. fr. (-θεῖν, ch. ii. 18. -θεια, iv. 16.) s = (see note) Luke xvii. 32. John xv. 20. xvi. 4. Acts xx. 35. 1 Chron. xvi. 15. t = Luke xxii. 26. Acts vii. 10. xv. 22. vv. 17, 24. Jer. iv. 22. u = ch. viii. 5 reff.

5. [for ειρηκεν, εφη C-corr.] rec εγκαταλιπω (*see LXX*-B[1]), with D[1] rel [Clem$_1$ Chr$_1$ Thdrt Damasc$_{h.1.}$ Thl]: txt ACD[3]KLM[P]ℵ c d f h m o 17 Chr-2-mss [Euthal-ms Damasc-ms Œc].

6. λεγειν bef ημας D[-gr: *ita audiente* (sic) *dicite* D-lat]: om ημας M. om και C[1][P] ℵ[1](*not in LXX*-ℵ) 17 vulg(and F-lat) D-lat Syr copt [æth].

7. προηγουμενων D[1] [*præpositorum* latt].

κοίτην τοῦ γεννήσαντος. The latter clause carries with it the anticipation of *condemnation* in κρινεῖ. Man may, or may not, punish them: one thing is sure: they shall come into judgment, and if so into condemnation, when God shall judge all.

5, 6.] St. Paul usually couples with filthy desire, *filthy lucre*, as both of them incompatible with the kingdom of God: e. g. 1 Cor. v. 10, 11; vi. 9 f.: Eph. v. 3, 5: Col. iii. 5. **5.**] **Let your manner of life** (reff.) **be void of avarice: contented** (sufficed) **with things present** (the construction is precisely as in ref. Rom., ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος· ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρὸν κ.τ.λ. On ἀρκούμενος and τοῖς παροῦσιν, see Bleek's examples. Among them, we have the very phrase in Teles. in Stobæus, serm. 95, βιώσῃ ἀρκούμενος τοῖς παροῦσι, τῶν ἀπόντων οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶν: Democrit. in Stobæus, serm. 1, τοῖς παρεοῦσιν ἀρκεῖσθαι: Phocyl. 4, ἀρκεῖσθαι παρεοῦσι, καὶ ἀλλοτρίων ἀπέχεσθαι. The construction ἀρκεῖσθαί τινι occurs in Herod. ix. 33, οὐδ' οὕτω ἔφη ἔτι ἀρκέεσθαι τούτοισι μούνοισι, and al. (Bl.): see also reff.): **for He** (viz. ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος, of ch. x. 23, God, already named ver. 4. "In post-biblical Hebrew," says Delitzsch, "אנח and אני are used as the mystical names of God") **hath said, I will not leave thee, no nor will I forsake thee** (passages bearing some resemblance to this are found in the O. T., but no where the words themselves: see reff. But in Philo, Confus. Ling. § 32, vol. i. p. 431, we have, λόγιον τοῦ ἵλεω θεοῦ μεστὸν ἡμερότητος ἐλπίδας χρηστὰς ὑπογράφον τοῖς παιδείας ἐρασταῖς ἀνῄρηται τοιόνδε, Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω. This is certainly singular, and cannot be mere coincidence. Bleek and Lünemann suppose the Writer to have made the citation direct from Philo (see Prolegg. § i. par. 156), whereas Delitzsch believes that the expression was taken from Deut. xxxi. 6 A, οὐ μή σε ἀνῇ οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλείπῃ, and had become inwoven into some liturgical or homiletic portion of the services in the Hellenistic synagogue. οὐδ' οὐ μή occurs again Matt. xxiv. 21): **6.**] **so that we say** (not '*can* say' nor '*may* say,' both which weaken the confidence expressed) **with confidence, The Lord** (יהוה in the Psalm, and probably used of the Father, as in other citations in this Epistle, e. g. ch. vii. 21; viii. 8—11; x. 16, 30; xii. 5 al., and without a citation ch. viii. 2) **is my helper** (in the Heb. only יְהוָה לִי), [**and** (not in Heb., see also digest)], **I will not be afraid: what shall man do unto me** (such is the connexion, both in the Heb. and here: not, "I will not be afraid what man shall do unto me," as the English Prayer Book after the vulg., "non timebo quid faciat mihi homo," which is ungrammatical (τί ἂν ποιῇ or ποιήσῃ))? **7.**] **Remember** (may be taken in two ways, as Thl., βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν ταῖς σωματικαῖς χρείαις, ... ἢ καὶ πρὸς μίμησιν αὐτῶν ἐπαλείφει τούτους. The former meaning would agree with μιμνήσκεσθε in ver. 3: but it is plain from what follows here (e. g. ἐλάλησαν and ἔκβασιν) that the course of these ἡγούμενοι is past, and it is remembering with a view to imitation that is enjoined) **your leaders** (ἡγούμενοι, vv. 17, 24, are their leaders in the faith: cf. also προηγούμενοι, in Clem.-rom. ad Cor. i. c. 21, p. 256. It is a word of St. Luke's, cf. reff., answering to the προϊστάμενοι of St. Paul, 1 Thess. v. 12. It is found in later Greek, —in Polyb., Herodian, Diod. Sic. al.,—in this same sense. See also Sir. ix. 17; x. 2

τινες [v] ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὧν [w] ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν [x] ἔκβασιν τῆς [y] ἀναστροφῆς [z] μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν.

ACDKL MPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

8 Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς [a] ἐχθὲς καὶ σήμερον [b] ὁ αὐτός, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. 9 [c] διδαχαῖς [d] ποικίλαις καὶ [e] ξέναις μὴ [f] παραφέρεσθε· [g] καλὸν γὰρ [h] χάριτι [i] βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρ-

v Acts viii. 25. xiii. 46. xiv. 25. xvi. 6, 32. w Acts xvii. 23 only †. Diod. Sic. xii. 15 al. in Bl. x 1 Cor. x. 13 only †. Wisd. ii. 17. viii. 8. xi. 14 only. y Gal. i. 13. Eph. iv. 22. James iii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 15 al5. 2 Pet. ii. 7. iii. 11 † Tobit 4. 14 AB(om ℵ). 2 Macc. v. 8. Ed-vat. (not AB) only. z 2 Thess. iii. 7, 9. 3 John 11 only †. Wisd. iv. 2 Bℵ. xv. 9 only. a John iv. 52. Acts vii. 28 only. Gen. xxxi. 5. Josh. iii. 4 al. b = ch. i. 12, from Ps. ci. 27. c plur., here only. d ch. ii. 4 reff. e = Acts xvii. 18. 1 Pet. iv. 12. Wisd. xvi. 2, 3, 16. f = Jude 12 (Mark xiv. 36 ∥ L.) only. 1 Kings xxi. 13 (Ezra x. 7) only. g Rom. xiv. 21. 1 Cor. vii. 1. Gal. iv. 18. h = Rom. xi. 6. Eph. ii. 5, 8 al. i ch. ii. 3 reff.

αναθεωρησαντες C.

8. rec (for *εχθες*) *χθες*, with C²D³KL[P] rel Orig₂ Ath₂ Epiph₁ Cyr-jer₁ [Euthal-ms Cyr₁] : txt AC¹D¹Mℵ. aft *αιωνας* ins *αμην* D¹(and lat).

9. rec *περιφερεσθε*, with KL d e g l o [47 arm Thl] : txt ACDM[P]ℵ rel vulg Syr copt [Bas₁ Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc Œc].

[illegible] which (of that kind, who) **spoke to you the word of God** (the aor. shews that this speaking was over, and numbers these leaders among those in ch. ii. 3: as those who heard the Lord, ὑφ' ὧν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη (ἡ σωτηρία). The phrase λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, is the usual one with St. Luke, cf. reff.), **of whom surveying** (ἀνα-θεωρεῖν, like ἀνα-ζητεῖν, to *contemplate*, or search from one end to the other. Bl. quotes from Winer de Verborum cum Prepp. compos. in N. T. Usu, p. iii, "aliquam rerum seriem ita oculis perlustrare, ut ab imo ad summum, ab extremo ad principium pergas." Similarly Chrys., συνεχῶς στρέφοντες παρ' ἑαυτοῖς. The word occurs elsewhere in St. Luke only (ref.)) **the termination** (by death: not as Œc., but without deciding, πῶς διεξέρχονται καλῶς τὴν ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἀναστροφήν: nor, as Braun and Cramer, the result *for others* of their Christian walk, viz. their conversion: nor as Storr, al., the result *for themselves*, viz. their heavenly reward, which their followers could not in any sense ἀναθεωρεῖν. We have ἔξοδος in the sense of death Luke ix. 31: 2 Pet. i. 15: and ἄφιξις Acts xx. 29. It is perhaps to be inferred that these died by martyrdom, as Stephen, James the brother of John, and possibly (but see the matter discussed in Prolegg. to James, and in Delitzsch's note here) James the brother of the Lord: and possibly too, St. Peter (see Prolegg. to 1 Pet.). So the ancient Commentators: so Thdor.-mops., Θεόδωρός φησιν ἡγουμένους τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῖς καταγγείλαντας τὸν λόγον τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ τελειωθέντας ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων αὐτόθι· πολλοὶ δὲ ἦσαν, οὔτε Στέφανος μόνον καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ μαχαίρᾳ ἀναιρεθείς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τοῦ κυρίου ἀδελφὸς Ἰάκωβος, ἕτεροι δὲ πλεῖστοι σιωπῇ παραδεδομένοι. Similarly Thdrt., al.) **of their conversation** (i.e. their Christian ἀναστρέφεσθαι, behaviour, walk, course. No English word completely gives it. For usage, see reff.), **imitate the faith.**

8.] **Jesus Christ is yesterday and to-day the same, and for ever** (as to the *construction*, **ὁ αὐτός** is the predicate to all three times, not as vulg. (not Syr., if at least Etheridge's version of it is to be trusted), "Jesus Christus heri et hodie: ipse et in sæcula;" Ambr.(passim), Calvin, al. As to the *connexion*, the verse stands as a transition from what has passed to what follows. 'It was Christ whom these ἡγούμενοι preached, ἐλάλησαν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ: Christ who supported them to the end, being the author and finisher of their faith; and He remains still with regard to you (ὥσπερ τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν οὐ κατέλιπεν, ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσιν ἀντελαμβάνετο αὐτῶν, οὕτω καὶ ὑμῶν ἀντιλήψεται· ὁ αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστι, altern. in Thl. Similarly Chrys. alt.) *the same*: be not then carried away' &c. As to the *meaning* of the words, **ἐχθές** (the common and also Attic form, whereas χθές is Epic, Ionic, and Attic) refers to the time past, when their ἡγούμενοι passed away from them; **σήμερον** to the time present, when the Writer and the readers were living. In our E. V., this verse, by the omission of the copula 'is,' appears as if it were in apposition with "the end of whose conversation:" and in the carelessly printed polyglott of Bagster, the matter is made worse, by a *colon* being substituted for the *period* after "conversation." Observe **Ἰησοῦς χριστός**, not common with our Writer: only e.g. ver. 21, where he wishes to give a solemn fulness to the mention of the Lord: Jesus, the Person, of whom we have been proving, that He is χριστός, the Anointed of God. Cf. also ch. x. 10).

9.] **Be not carried away** (the rec. περιφ. is probably from Eph. iv. 14. παρα-

δίαν, οὐ [k] βρώμασιν, [l] ἐν οἷς οὐκ [m] ὠφελήθησαν οἱ [l] * περιπατήσαντες. [10] Ἔχομεν θυσιαστηριον, [n] ἐξ οὗ [no] φαγεῖν

...φαγειν L.

k = ch. ix. 10 reff. (see note.) l = Eph. ii. 10. Col. iii. 7. Prov. viii. 20. m pass., Matt. xvi. 26 || L. 1 Cor. xiii. 3. Jer. ii. 11. n John vi. 26, 50, 51. Rev. ii. 7. o 1 Cor. ix. 4.

* περιπατοῦντες AD¹ℵ¹ vulg: περιπατησαντες CD³KLM[P]ℵ³ rel [arm Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc].

φέρεσθαι, as the prep. indicates, is to be carried out of the right course. So Plato, Phædr. p. 265 B, ἴσως μὲν ἀληθοῦς τινος ἐφαπτόμενοι, τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλοσε παραφερόμενοι: Plut. Timoleon 6, αἱ κρίσεις . . . . . σείονται καὶ παραφέρονται ῥᾳδίως ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων ἐπαίνων καὶ ψόγων, ἐκκρουόμενοι τῶν οἰκείων λογισμῶν. Ælian has ὑπὸ τοῦ οἴνου παραφερόμενος. Œc. says, τὸ δὲ παραφ. ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν μαινομένων τῶν τῇδε κἀκεῖσε παραφερομένων εἴρηται. The fixed point from which they are not to be carried away, is clearly that given in the last verse, viz. Jesus Christ) **by various** (ποικίλαις, παντοδαπαῖς· αἱ τοιαῦται γὰρ οὐδὲν βέβαιον ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' εἰσὶ διάφοροι· μάλιστα δὲ τὸ τῶν βρωμάτων διάφορον. Chrys. Thl. says, τουτέστιν παρὰ τοῦδε τόδε καὶ παρὰ τοῦδε τόδε . . . . . ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθεια μονοειδής, καὶ πρὸς ἓν ἀφορῶσα. The reference, from what follows, is to teachings about various meats) **and strange** (τουτέστιν, ἀλλότριαι τῆς ἀληθείας, Thl. The use of ἕτερος is similar, from which ἑτεροδοξία has its technical sense) **doctrines** (teachings: so διδασκαλίαι, Matt. xv. 9: Col. ii. 22: 1 Tim. iv. 1): **for it is good that the heart be confirmed** (reff.) **with grace** (God's grace, working *on us* by faith: δείκνυσιν ὅτι τὸ πᾶν πίστις ἐστίν· ἂν αὐτῇ βεβαιώσῃ, ἡ καρδία ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ἕστηκεν, Chrys.), **not with meats** (it is a question whether **βρώμασιν** be meant of meat eaten after sacrifices, or of "meats" as spoken of so much by St. Paul, meats partaken of or abstained from as a matter of conscience: cf. 1 Cor. viii. 8, βρῶμα ἡμᾶς οὐ παρίστησιν τῷ θεῷ: ib. ver. 13; ib. vi. 13: Rom. xiv. 15, 20, μὴ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ. The former view is taken by Schlichting, Bleek, Lünemann, al., on the grounds, 1. that the expression will not suit meats *abstained from*, only those partaken of: "Cor non reficitur cibis non comestis, sed comestis. Ciborum ergo usui, non abstinentiæ, opponitur hic gratia," Schlicht.; 2. that ver. 10, which is in close connexion with this, speaks of an altar and of partaking of meats sacrificed: and, 3. that this same reference, to meats offered in sacrifice, is retained throughout, to ver. 15. The other view is taken by Chrys., Thdrt., Œc., Thl., Primas., Faber Stap., Erasm., Calv., Beza, the great body of later Commentators, and recently by Böhme, Tholuck, and Delitzsch. It is defended against the above objections, 1. by remembering that in the other passages where βρώματα occurs with this reference, it is used not merely in the concrete, for meats absolutely partaken of, but in the abstract, for the whole department or subject of βρώματα, to be partaken of or abstained from: 2. see below on the verse: (3) stands or falls with (2). And besides, it is supported by the following considerations: 4. that βρώματα is a word not found in the law where offerings are spoken of (in Levit. xix. 6 and xxii. 30, we have βρωθήσεται of peace-offerings and thank-offerings): but in the distinction of clean and unclean, Levit. xi. 34: 1 Macc. i. 63: 5. that in all N. T. places, where βρῶμα is used in a similar connexion, it applies to clean and unclean meats: 6. that διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε must refer, not to meats eaten after sacrifices, but to some doctrines in which there was variety and perplexity, as to those concerning clean and unclean. And I own these reasons incline me strongly to this view, to the exclusion of the other. Two 'monstra interpretationis' need only be mentioned: that of the R.-Cath. Bisping, who interprets χάριτι "by the eucharist:" and that of Ebrard, who renders βεβαιοῦσθαι, "*cling fast to,*" and χάριτι and βρώμασιν as datives), **in which** (the observance of which, βρώματα, as above, being used for the observance of rules concerning meats and drinks &c.) **they who walked were not profited** (the **ἐν** belongs, not to ὠφελήθησαν, but to περιπατήσαντες, according to the very usual construction, περιπατεῖν ἔν τινι, for to observe, to live in the practice of any thing: see reff. and Acts xxi. 21. So Chrys., τουτέστιν, οἱ διὰ παντὸς φυλάξαντες αὐτά. These, who walked in such observances, are the whole people of God under the O. T. dispensation (notice the historic aorists), to whom they were of themselves useless and profitless, though ordained for a preparatory purpose: so that Calvin's objection is answered, "Certe patribus qui sub lege vixerunt utilis fuit pædagogia cujus pars erat ciborum discrimen." Yes, and so was the shedding of the blood of bulls and goats part of the

p w. inf., Heb. here only. Matt. ix. 6 ‖. Luke xii. 5. Acts ix. 14 al. 1 Macc. x. 35. q constr., ch. viii. 5.

οὐκ ᵒᵖ ἔχουσιν ᵒᵖ ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ ᑫ λατρεύοντες.

ACDK MPℵab cdefg hklmo 17.47

10. om εξουσιαν (*from similarity to* εχουσιν?) D[1](and lat) M Damasc.

pædagogia: but it was useless to take away sin. Cf. Thl., *οἱ τῇ τῶν βρωμάτων τηρήσει στοιχήσαντες διὰ παντὸς οὐδὲν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ὠφελήθησαν, ὡς τῆς πίστεως ἔξω ὄντες καὶ τῷ νόμῳ τῷ ἀνωφελεῖ δουλεύοντες.* But he understands it of *τοὺς τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν παρατήρησιν τῶν βρωμάτων εἰσάγοντες*). 10.] *What is the connexion with ver.* 9? It is represented as being entirely done away by our interpretation of *βρώματα*. If I regard it aright, it is not only not done away, but established in its proper light. Those ancient distinctions are profitless: one distinction remains: that our true meat is not to be partaken of by those who adhere to those old distinctions: that Christianity and Judaism are necessarily and totally distinct. See more below. **We have an altar** (to what does the Writer allude? Some have said (Schlichting, Sykes, Michaelis, Kuinoel, and even Tholuck) that no distinct idea was before him, but that he merely used the term *altar*, to help the figure which he was about to introduce. And this view has just so much truth in it, that there is no emphasis on *θυσιαστήριον*; it is not *θυσιαστήριον ἔχομεν*. The altar bears only a secondary place in the figure; but still I cannot think that it has not a definite meaning. Others understand by the altar, *Christ himself*. So Suicer, Wolf, al. So Cyr.-alex. de Adoratione, ix. vol. i. p. 310, *αὐτὸς οὖν ἄρα ἐστὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, αὐτὸς δὲ τὸ θυμίαμα, καὶ ἀρχιερεύς.* This again has so much truth in it, that the Victim is so superior to the altar as to cast it altogether into shade; but still is not Himself the altar. Some again (Corn. a-Lapide, Böhme, Bähr, Ebrard, Bisping, Stier, al.) understand, *the table of the Lord*, at which we eat the Lord's Supper. This is so far true, that that table may be said to *represent* to us the Cross whereupon the Sacrifice was offered, just as the bread and wine, laid on it, represent the oblation itself: but it *is* not the altar, in any propriety of language, however we may be justified, in common parlance, in so calling it. Some again, as Bretschneider, have interpreted it to mean the *heavenly place*, where Christ now offers the virtue of His Blood to the Father for us. This again is so far true that it is the antitype of the Cross, just as the Cross is the antitype of the Lord's table: but we do not want, in this word, the heavenly thing represented by, any more than the enduring ordinance representing, the original historic concrete material altar: we want that altar itself: and that altar is, the CROSS, on which the Lord suffered. That is our altar: not to be emphasized, nor exalted into any comparison with the adorable Victim thereon offered; but still our altar, that wherein we glory, that for which, as "pro aris," we contend: of which our banners, our tokens, our adornments, our churches, are full: severed from which, we know not Christ; laid upon which, He is the power of God, and the wisdom of God. And so it is here explained by Thos. Aquinas, Jac. Cappell., Estius, Bengel, Ernesti, Bleek, De Wette, Stengel, Lünem., Delitzsch) **to eat of which** (cf. esp. 1 Cor. ix. 13, *οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν· οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσεδρεύοντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ συμμερίζονται*) **they have not licence who serve the tabernacle** (who are these? Some, as Schlichting, Morus, and strange to say more recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 322 ff., understand by them the same, viz. Christians, as the subject of *ἔχομεν*. We Christians have an altar whereof (even) they who serve the (Christian) tabernacle have no right to eat: i. e. as explained by Hofmann, as the high priest himself did not eat of the sin-offerings whose blood was brought into the tabernacle, but they were burnt without the camp, so we Christians have no sacrifice of which we have any right to eat, no *further profit* to be derived from that one sacrifice, by which we have been reconciled to God. But this is, 1. false in fact. We *have a right* to eat of our Sacrifice, and are commanded so to do. All that our Lord says of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood (explain it how we will) would be nullified and set aside by such an interpretation. And, 2. it is directly against the whole context, in which the *βρώματα*, whatever they are, are pronounced profitless, and they who walked in them contrasted with us who have higher privileges. To what purpose then would it be to say, that we have an altar of which we *cannot* eat? that we have a sacrifice which brings us no profit, but only shame? I pass over the interpretation which understands by the words some particular class of Christians among the Hebrews, because it involves the anachronism of a distinction between clergy and laity which certainly then had no place: and also because it

11 ὧν γὰρ [r] εἰσφέρεται [s] ζώων τὸ αἷμα εἰς τὰ [t] ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα [u] κατακαίεται ἔξω τῆς [v] παρεμβολῆς· 12 [w] διὸ [w] καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα [x] ἁγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ [y] ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν [z] λαόν, ἔξω τῆς πύλης [a] ἔπαθεν.

r = Luke v. 18, 19. 1 Tim. vi. 7 only. Lev. xvi. 27.
s 2 Pet. ii. 12. Jude 10 only, exc. Rev. iv. 6 & passim. Ezek. x. 20.
t = ch. viii. 2 reff. u Exod. xxix. 14. 2 Pet. iii. 10 reff. v = Rev. xx. 9 only. (Acts xxi. 34. ch. xi. 4.) l. e. Lev. iv. 12 al. fr. w ch. xi. 12 reff. x ch. ii. 11 reff. y ch. ix. 12 reff. z ch. ii. 17 reff. a ch. ix. 26 reff.

11. rec aft αιμα ins περι αμαρτιας, with [C³]DKM[P]ℵ rel vulg Chr-comm, Thdrt: aft αγια C¹ Syr copt [arm]: om A æth-rom. for κατακαιεται, καταναλισκονται D¹: κατα (sic) m: καιεται k o.
12. om επαθεν ℵ¹.

would furnish no sense at all suiting the passage, referring as it then would to some Christians only, not to all. The only true reference of our words, as also that which has been all but universally acknowledged, is that to the Jewish priesthood, and in them to those who have part with them in serving the rites and ordinances of the ceremonial law. These have no right to eat of our altar: for just as the bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary were burnt without the camp, so Jesus suffered altogether without the gate of legal Judaism. Let us then not tarry serving that tabernacle which has no part in Him, but go forth to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For we cleave not to any abiding city, such as the earthly Jerusalem, but seek one to come. Let us then not tarry in the Jewish tabernacle, serving their rites, offering their sacrifices; but offer our now only possible sacrifice, that of praise, the fruit of a good confession, acceptable to God through Him. Thus and thus only does the whole context stand in harmony. Thus the words in *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* keep their former meanings: cf. ch. viii. 5, where we have *λατρεύοντες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ τῶν ἐπουρανίων*: and remember that *ἡ σκηνή*, barely so placed, cannot by any possibility mean any part of the Christian apparatus of worship, nor have an antitypical reference, but can only import that which throughout the Epistle it has imported, viz. the Jewish tabernacle: cf. ch. viii. 5; ix. 21 al. Bengel, with his keen sight for nice shades of meaning, has noticed, "est aculeus, quod dicit *τῇ σκηνῇ*, non *ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ*"). 11.] **For** (reason why this exclusion has place: because our great Sacrifice is not one of those in which the servants of the tabernacle had any share, but answers to one which was wholly taken out and burnt: see below) **of the animals of which the blood is brought into the holy place by the high priest, of these the bodies are consumed by fire outside the camp** (there was a distinction in the sacrifices as to the subsequent participation of certain parts of them by the priests. Those of which they *did partake* (I take these particulars mainly from Delitzsch) were: 1. the sin-offering of the rulers (a male kid), and the sin-offering of the common people (a female kid or lamb), Levit. iv. 22 ff., 27 ff. (compare the rules ib. ch. vi. about eating and not eating the sacrifices): 2. the dove of the poor man, Levit. v. 9: 3. the trespass-offering, Levit. vii. 7: 4. the skin of the whole burnt-offering, ib. ver. 8: 5. the wave-breast and heave-shoulder of the peace-offerings: 6. the wave-offerings on the feast of weeks, entire. But those of which they *did not partake* were, 1. the sin-offering of the high priest for himself, Levit. iv. 5—7, esp. ver. 12: 2. the sin-offerings for sins of ignorance of the congregation, Levit. iv. 16—21, cf. Num. xv. 24: 3. the sin-offering for high priest and people combined, on the great day of atonement, the blood of which was brought not only into the holy but into the holiest place, Levit. xvi. 27. Besides which we have a general rule, to which doubtless the Writer here alludes, Levit. vi. 30, "No sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire." As regards particular expressions: **τὰ ἅγια** here, as in ch. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, and x. 19, probably means not the holy place commonly so called, but the holy of holies, into which the blood of the sin-offering was brought on the day of atonement, and which only typified heaven, whither Christ as High Priest is entered with His Blood. **ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς** refers to the time when Israel was encamped in the wilderness: the enclosure of the camp was afterwards replaced by the walls of Jerusalem, so that *ἔξω τῆς πύλης* below answers to it).

12.] **Wherefore** (as being the antitype of the sin-offering on the day of atonement: "ut ille typus veteris testamenti imploretur, illa figura quæ est de carnibus extra castra comburendis," Est.) **Jesus also, that He might sanctify** (see on ch. ii. 11)

b Luke xx. 25. 1 Cor. ix. 26 (James ii. 24 v. r.) only. position, Isa. iii. 10. v. 13 al.
c ch. xi. 26 reff.
v 1 reff.

13 [b] τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς [v] παρεμβολῆς, τὸν [c] ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες· 14 οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν [d] ὧδε [e] μένουσαν [f] πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν [g] μέλλουσαν [h] ἐπιζητοῦμεν.

ACDK MPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

d = 1 Cor. iv. 2. e = ch. xii. 27. f = ch. xi. 10. g = ch. x. h ch. xi. 14 reff.

13. εξερχομεθα D[-gr] K[P 47^1] k Cyr_1 [Euthal-ms].

the people (see on ch. ii. 17) **through His own blood, suffered** (see on ch. ix. 26 on the *absolute* meaning of παθεῖν) **outside the gate** (ἔξω τῆς πόλεως Ἱερουσαλήμ, Œc. It is necessary in order to understand this rightly, to trace with some care the various steps of the symbolism. The offering of Christ consists of two parts: 1. His offering on earth, which was accomplished on the cross, and answered to the slaying of the legal victim and the destruction of its body by fire, the annihilation of the fleshly life: and, 2. His offering in the holy place above, which consisted in His entering heaven, the abode of God, through the veil, that is to say His flesh, and carrying His blood there as a standing atonement for the world's sin. This, the sanctifying of the people through His own blood, was the ulterior end of that sacrifice on earth: and therefore whatever belonged to that sacrifice on earth is said to have been done in order to that other. This will sufficiently account for the telic clause here, without making it seem as if the ultimate end, the sanctification of God's people, depended on the subordinate circumstance of Christ's having suffered outside the gate. It did depend on the entire fulfilment by Him of all things written of Him in the law: and of them this was one).

13.] **So then** (τοίνυν commonly in Greek stands second at least in a sentence. But in later writers as in the LXX (reff.), it is not uncommonly put first, as here; and sometimes even in classical Greek: cf. Lobeck on Phrynichus, p. 342 f., who gives an example from Aristoph. Acharn. 904, ἐγῷδα· τοίνυν συκοφάντην ἔξαγε: and several from later authors) **let us go forth to Him outside the camp** (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔξω τῆς κατὰ νόμον γενώμεθα πολιτείας, Thdrt. This is certainly intended, and not the meaning given by Chrys. (τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ αἴρωμεν καὶ ἔξω κόσμου μένωμεν, in his *second* exposition in Hom. xxxiii. His *first* exposition is very similar, not as quoted by Bleek, that we should follow the Lord in his sufferings: this latter is the explanation of τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες: see below. I may mention that the fact of Chrys. having given two expositions of the passage, as of some others, has much bewildered the Commentators. Delitzsch, e. g., charges Bleek with error in saying that Chrys. omits περὶ ἁμαρτίας in ver. 11. He does omit it the second time, but not the first), Limborch, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, al., nor that of Schlichting ("exilia, opprobria, &c., cum illo subeamus"), Grot., Michaelis, Storr, al. Both these may be involved in that which is intended; the latter particular is presently mentioned: but they are not identical with it. Possibly there may be a reference to Exod. xxxiii. 7, ἐγένετο, πᾶς ὁ ζητῶν κύριον ἐξεπορεύετο εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τὴν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς. Bleek objects that if so, we should not expect ἡ σκηνή to have been so shortly before mentioned as representing the Jewish sanctuary, in distinction from the Christian. But this seems hardly sufficient reason for denying the reference. The occasion in Exod. xxxiii. was a remarkable one. The people were just quitting Sinai, the home of the law; and the πᾶς ὁ ζητῶν τὸν κύριον seems to bear more than ordinary solemnity), **bearing His reproach** (see on ch. xi. 26. τουτέστι, τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχοντες. κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν, Chrys., Œc.).

14.] **For** (reason why such going forth is agreeable to our whole profession: not, as Bengel, al., why the word παρεμβολή, and not πόλις, is used above) **we have not here** (on earth: not, as Heinrichs, in the earthly Jerusalem. ὧδε in a local sense is said by Böhme, after Aristarchus, to be hardly Greek: but it is a mistake; the sense being found in the classics from Homer downwards. Palm and Rost, sub voce, maintain the correctness of Aristarchus's view: but it seems beyond question that in such expressions as Ἥφαιστε πρόμολ' ὧδε, the local meaning must be recognized) **an abiding city, but we seek for** (ἐπιζητεῖν, see on ref.) **that** (abiding city) **which is to come** ("Futuram civitatem hanc vocat, quia *nobis* futura est. Nam Deo, Christo, Angelis jam præsens est." Schlichting. Yet this is not altogether true. The heavenly Jerusalem, in all her glory, is not yet existing, nor shall be until the number of the elect is accomplished. Then she shall come down out of heaven as a bride prepared for her husband, Rev. xxi. 2. This verse certainly comes with a solemn tone on the reader, considering how short a time the μένουσα

15 [i] Δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν [k] ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν [l] αἰνέσεως [m] διὰ παντὸς τῷ θεῷ, [n] τουτέστιν [o] καρπὸν [op] χειλέων [q] ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. 16 τῆς δὲ [r] εὐποιΐας καὶ [s] κοινωνίας μὴ [t] ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις [u] εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός.

17 Πείθεσθε τοῖς [v] ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ [w] ὑπείκετε· αὐτοὶ γὰρ [x] ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν [y] ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ὡς [z] λόγον [z] ἀποδώσοντες, ἵνα [a] μετὰ χαρᾶς τοῦτο ποιῶσιν καὶ μὴ

i Rom. i. 8. 1 Pet. ii. 5. k ch. vii. 27 reff. l here only. w. θυσία, 2 Chron. xxix. 31. xxxiii. 16. Ps. xlix. 14 al. m Acts ii. 25 (from Ps. xv. 8). x. 2. Rom. xi. 10. ch. ix. 6. n ch. ii. 14 reff. o = Hosea xiv. 3. (Prov. xviii. 20. xxxi. 31 A [not F.] Bℵ.) p = Matt. xv. 8 ‖ Mk., from Isa. xxix. 13. Rom. iii. 13. 1 Cor. xiv. 21. 1 Pet. iii. 10 (ch. xi. 12) only. q dat., = here only. (w. ἐν, Matt. x. 32 al. fr.) ἐξομ., Matt. xi. 25. Ps. cxxxv. 1. cxxxviii. 1. r here only †. s = Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. ix. 13 only. (1 John i. 3 al.) t = ver. 2. u ch. xi. 5, 6 (reff.) only. v ver. 7. w here only †. Gr. freq. x Mark xiii. 33. Luke xxi. 36. Eph. vi. 18 only. Prov. viii. 34 al. (-πνία, 2 Cor. xi. 27.) y = 2 Cor. xii. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 11. z Matt. xii. 36. Luke xvi. 2. Acts xix. 40. 1 Pet. iv. 5. Dan. vi. 2. Theod. a ch. x. 34 reff.

15. om ουν D[1]ℵ[1][P Syr]. 16. ins της bef κοινωνιας D.
17. aft υπεικετε ins αυτοις ℵ[3]. ως λογ. αποδ. bef υπερ τ. ψυχ. υμ. A vulg[(and F-lat) Orig-int$_1$] Primas. [αποδωσονται D[1]-gr. add περι υμων D[1](and lat) copt.]

πόλις did actually remain, and how soon the destruction of Jerusalem put an end to the Jewish polity which was supposed to be so enduring). 15.] **Through Him** (placed first, as carrying all the emphasis—through Him, not by means of the Jewish ritual observances) **therefore** (this **οὖν** gathers its inference from the whole argument, vv. 10—14) **let us offer up** (see on ref.) **a sacrifice of praise** (**θυσία αἰνέσεως** is the term for a thank-offering in the law: see Levit. vii. 12 (5, LXX). Cf. reff. and Ps. xlix. 23, *θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάσει με*, and cxv. 17 (cxvi. 8), *σοὶ θύσω θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*. The Commentators quote an old saying of the Rabbis, "Tempore futuro omnia sacrificia cessabunt, sed laudes non cessabunt." Cf. Philo de Victim. Offer. § 3, vol. ii. p. 253, *τὴν ἀρίστην ἀνάγουσι θυσίαν, ὕμνοις τὸν εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα θεὸν γεραίροντες*) **continually** (not at fixed days and seasons, as the Levitical sacrifices, but all through our lives) **to God, that is, the fruit of lips** (*καρπὸν χειλέων* is from Hosea (ref.), where the LXX give *ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν* as the rendering of וּנְשַׁלְּמָה פָרִים שְׂפָתֵינוּ, "we will account our lips as calves" (for a sacrifice): E. V., "we will render the calves of our lips." The fruit of the lips is explained by the next words to be, a good confession to God) **confessing to His name** (i. e. the name of God, as the ultimate object to which the confession, *δι' αὐτοῦ*, Jesus, is referred. For the construction, see reff.). 16.] **But** (q. d. the fruit of the lips is not the only sacrifice: God must be praised not only with the lips but with the life. So Thdrt., *ἔδειξε τὴν τῆς αἰνέσεως θυσίαν ἀρέσκουσαν τῷ θεῷ· συνέζευξε δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν τῆς εὐποιΐας ἣν κοινωνίαν εἰκότως ἐκάλεσε*) **of beneficence** (*εὐποιΐα* is a word of later Greek: Wetstein gives many examples of it. Pollux says *εὐεργεσία, χάρις, δωρεά. τὸ γὰρ εὐποιΐα οὐ λίαν κέκριται*) **and communication** (of your means to others who are in want, see reff.: an usage of the word which, as Bleek remarks, sprung up in the primitive Christian church, as also the corresponding one of the verb: see on ch. ii. 14) **be not forgetful** (ver. 2): **for with such sacrifices** (viz. *εὐποιΐᾳ καὶ κοινωνίᾳ*, not including ver. 15, which is complete in itself) **God is well pleased** (*εὐαρεστοῦμαί τινι* (ref.) is not elsewhere found in N. T. or LXX, but in the later Greek writers, e. g. Diog. Laert. iv. 6. 18: Diod. Sic. iii. 54; xx. 18: Clem.-alex. Strom. vii. 7, § 45, p. 858, ib. 12, § 74, p. 876 P.: and so in Polyb. iii. 8. 11, *δυσηρεστοῦντο τοῖς ὑπ' Ἀννίβου πραττομένοις*).

17—END.] *Concluding exhortations and notices.* 17.] Having already in ver. 7 spoken of their deceased leaders in the church, and thereby been reminded of *their* stedfastness in the faith, he has taken occasion in the intervening verses to admonish them respecting the danger of apostasy to Judaism, and to exhort them to come fearlessly out of it to Christ. Now he returns to their *duty to their leaders*. **Obey your leaders** (*περὶ ἐπισκόπων λέγει*, Œc., Thl.), **and submit (to them)** (*πείθεσθαι*, in the regular course of your habits, guided by them, persuaded that their rule is right: *ὑπείκειν*, where that rule interferes with your own will: *πείθεσθαι* has more of free following, *ὑπείκειν* of dutiful yielding): **for they** (on their part, brought out by the **αὐτοί**) **keep watch on behalf of your souls** (not = *ὑπερ ὑμῶν* as Böhme, but rather = *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἰς σωτηρίαν*: the

[b] στενάζοντες, [c] ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο. 18 [d] Προσεύχεσθε [d] περὶ [e] ἡμῶν· πειθόμεθα γὰρ ὅτι [f] καλὴν [f] συνείδησιν ἔχομεν, [g] ἐν πᾶσιν καλῶς [h] θέλοντες [i] ἀναστρέφεσθαι· 19 [k] περισσοτέρως δὲ [l] παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἵνα [m] τάχιον [n] ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν.

20 Ὁ δὲ [o] θεὸς τῆς [o] εἰρήνης, ὁ [p] ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν

ACDK MPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

b Mark vii. 34. Rom. viii. 23. 2 Cor. v. 2, 4. James v. 9 only. Isa. xxiv. 7. c here only †. Gr. freq. d Luke vi. 28. Acts viii. 15. Col. i. 3. e plur., see note. f Acts xxiii. 1. see ch. x. 22 reff. g = ver. 4 reff. h John v. 35, 40. 2 Tim. iii. 12. i = 2 Cor. ii. 12. Eph. ii. 2. 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. i. 17. 2 Pet. ii. 18. k ch. ii. 1 reff. l = Rom. xii. 1 al. fr. (ch. iii. 13 reff.) m John xiii. 17. xx. 4. 1 Tim. iii. 14. ver. 23 only †. Wisd. xiii. 19. 1 Macc. ii. 40 only. n = here (Mark iii. 5 ||. viii. 25. ix. 12 || Mt. Acts i. 6) only. Hos. xi. 11. Polyb. viii. 29. 6, ἀποκατέστησαν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον. o Rom. xv. 33. xvi. 20. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. 2 Cor. xiii. 11. Phil. iv. 9. 1 Thess. v. 23. p = Rom. x. 7. Ps. xxix. 3.

18. ins *και* bef *περι* D[1](and lat) Chr$_1$. rec (for *πειθομεθα*) *πεποιθαμεν*, with C[3]D[3]Kℵ[3] rel [arm Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc], *confidimus* vulg: txt AC[1]D[1]M[P] 17, *suademus* D-lat. (ℵ[1] reads *περι ημων οτι καλην. θα γαρ οτι καλην.*)

ψυχή bringing in the idea of immortality), **as having to give an account** (Thdrt. well-remarks, παραινεῖ μὲν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὑπακούειν τοῖς διδασκάλοις· διήγειρε δὲ κατὰ ταὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους εἰς πλείονα προθυμίαν· διδάσκει γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἀγρυπνεῖν καὶ τὰς εὐθύνας δειμαίνειν. Chrys. de Sacerdotio, lib. vi. init., vol. i. 2, p. 677 (Migne), says, τὸ γὰρ πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγ. κ.τ.λ. . . . . ἀποδώσοντες, εἰ καὶ πρότερον εἶπον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ νῦν σιωπήσομαι· ὁ γὰρ φόβος ταύτης τῆς ἀπειλῆς συνεχῶς κατασείει μου τὴν ψυχήν): **that they may do this** (viz. *watch*, not give an account, for thus the present ποιῶσιν, and τοῦτο γὰρ ἀλυσιτελὲς ὑμῖν would be inapplicable) **with joy, and not lamenting** (over your disobedience): **for this** (their having to lament over you) **is unprofitable for you** (λυσιτελεῖ is found in Luke xvii. 2. "The exhortation is like Paul in its spirit, cf. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13, but more like Luke in its expression. And as we proceed, St. Luke's and St. Paul's expressions are found mingled together." Delitzsch). **18.] Pray for us** (here, as elsewhere, it is probably a mistake to suppose that the first person plural indicates the Writer alone. As Del. observes, the passage from the ἡγούμενοι to the Writer individually would be harsh. And when Bleek finds in ver. 19 a proof that the Writer only is meant, he misses the point, that this ἡμῶν, including the Writer and his companions, is in fact a transition note between ver. 17 and ver. 19. Cf. Eph. vi. 19: Rom. xv. 30: 2 Cor. i. 11): **for we are persuaded** (πειθόμεθα, which is St. Luke's way of speaking, cf. Acts xxvi. 26, has been changed into πεποίθαμεν, which is St. Paul's, cf. Gal. v. 10: Phil. i. 25; ii. 24) **that** (Bengel, al. pause at πεποίθαμεν (rec.) γάρ, rendering ὅτι "quia: nam *confidimus* ponitur absolute, uti *audemus*, 2 Cor. v. 8." But the other is the better and more probable rendering, even with the rec.: and with πειθόμεθα, more necessary still) **we have a good conscience** (St. Luke's expression. see reff.: and here chosen perhaps to correspond to καλῶς below), **desiring in all things** (not as Chrys., Erasm. (par.), Luth., al., masculine,—οὐκ ἐν ἐθνικοῖς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν,—but as in ver. 4) **to behave ourselves with seemliness** (τουτέστιν, ἀπροσκόπως διάγειν σπουδάζοντες καὶ ἀσκανδαλίστως. Thl. This appears to point at some offence of the same kind as we know to have been taken at the life and teaching of St. Paul with reference to the law and Jewish customs). **19.] But I the more abundantly** (see on ch. ii. 1) **exhort you to do this** (ποῖον τοῦτο; τὸ εὔχεσθαι περὶ ἡμῶν, Œc.), **that I may be the sooner** (τάχιον is the form of the comparative usual in later Greek: in Attic θᾶσσον is commoner: Herod. uses ταχύτερον: cf. Palm and Rost in ταχύς, and Lobeck on Phryn. p. 77, who adds "In vulgari dialecto quantopere hoc nomen viguerit, innumera Diodori, Plutarchi, Dionysii et æqualium, exempla docent, quæ sciens prætermitto") **restored to you** (reff., and Polyb. iii. 98. 7, ἐὰν ἐξαγαγὼν τοὺς ὁμήρους ἀποκαταστήσῃ τοῖς γονεῦσι καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν. Cf. St. Paul's expression Philem. 22, ἐλπίζω γὰρ ὅτι διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν. On the inferences from this and the other notices in this concluding passage, see Prolegg.).

20, 21.] *Solemn concluding prayer.* πρῶτον παρ' αὐτῶν αἰτήσας τὰς εὐχάς, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς ἐπεύχεται πάντα τὰ ἀγαθά. Chrys. **20.] But** (δέ often introduces a concluding sentence, breaking off, as we use *but*: see again ver. 22, and passim at the end of St. Paul's Epistles) **the God of peace** (so, often, at the end of St. Paul's Epistles: see reff., and 2 Thess. iii. 16. In the presence of so many instances of the expression under different circumstances, it would perhaps be hardly safe to infer from it here any

τὸν [qr] ποιμένα τῶν [q] προβάτων τὸν [s] μέγαν ἐν [t] αἵματι [tu] διαθήκης [u] αἰωνίου τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, 21 [v] καταρτίσαι

q John x. 2. Isa. lxiii. 11. r of Christ, John x. 11, 14. Matt. xxvi. 31, from Zech. xiii. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 25. s = ch. iv. 14 reff. t ch. x. 29 reff. u so Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 40. xxvii. (l.) 5 al. v = 1 Cor. i. 10. 2 Cor. xiii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 10. Ezra iv. 13.

20. aft ιησ. ins χριστον D[1] f 17 [47] vulg[not am fuld[1]] D-lat Syr copt [æth arm-edd Euthal-ms] Chr Thdrt.

reference to danger of strife within the church addressed. Still the words are not a mere formula, and in all the above places, some reference is made, doubtless, to circumstances either of internal dissension or external tribulation. And certainly both the exhortations in vv. 17—19 point to a state in which there was danger of disobedience within and suspicion towards the Writer and those who were on his part. So that 'peace' was a natural wish for them, even without taking into account those troubles which harassed and threatened them from without, in regard of which it would be also a haven, where they would be), **who brought up from the dead** (περὶ ἀναστάσεως εἴρηται τοῦτο, Chrys. But perhaps not of the Resurrection only, but of the Ascension also. Delitzsch well remarks that ἀνά is not only *rursum*, but *sursum*: and Bl. refers to Plato, Rep. vii. p. 521 c, πῶς τις ἀνάξει αὐτοὺς εἰς φῶς, ὥσπερ ἐξ ᾅδου λέγονται δή τινες εἰς θεοὺς ἀνελθεῖν; "This is the only place where our Writer mentions the Resurrection. Every where else he lifts his eyes from the depth of our Lord's humiliation, passing over all that is intermediate, to the highest point of His exaltation. The connexion here suggests to him once at least to make mention of that which lay between Golgotha and the throne of God, between the altar of the Cross and the heavenly sanctuary, the resurrection of Him who died as our sin-offering." Delitzsch) **the great Shepherd of the sheep** (the passage before the Writer's mind has been that in the prophetic chapter of Isaiah (ref.), where speaking of Moses, it is said, ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων, where A and the Codex Marchalianus read ἐκ τῆς γῆς, as 46 Chrys. read here, ℵ and the Complutensian having ἐκ γῆς. In Isa. the shepherd is Moses; and the comparison between Moses and Christ is familiar to our Writer, ch. iii. 2—6. The addition of τὸν μέγαν as applied to Christ, is correspondent to His title ἱερεὺς μέγας, ch. x. 21. To deny this reference, with Lünemann, seems impossible, with the remarkable conjunction of τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων. The connexion here in which this title of our Lord is brought in, may be, that οἱ ἡγούμενοι having been just mentioned, and himself also, and his labours and theirs for the settlement of the Church in peace being before his mind, he is led to speak of Him who is the Chief Shepherd (1 Pet. v. 4), who was brought again from the dead by the God of Peace), **in the blood of the everlasting covenant** (but in what sense? First διαθήκη αἰώνιος is as Thdrt., αἰώνιον δὲ τὴν καινὴν κέκληκε διαθήκην, ὡς ἑτέρας μετὰ ταύτην οὐκ ἐσομένης· ἵνα γὰρ μή τις ὑπολάβῃ, καὶ ταύτην δι' ἄλλης διαθήκης παυθήσεσθαι, εἰκότως αὐτῆς τὸ ἀτελεύτητον ἔδειξε. Then, the expression itself can hardly but be a reminiscence of Zech. ix. 11, καὶ σὺ ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης σου ἐξαπέστειλας δεσμίους σου ἐκ λάκκου οὐκ ἔχοντος ὕδωρ: and if so, the import of the preposition here will be at least indicated by its import there. And there it is, by virtue of, in the power of, the blood of thy covenant, i. e. of that blood which was the seal of the covenant entered into with thee. So also we must understand it here. Did the sentence apply only to the exaltation of Christ, the ἐν might be taken as by Bleek after Calv., '*with* the blood,' so that Christ took the blood with Him. So Œc. and Thl., ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν σὺν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τουτέστι σὺν τῇ ἐγέρσει αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ κεχάρισται ἡμῖν εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον: and Calvin, "Videtur mihi apostolus hoc velle, Christum ita resurrexisse a mortuis, ut mors tamen ejus non sit abolita, sed æternum vigorem retineat: ac si dixisset, Deus Filium suum excitavit, sed ita ut sanguis, quem semel in morte fudit, ad sanctionem fœderis æterni post resurrectionem vigeat, fructumque suum proferat perinde ac si semper flueret." But here it is joined to the exaltation only by means of the resurrection. And thus, as Del. maintains, the instrumental, conditioning-element force of ἐν seems to predominate: through, or in virtue of, the blood (Acts xx. 28). It is surely hardly allowable to join the words ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου with τὸν ποιμένα τὸν μέγαν. Yet this is done by Beza, Estius, Grot., Limborch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Lünem., Ebr., al., some of them joining it with μέγαν. It seems to me that τόν would in this case be repeated after μέγαν. The *idea* however is no less true, and is indeed involved in the connexion with

w ch. vii. 25 reff. x ch. x. 7 reff. y = Phil. i. 6. ii. 13 al. z elsw. P. (Rom. xii. 1, 2. Eph: v. 10 al[5].) only. Wisd. iv. 10. ix. 10 only. (-τως, ch. xii. 28. -τεῖν, ver. 16.)

ACDK MPℵ a b c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ [w] εἰς τὸ [x] ποιῆσαι τὸ [x] θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν [y] ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ [z] εὐάρεστον [a] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

22 [b] Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [c] ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ [d] λόγου τῆς [de] παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ [f] διὰ βραχέων [g] ἐπέστειλα

a Heb., ch. iv. 13 only. = Acts vi. 5. 1 Tim. ii. 3. 1 John iii. 22. Ps. cxiv. 9. b ver. 19. c Matt. xvii. 17. Acts xviii. 14. 2 Tim. iv. 3. Job vi. 26. d Acts xiii. 15 only. 1 Macc. x. 24. e = Rom. xii. 8. ch. vi. 18. L.P.H. f (see Acts xiv. 22.) διὰ βραχέων κ. κεφαλαιωδῶς, Polyb. ii. 48. 8. Plato. Demosth., Isocr., in Wetst. & Bl. g Acts xv. 20. xxi. 25. 3 Kings v. 8 A (not F.) only.

21. ημας D[1][-gr]. om εργω [D[1]]ℵ. aft εργω ins και λογω [A] Chr-comm. aft ποιησαι ins ημας D[1][-gr]. ins αυτω bef ποιων AC[1] ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving); αυτος 71, *ipso faciente* D-lat. ημιν D[-gr] KMℵ d e f g k 17 [47 arm] Syr Thdrt Œc. om των αιωνων C[3] D[-gr] m arm Thdrt[1] : ins AC[1]KM[P]ℵ rel vulg Syr copt [æth Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt[h.1.] Damasc]. (D-lat def.)
22. om γαρ ℵ[1]. απεστειλα D[-gr] a b[1].

ἀναγαγών, and thus with the whole sentence. The Lord Jesus did become, in His mediatorial work, the great Shepherd of the sheep, by virtue of that covenant which was brought in by His blood (Acts, ubi sup.): and by virtue of that blood also He was raised up as the great Shepherd, out of the dead, and to God's right hand. Cf. on the whole, reff.; and Isa. lv. 3; lxi. 8: John x. 11—18), **even our Lord Jesus** (here the personal name, **Jesus**, is joined with the assertion of His lordship over us: below, where the inworking of the Spirit through Him is spoken of, it is διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, His office as Christ at God's right hand having made Him the channel of the Spirit to us: the anointing on Him, the Head, flowing down to the skirts of the raiment. Cf. Acts ii. 36, ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε),

21.] **perfect you** (πληρῶσαι, τελειῶσαι, Œc. μαρτυρεῖ αὐτοῖς μεγάλα· τὸ γὰρ καταρτιζόμενόν ἐστι τὸ ἀρχὴν ἔχον, εἶτα πληρούμενον, Chrys. Still, as Bleek remarks, the praise of having made a beginning is not necessarily involved in the wish that they may be perfected) **in every good work, towards the doing His will** (cf. ch. x. 36. The expression here is in the same final sense as there, as the aor. shews: it is not εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν, 'to the habit of doing,' but εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι, 'to the having done,' i. e. 'to the accomplishing'), **doing in you** (ποιῶν chosen expressly as taking up εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι, in exact correspondence with St. Paul's saying Phil. ii. 13, ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν) **that which is well-pleasing in His sight** (ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, an expression of St. Luke's principally. It is a pregnant construction, involving τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὐάρεστον αὐτῷ. See Eph. v. 10 al.), **through Jesus Christ** (the reference is variously given: to εὐάρεστον, well-pleasing &c. through J. C.; so Grot., Hammond ("secundum Christi præcepta" &c.), al.: or to the verb, ποιῶν, as Thl., ὥστε, ὅταν ποιῶμεν ἡμεῖς τὸ καλόν, ὁ θεὸς ποιεῖ τοῦτο ἐν ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, τουτέστι, μεσίτῃ κ. ἐνέργῳ τούτῳ χρώμενος: so Œc. The latter is by far the more probable, as the former would introduce a superfluity): **to whom** (i. e. to God, the chief subject of the whole sentence, God, who is the God of peace, who brought up the Lord Jesus from the dead, who can perfect us in every good work, to accomplish His will, and works in us that which is well-pleasing to Him through Jesus Christ. The whole majesty of the sentence requires this reverting to its main agent, and speaks against the referring **ᾧ ἡ δόξα** to our blessed Lord, who is only incidentally mentioned. See the very similar construction 1 Pet. iv. 11, where however the reference is not by any means equally certain) **be** (in 1 Pet. l. c. ἐστίν: and possibly also here: but perhaps ἔστω is the more probable supplement) **the glory for ever. Amen.**

22.] **But** ('claudendi,' see above, ver. 20) **I beseech you, brethren, endure** (reff.) **the word of my exhortation** (or, *of exhortation*. ἀσμένως δέξασθε τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ γράμματα, Schol.-Matth. Cf. Philo, Quod Omn. Prob. Liber, § 6, vol. ii. p. 451, καὶ πῶς πατρὸς μὲν ἢ μητρὸς ἐπιταγμάτων παῖδες ἀνέχονται; I may observe, that παράκλησις is rendered by the vulg. wrongly "*solatium*." In that case no ἀνέχεσθε would have been needed. The expression λόγος παρακλήσεως applies without doubt to the whole Epistle, from what follows: not as Beza, Calov., al., to the few exhortations preceding, nor as Grot. to ch. x.—xiii. only: nor as Kuinoel, al., to the exhorta-

ὑμῖν. 23 Γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν Τιμόθεον [h] ἀπολελυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν [i] τάχιον ἔρχηται, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς. 24 Ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς [k] ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας τοὺς [l] ἁγίους. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. 25 [m] ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, ἀμήν.

...αμην M.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

h Epp., here only. = Acts xvi. 35—or iii. 13. see note.
i ver. 19 reff.
k vv. 7, 17.
l Acts ix. 13, 32, 41. xxvi. 10. Epp. passim. Heb., ch. vi. 10 only.
m absol., Eph. vi. 24. Col. iv. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 21. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Tit. iii. 15.

23. rec om ημων, with $D^{2.3}$K[P] rel Chr_2 [Euthal-ms] $Thdrt_2$ Damasc: ins ACD¹M ℵ¹(ℵ³ disapproving) m 17 [47] vulg Syr copt [æth arm] $Euthal_1$ Dial-$trin_1$. for ερχηται, ερχησθε ℵ¹.
25. for υμων, των αγιων D¹. om αμην ℵ¹ 17 fuld [arm-zoh].

SUBSCRIPTION. rec προς εβρ. εγραφη (31 adds εβραιστι) απο της ιταλιας δια τιμοθεου, with d; simly most of our mss: προς εβρ. εγραφη απο ρωμης A: προς εβρ. εγραφη απο ιταλιας [P 47, and adding] δια τιμοθεου K [Euthal-ms]: om DM l m: txt Cℵ 17.

tions scattered up and down in the Epistle. It is St. Luke's expression, see reff.): for also (besides other reasons, there is this) in (by means of, in the material of) few (words) (few in comparison of what might have been said on such a subject. τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν ὅμως βραχέα ταῦτά φησιν, ὅσον πρὸς ἃ ἐπεθύμει λέγειν. Thl.: for the expression, see reff.) I have written (the epistolary aorist, as 'dabam,' ἔγραψα, freq. in St. Paul, al. The word is elsewhere peculiar to St. Luke in N. T., see reff.) to you. **23.**] **Know** (γινώσκετε can hardly but be imperative, standing as it does at the beginning of the sentence. In τὴν δὲ δοκιμὴν αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε, Phil. ii. 22, it is otherwise arranged. When the knowledge already exists, the *fact* is the prominent thing: when the knowledge is first conveyed, the *information*) **that our brother Timotheus is dismissed** (the construction is good Greek: Del. gives as instances ἤκουσε τὴν χώραν δῃουμένην, Xen. Anab. v. 5. 7: πυθόμενοι βασιλέα τεθνηκότα, Thuc. iv. 50: γνῶτε ἀναγκαῖον ὂν ὑμῖν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς γενέσθαι, ib. vii. 77. It is in fact the original government of the accus. and inf. with a participial predicate substituted for the infinitive: 'Know him being,' for 'know him to be.' ἀπολύειν, on which see Prolegg. § ii. 24, does not occur in St. Paul, but is frequent in St. Luke; e. g. Luke xxii. 68; xxiii. 16 ff.: Acts iii. 13; iv. 21, of dismissal from prison or custody; Acts xiii. 3; xv. 30, of official sending away; Acts xv. 33, of solemn dismissal, and Acts xix. 41; xxiii. 22, of simple dismissal), **with whom, if he come** (πρός με . . . εἰκὸς γὰρ ἦν, ἀπολελύσθαι μὲν αὐτόν, μήπω δὲ ἀπεληλυθέναι πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον. Œc.) **soon** (Luther, Schulz, al. take this in the Attic sense of ἐὰν θᾶττον or ἐπειδὰν θᾶττον, "as soon as," "simul atque:" but such can hardly be the sense here), **I will see you** (πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐρχόμενος. Œc.). **24.**] **Salute all your leaders, and all the saints. They from Italy salute you** (on this, see Prolegg. § ii. 13). **25.**] **Grace** (the grace, viz. of God. "Non exprimit, cujus gratiam ac favorem, unde omnis felicitas oritur, illis optet, quippe rem Christianis notissimam, Dei nimirum, Patris nostri, et Jesu Christi, Domini nostri." Schlichting. Where ἡ χάρις is not put thus barely, as in the similar places of St. Paul, it is always filled up by τοῦ κυρίου (ἡμῶν) Ἰησοῦ (χριστοῦ), e. g. (Rom. xvi. 24) 1 Cor. xvi. 23: 2 Cor. xiii. 13 al. fr.) **be with all of you** (πάντων first, carrying the emphasis. ὑμῶν πάντων would express more the totality of the church: πάντων ὑμῶν, every individual). **Amen.**

ΙΑΚΩΒΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

a so Rom. i. 1. Phil. i. 1. (Tit. i. 1.) 2 Pet. i. 1. Jude 1.
b Matt. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 30. (see Acts xxvi. 7.) Exod. xxiv. 4.
c John vii. 35. 1 Pet. i. 1 only. Ps. cxlvi. 2.
d = Acts xv. 23. xxiii. 26. (2 John 10, 11. Isa. xlviii. 22. lvii. 21.)‡. Esdr. viii. 9. 2 Macc. ix. 19.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

I. [1] Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [a] δοῦλος ταῖς [b] δώδεκα [b] φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ [c] διασπορᾷ [d] χαίρειν.

Title. Steph ιακωβου καθολικη επιστολη, with g h: επ. ιακ. καθ. k o: επ. καθ. ιακ. a c: ιακ. επ. καθ. 13: καθ. επ. ιακ. j: elz ιακ. του αποστ. επ. καθ., with (but omg του) [P] l: επιστ. τ. αγ. αποστ. ιακ. καθ. m: επ. καθ. τ. αγ. αποστ. ιακ. L: γραμμα προς εβραιους ιακωβου αδελφοθεου f: txt BK, also A in subscr. (In ACℵ the title is wanting.)

Chap. I. 1.] Address and greeting. **James** (for all questions who the Author of this Epistle was, see the Prolegomena. I assume here that which I have there endeavoured to establish, that it is "James the Lord's brother," the first president or bishop of the church at Jerusalem, an Apostle, but not one of the Twelve), **servant** (not necessarily, as Huther, an official appellation; but implying, as he also confesses, devotion to God and His work alone, irrespectively of self-will or other men's will. Œc. says, *ὑπὲρ πᾶν δὲ κοσμικὸν ἀξίωμα οἱ τοῦ κυρίου ἀπόστολοι τὸ δοῦλοι εἶναι χριστοῦ καλλωπιζόμενοι, τοῦτο γνώρισμα ἑαυτῶν βούλονται ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ λέγοντες, καὶ ἐπιστέλλοντες καὶ διδάσκοντες*. Similarly Didymus, and Incert. in Catena) **of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ** (not '*of the God and Lord, J. C.*,' but as Œc., *θεοῦ μέν, τοῦ πατρός· κυρίου δέ, τοῦ υἱοῦ*. Huther remarks, that in all the addresses of Epistles, the whole name Ἰησοῦς χριστός is given. St. James mentions our Lord only here and ch. ii. 1 in this Epistle, and not at all in his speeches in Acts xv. and xxi. Bengel says, "Videri potuisset, si Jesum sæpe appellaret, id ex ambitione facere, cum esset frater Domini. Atque eo minus novit Christum secundum carnem"), **to the twelve tribes** (of Israel: nor can there be any reasonable doubt that this Epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians in the first place. Not however to them, as distinguished from Gentile Christians: for the two classes appear to have been not as yet distinct. If the later date of the Epistle be taken (see Prolegg), then the Jewish Christians are addressed as the nucleus and kernel of all Christendom. But to my mind, the former is more probable) **which are in the dispersion** ("Legimus, occiso a Judæis B. Stephano, quia facta est in illa die persecutio magna in ecclesia quæ erat Hierosolymis, et omnes dispersi sunt per regiones Judææ et Samariæ, præter Apostolos. His ergo dispersis qui persecutionem passi sunt propter justitiam, mittit Epistolam." Bede. This is hardly correct; but more probable than De W.'s view that the words are used merely to describe the scattered and distressed state of the Christians, as διασπορά did of the Jews. The most likely reference of διασπορά is to the literal and actual Jewish dispersion, as in reff.: and the Epistle must be considered as addressed, from the head of the mother church in Jerusalem, to the Jewish believers, residing among the dispersed tribes of Israel), **greeting** (the formula χαίρειν is not found in the address of any other apostolical Epistle; but it occurs in the Epistle drawn up under the direction of James to the

2 [e] Πᾶσαν χαρὰν [f] ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν [g] πειρασμοῖς [h] περιπέσητε [i] ποικίλοις, 3 γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὸ [k] δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως [l] κατεργάζεται [m] ὑπομονήν. 4 ἡ δὲ [m] ὑπομονὴ [no] ἔργον [p] τέλειον [o] ἐχέτω, ἵνα ἦτε [p] τέλειοι

e = Phil. ii. 29. 2 Cor. xii. 12. ver. 21. 1 Pet. v. 10 al. f = Heb., x. 29 reff. 2 Pet. iii. 15. Eur. Med. 454, πᾶν κέρδος ἡγοῦ. g = Acts xx. 19. 1 Pet. i. 6. Sir. xxxvi. (xxxiii.) 1. h Luke x. 30. Acts xxvii. 41 only. 2 Kings i. 6. i Heb. ii. 4 reff. k 1 Pet. i. 7 only. Ps. xi. 6. Prov. xxvii. 21 only. (-μος, ver. 12.) l = Rom. iv. 15. v. 3. vii. 8. 2 Cor. iv. 17 al. m Luke viii. 15. Rom. ii. 7. 2 Thess. i. 4. Heb. xii. 1. ch. v. 11. 2 Pet. i. 6. Ezra x. 2. n = 1 Thess. i. 3. 2 Thess. i. 11 al. o ch. ii. 14, 18. p Matt. v. 48. xix. 21. James, vv. 17, 25. ch. iii. 2. Ps. cxxxviii. 22.

CHAP. I. 3. om *της πιστεως* B[2] 81 lat-ff_1 syr: AB[1]CKL[P]ℵ rel vulg vind Syr copt æth arm Thl_1 [Aug_1] $Bede_1$.

Gentile churches in Acts xv. 23).

2—12.] *Exhortations regarding the endurance of trials.* 2.] **Think it all joy** (**χαράν**, following up **χαίρειν**, a characteristic of the style of this Epistle: so *ὑπομονήν· ἡ δὲ ὑπομονή*, ver. 3; *λειπόμενοι· εἰ δέ τις λείπεται*, ver. 4 f.; *διακρινόμενος· ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος*, ver. 6; *ἀπείραστός ἐστι . . . πειράζει δέ*, ver. 13; *βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν· ὀργὴ γάρ*, ver. 19 f.; *τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον . . . . γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου*, ver. 21 f.; *τούτου μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία· θρησκεία καθαρὰ κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 26 f.;—yea, and that when &c. **πᾶσαν**, as in reff., not "*all (of it) joy*," eitel Freude, as Luther: but "*all sorts of*," "*every kind of*," "*all conceivable*," "rem revera omnique ex parte lætam," as Theile, in Huther. Bengel's idea is good, that 'all' is used as applying to all kinds of temptations; transferred from the subject to the predicate), **my brethren** (this is the constant address in our Epistle. It betokens community of origin and of faith), **whensoever ye fall into** (**περιπίπτειν** is used of becoming unexpectedly surrounded by adverse circumstances of any kind: so in reff.: so *ὅστις ἂν τοιαύταις ξυμφοραῖς περιπέσῃ*, Plato, Legg. ix. p. 877 C: *μεγάλοις ἀτυχήμασιν ὑπ' Αἰτωλῶν, καὶ μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς περιπεσόντες*, Polyb. iv. 19. 13: *περιπεσὼν βιαίοις πληγαῖς*, ib. iii. 116. 9. Herodotus also uses the expression, cf. vi. 16, and Thuc. ii. 54) **various temptations** (the **πειρασμοί** here are not only what we properly call *temptations*, but any kind of distresses which happen to us, from without or from within, which in God's purpose serve as *trials* of us: the latter word being, in this its now common general meaning, a word derived from the Christian life. See ref. 1 Pet., which is strictly parallel. Œc. says, after Chrys. (in Catena), *τὴν κατὰ θεὸν λύπην καὶ τοὺς πειρασμοὺς τούτους καὶ ἐπαινετοὺς οἶδε καὶ χαρᾶς ἀξίους· δεσμὸς γὰρ οὗτοί εἰσιν ἀρραγής, καὶ αὔξησις ἀγάπης καὶ κατανύξεως.* Then, after quoting Sir. ii. 1: John xvi. 33: and Matt. vii. 14, ... *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐκτὸς γυμνασίων οὔτε κοσμικῶν οὔτε τῶν κατὰ θεὸν στεφάνων ἀξιωθῆναι*):

3.] *Ground of this joy*: **knowing** (as you do) **that the proof of your faith** (**δοκίμιον**, or *δοκιμεῖον*, Plato, Tim. p. 65 C. Pott explains it, "quo quid exploratur;" Heisen, "quo rei, quæ sub examen vocatur, manifestatur sinceritas, eaque probatur omne id intrinseca virtute possidere, quod extrinsecus specie et nomine præ se fert." So in Dion. Hal. Rhetor. ii., *δεῖ δὲ ὥσπερ κανόνα εἶναι καὶ σταθμήν τινα καὶ δοκίμιον ὡρισμένον πρὸς ὅ τις ἀποβλέπων δυνήσεται τὴν κρίσιν ποιεῖσθαι*: so, but joining with the idea of a test that of amelioration and perfecting also, Herodian ii. 10. 12, *δοκίμιον δὲ στρατιωτῶν κάματος ἀλλ' οὐ τροφή.* The word must be taken here as abstract, 'the *proving*,' not as concrete, 'the *medium of proof*,' viz. the temptations. See further on 1 Pet. i. 7) **worketh** (reff.) **endurance** (**ὑπομονή**, "perseverantia, quod magis est quam patientia," Theile. But does not St. Paul, Rom. v. 3, 4, state precisely the converse, viz. that *ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν*? Doubtless: but it is really the same that is said: *θλῖψις* there = *τὸ δοκίμιον* here. As De Wette observes, the thought is not carried to its end as in Rom., but the Apostle breaks away at *ὑπομονήν* to exhort respecting it):

4.] **but** (q. d. and be not weary of enduring: but) **let endurance have a perfect work** (*σκόπει, οὐκ εἶπε τὴν ὑπομονὴν ὁριστικῶς, ὅτι ἔργον τέλειον ἔχει, ἀλλὰ προστακτικῶς, ἐχέτω· οὐ γὰρ προϋποκειμένην ἀρετὴν ἐξαγγέλλει, ἀλλὰ νῦν ἐγγινομένην· ὡς χρὴ γενέσθαι νομοθετεῖ.* Œc. In fact, from the repetition of *ἔργον* from *κατεργάζεται*, it is much as if he had said *ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ κατεργαζέσθω σωτηρίαν τέλειον.* The allusion seems to be to our Lord's saying Matt. xxiv. 13, *ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.* So that the words are to be taken simply and literally; **ὑπομονή** as the abstract, endurance, and **ἔργον** as the work wrought out (see reff.) by *ὑπομονή* in its continuance: not as by De Wette after Erasmus ("Tolerantia non

καὶ [q] ὁλόκληροι, ἐν [r] μηδενὶ [s] λειπόμενοι. [5] εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν [s] λείπεται [t] σοφίας, [uv] αἰτείτω [v] παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν [w] ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ [x] ὀνειδίζοντος, καὶ [y] δοθήσεται αὐτῷ. [6] [u] αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει, μηδὲν [z] διακρινόμενος· ὁ γὰρ

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

q 1 Thess. v. 23 only. Deut. xxvii. 6 al.
r neut., so Heb. xiii. 4 reff.
s = ch. ii. 15 (Luke xviii. 22. Tit. i. 5. iii. 13) only ‡.
t = ch. iii. 13, 15, 17.
u in James (ch. v. 2, 3) and 1 John (iii. 22. v. 14, &c.) always of prayer.
v John iv. 9. Acts iii. 2. ix. 2. Zech. x. 1 al.
w here only. Prov. x. 9. Wisd. xvi. 27. 2 Macc. vi. 6 only.
x Matt. xi. 20 al. Sir. xli. 22. xx. 15.
y Matt. vii. 7.
z Matt. xxi. 21. Acts x. 20. Rom. iv. 20. xiv. 23. Jude 22 ‡. (Jer. xv. 10.)

5. *του θεου* bef *του διδοντος* A: om *θεου* j.

habebit laudem absolutam, nisi quemadmodum in malis tolerandis fortis est et alacris, ita in bonis operibus exercendis sibi constet"), Calov., Morus ("Tolerantia adjunctum habeat factum"), Pott ("Perseverantiæ fructus sit perfectum virtutis studium"), al., to be understood as if *ὑπομονή* were *ὁ ὑπομένων*, and *ἔργον* the aggregate of *ἔργα*. And **τέλειος** is not to be understood as = *εἰς τέλος ὑπομένων*, but in its ordinary sense of 'perfect,' fully brought out and accomplished. And as Bengel remarks, "Perfecta est patientia, quæ gaudet"), **that ye may be perfect** (for the work of God in a man *is* the man. If God's teaching by patience have had a perfect work in you, *you* are perfect: His is a *λόγος ἔμφυτος*, ver. 21. And the purpose of that work is, to make us perfect) **and entire** (that in which every part is present in its place: so we have *ὁλόκληρος καὶ ὑγιής*, Plato, Tim. p. 44 C: *τὸ βασίλειον ὂν ἐν ὁλοκλήρῳ τῷ γένει*, Corp. Inscrip. 353. 26. The word is much used in Philo (see also Athenæus vii. p. 700 and Pollux i. 1 in Wolf here) of sacrifices and sacrificing priests, in a technical sense, of which however there is no trace here), **deficient in nothing** (the subjoining a negative corroboration to a positive clause is characteristic of St. James: cf. vv. 5 and 6. The expression here is illustrated by Raphel from Polyb. p. 1202, l. 15, *ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους εὐνοίᾳ παρὰ πολὺ τἀδελφοῦ λειπόμενος*. Here however there is no comparison with others, only one implied with that *ὁλοκληρία* which ought to be their ultimate state). 5.] **But** (q. d. but this perfection and entireness, this defect in nothing, will not be yet attained; and you will find, when you aim at it, that you are lacking in the very first requisite) **if any of you** (*εἰ* is not "*quandoquidem*," as Estius, but *εἴ τις* is as usual 'if any,' and nearly = *ὅστις ἄν*) **is deficient in** (*of*, gen. as in ch. ii. 15) **wisdom** (*τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ τελείου ἔργου σοφίαν λέγει*, Œc. Huther quotes from the Etym. Mag., *γνῶσις μέν ἐστι τὸ εἰδέναι τὰ ὄντα· σοφία δέ, καὶ τὸ τὰ ὄντα γινώσκειν καὶ τὸ τὰ γνωστὰ πράττειν*. For what is meant by wisdom here, see ch. iii. 15—17), **let him ask** (either supply '*it*,' or take the verb absolutely, which is better: so E. V., see below) **from God who giveth** (the part. is put first because it is that which is to be brought out in the sentence: q. d. 'from the giver, God.' Thus asking and giving are put forward as belonging to us and God in the abstract, and we do not want any object, as *τὴν σοφίαν*, supplied) **to all men simply** (so Rom. xii. 8, *ὁ μεταδιδούς, ἐν ἁπλότητι*: but perhaps *ἁπλότης* may also signify *liberality*. See note on that place. It is not however necessary here to render "*benigne*," as Bede, Casaubon, al.: nor "*affluenter*," as Erasm., Grot., Est., al.; nor "*candide*," "*sincere*," as Pott, Theile, al.; nor = *συντόμως, καθάπαξ*, as Hesychius: but we must interpret by what follows, and understand it of *simply giving*, and adding nothing afterwards which may take off from the graciousness of the gift) **and upbraideth not** (in what sense is rather doubtful. Many (Morus, Carpzov, Storr, al.) interpret it of sending away with a refusal: but as Huther remarks, though *καταισχύνειν* may bear this meaning, *ὀνειδίζειν* is never found so used: certainly not in Sir. xx. 15, *ἄφρων . . . ὀλίγα δώσει καὶ πολλὰ ὀνειδίσει*. By far the greatest part of Commentators understand it of reproaching by the recounting of benefits bestowed. But this again does not reach the full and general nature of the expression here: nor does it find any justification in that of Demosthenes, p. 316. 10, *ὑπομιμνήσκειν τὰς ἰδίας εὐεργεσίας μικροῦ δεῖν ὅμοιόν ἐστι τῷ ὀνειδίζειν*: for it is one thing to say that such reminding is almost equivalent to *ὀνειδίζειν*, and another and a widely different one to use *ὀνειδίζειν* in this sense, which is never done. The real meaning here is just as in Sir. xx. 15 above, and in Sir. xli. 22, *μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι μὴ ὀνείδιζε*, viz. upbraiding with any kind of reproaches, as God might well do, so unworthy are we to approach Him with any request. This of course would include that other: but as Semler, "Non tantum significat molestam commemorationem beneficiorum, sed etiam qualemcunque reprehensionem." So De Wette and Huther), **and it shall be given to him** (viz. *σοφία*, see 3 Kings iii. 9—12.

[z] διακρινόμενος [a] ἔοικεν [b] κλύδωνι θαλάσσης [c] ἀνεμιζομένῳ καὶ [d] ῥιπιζομένῳ. [7] μὴ γὰρ [e] οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι [f] λήμψεταί τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου. [8] ἀνὴρ [g] δίψυχος, [h] ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς [i] ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ. [9] [j] καυχάσθω

a = ver. 23 only. Xen. Mem. i. 6. 10. b Luke viii. 24 only. Jon. i. 4, 11, 12. c here only †. d here only †. (-πή, 1 Cor. xv. 52.) e constr., here only. (John xxi. 25. Phil. i. 17 only. Job xi. 2. 1 Macc. v. 61. 2 Macc. v. 21. vii. 24 only.) f constr., Acts ii. 33. iii. 5. xxvi. 10. 2 Pet. i. 17. Rev. ii. 27. g ch. iv. 8 only †. h ch. iii. 8 only. Isa. liv. 11 only. (-στασία, ch. iii. 16.) i = Matt. xxi. 32. xxii. 16. Luke i. 79. Acts xiii. 10. xiv. 16. Rom. iii. 16 (from Isa. lix. 7) al. j ch. iv. 16. elsw., P. (Rom. ii. 17. v. 3. Gal. vi. 13 [all these w. ἐν]) only. Jer. ix. 23.

7. om τι [C[1](appy: οτι to παρα is written over an erasure] ℵ 36.

The whole verse seems to be written in remembrance of Matt. vii. 7—12). 6.] **But let him ask in faith** (persuasion that God can and will give: cf. Matt. xxi. 22, *πάντα ὅσα ἐὰν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε*: and cf. *εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως*, ch. v. 15), **nothing** (*μηδέν* is adverbial, as in Mark v. 26: Luke iv. 35: Acts iv. 21; x. 20, *μηδὲν διακρινόμενος* as here: so also xi. 12 al. In all these places it will of course admit of being understood 'in nothing,' the accus. of reference: but it is simpler to believe that it had got past this and become an adverb) **doubting** (cf. Matt. xxi. 21, from which this is evidently taken, *ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε*, &c. Huther says well, "*διακρίνεσθαι* is not = *ἀπιστεῖν* (Luke xxiv. 11), but includes in it the essential character of *ἀπιστία*: while *πίστις* says 'Yes,' and *ἀπιστία* 'No,' *διακρίνεσθαι* is the union of 'Yes' and 'No,' but so that 'No' is the weightier: it is that inward giving way which leans not to *πίστις*, but to *ἀπιστία*. The deep-lying ground of it is *pride*, and so far Thl. is right in saying, *διακρινόμενος δὲ ὁ μεθ' ὑπεροψίας αἰτῶν· ὑβριστὴς ὁμολογουμένως ὁ διακρινόμενος*: whereas Œc. in the words, *λέγων ἐν σεαυτῷ ὅτι πῶς δύναμαι αἰτῆσαί τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ λαβεῖν, ἡμαρτηκὼς τοσαῦτα εἰς αὐτόν*, brings out a point which belongs not to *διακρίνεσθαι*, but to a yet weak faith"): **for he that doubteth is like** (reff.) **a wave of the sea** (reff. The verb *κλυδωνίζεσθαι* occurs Eph. iv. 14 and Isa. lvii. 20, *οἱ ἄδικοι . . κλυδωνισθήσονται*) **driven by the wind** (a word no where else found. The corresponding *ἀνεμοῦσθαι* occurs in Hippocr., Plato (Tim. p. 83 A), Ælian, Lucian, al. It explains itself) **and tossed about** (*ῥιπίζεσθαι*, from *ῥιπή* (*ῥιπαὶ ἀνέμων*, Pind. Pyth. ix. 85: Soph. Antig. 137 al.; *κυμάτων ἀνέμων τε*, Pind. Pyth. iv. 346), to be blown about by wind: so *τί δέ, εἰ μὴ πρὸς ἀνέμου ῥιπίζοιτο τὸ ὕδωρ*, Philo de Mundo, § 18, vol. ii. p. 620: *δῆμος ἄστατον κακόν, καὶ θαλάσσῃ πάνθ' ὅμοιον ὑπ' ἀνέμου ῥιπίζεται*, Dio Chrys. Orat. xxxii. p. 368 B. The more usual meaning of the verb (from *ῥιπίς*), to kindle (*ῥιπίζεται, κατακαίεται*, Hesych.), is not applicable here. The word forms a synonym with *ἀνεμίζεσθαι*; and the use of these synonymous expressions so close to one another is again a characteristic of St. James. A good explanation of the figure is quoted by Wiesinger from Heisen: "Modo ad litus fidei speique jactatur, modo in abyssum diffidentiæ revolvitur; modo in sublime tollitur fastus mundani, modo imis arenis miscetur nunc desperationis nunc afflictionis" &c.):

7.] **for** (takes up and repeats the former *γάρ*: not as Calvin, "non ergo existimet," nor as Huther, = nämlich) **let not that man** (said with a certain slight expression of contempt) **think** (cf. Matt. v. 17, *μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*) **that he shall receive any thing** (sc. *τῶν αἰτουμένων*: some things, as life, food, raiment, &c., he does continually receive) **from the Lord** (i. e. as usually in this Epistle, from GOD. So ch. iv. 10, 15; v. 4, 10, 11: see at each of those places. On the other hand, *ὁ κύριος*, ch. v. 7, 14, 15, is used of Christ. Hofmann remarks that where the Father is not expressly distinguished from the Son by the context, the Godhead, in its unity, is to be understood by *ὁ θεός*: and the same may be said of *ὁ κύριος*). 8.] **He is a man with two minds, unstable** (cf. Dio Chrys. above. Hippocrates uses it of fevers which observe no fixed periods: Demosth. p. 303, of the wind, *ἀκατάστατον ὥσπερ ἐν θαλάττῃ πνεῦμα*. We have *ἀκαταστασία* ch. iii. 16, and in Luke xxi. 9: 1 Cor. xiv. 33: 2 Cor. vi. 5; xii. 20) **in all his ways** (such is the best way of taking this sentence, making it all predicate and all to apply to *ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος* as its subject. The common way, to take *ἀνὴρ δίψυχος* as a new subject, as E. V., "a double-minded man is unstable," has this against it, that it makes the very unusual word *δίψυχος*, found here and in ch. iv. 8 for the first time in Greek literature, to be a mere usual epithet and word of passage. Another way, taken by Beza, al., is to make *ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, ἀκατάστ. κ.τ.λ.*, *all subject*, and in apposition with *ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος*,—"ut qui sit animo duplici," &c. There is no objection to this, but that it

δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ [k] ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ [l] ὕψει αὐτοῦ, [10] ὁ δὲ πλούσιος ἐν τῇ [m] ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὡς [no] ἄνθος [np] χόρ-

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

k Matt. xi. 29. Luke i. 52. Rom. xii. 16. 2 Cor. vii. 6. x. 1. ch. iv. 6, & 1 Pet. v. 5 (both from Prov. iii. 34) only. Isa. xi. 4. l = here only. (Luke i. 78. xxiv. 49. Eph. iii. 18. iv. 8. Rev. xxi. 16 only. Job v. 11.) m Luke i. 48. Acts viii. 33 (from Isa. liii. 8). Phil. iii. 21 only. n here bis and 1 Pet. i. 24, from Isa. xl. 6 only. Ps. cii. 15. o as above (n). Job xiv. 2. p as above (n). Matt. vi. 30 al.

9. om ο (bef αδελφος) B 65 [arm].

does not so well suit the abrupt and predicative style of St. James. How De Wette can say that it would require the article, I cannot imagine: the art. would be only admissible in two cases: 1. if (ὁ) ἀνήρ were subject, and δίψυχος, ἀκατάστ. . . . predicate; 2. on the rendering of the E. V., "The (a) double-minded man (generic) is," &c. But then we should surely not have ἀνήρ, but ἄνθρωπος. From this passage the use of **δίψυχος** spread onwards in the Fathers: we have very early, in the Apostol. Constt. vii. 11, *μὴ γίνου δίψυχος ἐν προσευχῇ εἰ ἔσται ἢ οὔ*: in Clem.-rom. i. 23, p. 260, *ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τὴν ψυχήν*. The διακρίνεσθαι arises out of the διψυχία: this causes him, as Sir. ii. 12, *ἐπιβαίνειν ἐπὶ δύο τρίβους*. Cf. also Sir. i. 27, *μὴ ἀπειθήσῃς φόβῳ κυρίου, καὶ μὴ προσέλθῃς αὐτῷ ἐν καρδίᾳ δισσῇ*, and Tanchuma Rabba in Deut. xxvi. 17, "Ne habeant (qui preces ad Deum facere velint) duo corda, unum ad Deum, aliud vero ad aliam rem directum").

9.] The connexion appears to be this: we must not pray before God, we must not be before God, double-minded; in our trials, we shall get no heavenly wisdom, if this is so. This double-mindedness, one soul drawn upwards to God, the other drawn downwards to the world, causes nothing but instability, and cannot result in that joy which is to be *our* attitude in trial. And it arises from misapprehension of our appointed state in trial: the poor and humble forget the exceeding honour thus done to them, which ought to be to them ground of boasting, far more worthy than (see below) the rich in this world have in their riches which shall so soon fade away: whereas (ver. 12) he that is tried shall receive a crown of life from the Lord. **But** (contrasted with the διψυχία above) **let the brother** (the Christian believer) **who is low** (poor and afflicted; not merely, low in station: this explanation goes with the view that ὁ δὲ πλούσιος below is Christian also) **glory in his exaltation** (which he has obtained by being admitted into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, and which he has further in reversion in the glorious crown of life hereafter, ver. 12): 10.] **but the rich** (not ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ πλούσιος, nor is the πλούσιος to be understood any otherwise than in the rest of the Epistle, cf. ch. ii. 6 f.; v. 1 ff. There are difficulties either way; but on mature consideration I find those on the usual hypothesis, of the πλούσιος *being also a brother*, insuperable. For in that case, 1. a most unnatural change in the sense is necessary at ὅτι: 'Let the rich brother glory in his humiliation, for, or because, *considered merely as a rich man*,' &c.: so that ὁ πλούσιος is a Christian brother at first, and then a mere rich man in the next clause: 2. such a meaning will not suit *οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρανθήσεται*, which is simply predicated of ὁ πλούσιος, the subject enunciated in ὁ δὲ πλούσιος above, and cannot with any probability be supposed to be said of him merely quoad his riches. Whereas on the other view the difficulties are no more than arise from a confessedly elliptical parallelism. After ὁ δὲ πλούσιος we must supply, not necessarily καυχάσθω, but rather καυχᾶται: 'Let the ταπεινός glory in his exaltation, whereas the rich man glories in his debasement,' cf. Phil. iii. 19, *ὧν ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν*. The above view, as far as πλούσιος is concerned, is adopted by the author of the Comm. on the Lamentations in Jerome's works ("Quod autem dicit, filiam Edom gaudere et lætari quod pervenerit ad eam calix Domini, per ironiam legendum est, et est illud in epistola Jacobi apostoli . . . . 'dives autem in humilitate sua,' subauditur a superiore glorietur, quod non tamen ad gloriam, sed ad humilitatem ejus et damnationem pertinet"), Bede, Lyra, Thomas Aq., Beza, Wetst., Pott, Hottinger, Huther, al.: but impugned by De Wette, Wiesinger, Stier, al.) **glories** (see above) **in his humiliation** (cf. ref. Phil.: in that which is in reality his debasement, just as in the other case the lowly Christian is called on to boast in what is in reality his exaltation. Thus, and thus only, the parallelism coheres. On the ordinary view, the ὕψος of the *ταπεινὸς brother* is, that which is really but not apparently his exaltation, whereas the ταπείνωσις of the πλούσιος *brother* is that which is apparently but not really his debasement); **because as a flower of the grass** (reff.) **he shall pass away.**

11.] **For** (justification of ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου

του [q] παρελεύσεται. 11 [r] ἀνέτειλεν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος σὺν τῷ [s] καύσωνι καὶ [t] ἐξήρανεν τὸν [p] χόρτον, καὶ τὸ [o] ἄνθος αὐτοῦ [u] ἐξέπεσεν καὶ ἡ [v] εὐπρέπεια τοῦ [w] προςώπου αὐτοῦ [x] ἀπώλετο· οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς [y] πορείαις αὐτοῦ [z] μαρανθήσεται. 12 μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς [a] ὑπομένει [b] πειρασμόν, ὅτι [c] δόκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν [de] στέφανον τῆς [df] ζωῆς, ὃν [g] ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς [h] ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. 13 μηδεὶς [i] πειραζόμενος λεγέτω ὅτι [k] ἀπὸ θεοῦ [l] πειράζο-

q 2 Pet. iii. 10 reff.
r = Matt. xiii. 6 ‖ Mk. al. intr., Heb. vii. 14 reff.
s Matt. xx. 12. Luke xii. 55 only. Jonah iv. 8. Ezek. xvii. 10.
t = Matt. xiii. 6 ‖ L. (xxi. 19.) Ezek. xvii. 24.
u Acts xii. 7. = 1 Pet. i. 24. Isa. xxviii. 1, 4.
v here only. Ps. xlix. 2. Lam. i. 6.
w = Luke xii. 56. Ps. ciii. 30.
x = 1 Pet. i. 7 reff.
y Luke xiii. 22 only. = plur., Ps. lxvii. 24. Nah. ii. 5.
z here only. Job xxiv. 24. Wisd. ii 8. xix. 20 only.
a = & constr., Heb. x. 32 reff.
b = ver. 2.
c Rom. xiv. 18. xvi. 10. 1 Cor. xi. 19. 2 Cor. x. 18. xiii. 7. 2 Tim. ii. 15 only. 3 Kings x. 18.
d Rev. ii. 10.
e 2 Tim. iv. 8. 1 Pet. v. 4 al. Prov. iv. 9.
f = 1 Pet. iii. 7. Phil. ii. 16.
g = Heb. x. 23 reff. acc. rei, Rom. iv. 21. dat. pers., Heb. vi. 13 al.
h Rom. viii. 28. 1 Cor. ii. 9. ch. ii. 5.
i = 1 Cor. vii. 5. x. 13. Gal. vi. 1 al.
k = Acts ii. 22. 2 Cor. iii. 18.

11. om 2nd *αυτου* B. *πορiαις* A[ℵ] 40. 89. 97 Thl. for 3rd *αυτ.*, *ἑαυτου* C[1](appy).

12. for *ανηρ*, *ανθρωπος* A 70. 104. *υπομενεῖ* KL[P] f i l, *υπομενῇ* m; *sustinuerit* lat-*ff*, Chrom[1]: *suffert* vulg: *υπομεινη* 13. rec aft *επηγγειλατο* ins *ο κυριος*, with KL[P] rel syr arm-zoh(1805) Thl Œc, *κυριος* C 117; *ο θεος* 4. 13(appy). 27-9. 103 vulg Syr copt æth: om ABℵ a[1] lat-*ff*, arm-usc.

13. for *απο*, *υπο* ℵ a. rec ins *του* bef *θεου*: om ABCKL[P]ℵ rel Eus Cyr[-p₂] Damasc Thl Œc.

παρελεύσεται) **the sun arose** (it is given in the form of a tale, a narration of what happened and ever does happen: see Isa. xl. 7, from which the whole is adapted) **with the heat** (or, the hot east wind, the קדים: this interpretation seems approved by ref. Jonah, *καὶ ἐγένετο ἅμα τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ προσέταξεν ὁ θεὸς* (*κύριος ὁ θ.* A) *πνεύματι καύσωνι* (*-νος* ABℵ): see Winer, Realw. art. "Wind." But *καύσων* in ref. Matt. and Isa. xlix. 10, is evidently only *heat:* and considering, 1. the relation between that Gospel and St. James, and, 2. that the LXX, when the *Kadim* is intended, almost always add *ὁ ἄνεμος* or *τὸ πνεῦμα*, I prefer the other meaning, the arid scorching which accompanies the increasing power of the sun), **and dried up the grass, and the flower thereof fell away** (all from Isaiah), **and the beauty of its appearance** (so *πρόσωπον* in reff., the external appearance of any thing) **perished: thus also shall the rich man** (the same as was spoken of ver. 10: not *ὁ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ*, but the *πλούσιος* himself) **wither** (reff.: the verb continues the similitude) **in his ways** (cf. ref. Psalm and Prov. ii. 8. Luther's translation, in seiner Habe, rests on the reading *πορίαις*). **12.**] We now return to the suffering and tempted Christian, who has his *μακαρισμός*, and a possession more precious and more sure than worldly wealth. **Blessed is the man** (no stress on *ἀνήρ*, cf. vv. 7, 8, 20) who **endureth** (the emphasis is on *ὑπομένει*, which distinguishes this saying from that in ver. 2; it is not the mere *περιπεσεῖν πειρασμοῖς*, but the *ὑπομένειν πειρασμόν*, which is felicitated. There is no reason to read *ὑπομενεῖ*, as Bengel. The blessing is categorical, and as well expressed by the present as by the future) **temptation: because when he has become approved** (by the trial: when he has undergone the *δοκίμιον*, ver. 2. This *δόκιμος γενόμενος*, as connected with that verse, furnishes some support to the reading which omits *τῆς πίστεως* there. The *δοκίμιον* is of himself, and it is he that becomes *δόκιμος* by it) **he shall receive the crown of life** (**τῆς ζωῆς** is gen. of apposition: the crown *is* life eternal: **τῆς** *ζωῆς*, 'vitæ illius,' of that life of which we know, which is glorious and eternal. No image derived from *athletes* must be thought of in the verse, as is done by many: such an image would be foreign to the ideas of Jews, with whom the receiving a crown from God was a familiar image, irrespective of any previous contest for a prize: cf. Ps. xxi. 3: Wisd. v. 16, *λήψονται τὸ βασίλειον τῆς εὐπρεπείας καὶ τὸ διάδημα τοῦ κάλλους ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου*), **which He promised to them that love Him** (*who* promised it, is understood: God, repeatedly, in substance: whenever a kingdom is foretold as the future inheritance of His people: *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν*, cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8, and the same words again in ch. ii. 5. It is a formula frequently occurring in the law and the Prophets: cf.

μαι. ὁ γὰρ θεὸς [l]ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν, [i]πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα, [14] ἕκαστος δὲ [i]πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας [m]ἐπιθυμίας [n]ἐξελκόμενος καὶ [o]δελεαζόμενος· [15] [p]εἶτα ἡ

ABCKL Ρℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

l here only †. ἀπείρατος συμφορῶν, Jos. B. J. iii. 7. 32.
m sing., Rom. vii. 7, 8. Col. iii. 5. 1 Thess. iv. 5 al.
n here only ‡. (Prov. xxiv. [xxx.] 33 only.) ἐξελκύειν, Job xx. 15.
o 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18 only †.
p Mark iv. 7. Luke viii. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 24 al.

15. om η (bef επιθυμια) C.

Exod. xx. 6: Deut. vii. 9: Judg. v. 31: Neh. i. 5: Ps. v. 11; cxliv. 20: Dan. ix. 4: Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 16; xlvii. 22).

13—15.] *The truth respecting temptation.*

13.] **Let no one when tempted** (in the manner hitherto spoken of through the chapter. There is no warrant for changing in the slightest degree the reference of the word. The 'tentatio' is a trying of the man by the solicitation of evil: whether that evil be the terror of external danger, or whatever it be, all πειράζεσθαι by means of it arises not from God, but from ourselves —our own ἐπιθυμία. God ordains the temptation, overrules the temptation, but does not tempt, is not the spring of the solicitation to sin) **say that** (ὅτι recitantis) **I am tempted from God** (by agency proceeding out and coming from God: very different from ὑπὸ θεοῦ, which would represent God as the agent: as indeed He is in πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα below. See Winer, § 47 *b. b* note. Thus the man would transfer his own responsibility to God. There does not seem to be any allusion to the fatalism of the Pharisees, as Schneckenburger, al. seem to think: the fault is one of common life, and is alluded to Sir. xv. 11, μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι διὰ κύριον ἀπέστην): **for God is unversed in things evil** (the meaning usually given, "*untempted,*" or "*not able to be tempted,*" is against the usage of the word. It occurs in four forms, ἀπείρᾱτος, ἀπείρᾰτος, ἀπείρητος (Ion.), and ἀπείραστος; and in all of them seems to have but two meanings: 1. *that has not been tried:* so οὐδὲν ἀπείρατόν ἐστί τινι, Dem. p. 310; πόντος ἀπείρατος ὢν τοῖς Ἕλλησι, Luc. Tox. 3: 2. *that has not tried:* so οὐκ ἀπείρατος καλῶν, Pind. Ol. 10 (11). 18; ἀλλοδαπῶν οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι, id. Nem. 1. 33; κακῶν ἀπείρατος (that has never experienced adversity), Plut. παῤῥησίας, ἔρωτος ἀπείρατος, unversed in free speaking, in love, Lucian, Plut. See Palm and Rost's Lex., and numerous other examples in Wetstein. And even if we chose here to depart from usage, and suppose that ἀπείραστος is not a later form of ἀπείρατος, but a verbal from πειράζω, to be interpreted by the meaning of that verb in the context, we should get a meaning for ἀπείραστος entirely foreign from the context: viz. that God is not tempted of evil, whereas there is no question here of God *being tempted,* but of God *tempting.* Some have endeavoured to escape this by giving ἀπείραστος an active sense—"God is not one who tempteth to evil." So Schol. in Cramer's Catena: ὅτι ὁ θεὸς πειράζων ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ κακοποιῆσαι· διὸ καὶ ἐλέχθη ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν: so the Æthiopic version: the vulg., "Deus intentator malorum est:" Luther, al. This doubtless it *may have*: we find μηροὶ καλυπτῆς ἐξέκειντο πιμελῆς, Soph. Ant. 1011: τῷμῷ τἀνδρὶ μεμπτός, id. Trach. 446: ὕποπτος Τρωϊκῆς ἁλώσεως, Eur. Hec. 1117. But there are two objections: 1. that this sense would be tautological, the succeeding clause only repeating the assertion: 2. that thus the gen. κακῶν can only mean 'of evil men:' 'God is no tempter of evil men,' which is out of the question. It seems then that we must take refuge in the ordinary meaning of the word, and render it '*unversed in,*' 'having no experience of.' And thus De Wette and Huther. Œc. takes the words as in the citation from Plutarch above: τὸ θεῖόν τε καὶ μακάριον οὔτε αὐτὸ πράγματα ἔχει, οὔτε ἑτέροις παρέχει: which is decidedly wrong. Taken as above, ἀπείραστος does not carry a negation of πειράζει, but forms a paronomasia with it: and the sentiment is just as in the passage of Sir. above quoted, which goes on πᾶν βδέλυγμα ἐμίσησεν κύριος), **but** (the δέ takes up the contrast again from πειράζομαι: 'not so, but.' I may observe that the δέ is against the ordinary acceptation of ἀπείραστος, on which it ought to be καί) **HE tempteth no man** (the αὐτός does not, as commonly supposed, bring out God's action in distinction to His not being tempted— 'as He is not tempted, so neither does He himself tempt any man' (see this urged in Wiesinger): but brings out this, that the temptation indeed takes place, but from another cause. Huther gives the sense well: "Let none say when he is tempted to evil, From God am I tempted: for God hath no part in evil: but as to the temptation, He tempteth no man" &c.):

14.] **but each man is tempted, being** (slightly causal, 'in that he is') **drawn out and enticed by his own lust** (the image, if

[m] ἐπιθυμία [q] συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία [r] ἀποτελεσθεῖσα [s] ἀποκύει θάνατον. 16 [t] Μὴ πλανᾶσθε,

q = Luke i. 24, 31, 36. ii. 21 (v. 9 al.) only. Gen. iv. 1, 17 al.
r Luke xiii. 32 only †. 2 Macc. xv. 39 only. Plato, Gorg. 503, ἀποτελεῖν ἐπιθυμίαν.
s ver. 18 only †.
t 1 Cor. vi. 9. xv. 33. Gal. vi. 7. Isa. xliv. 8.

we are justified in supposing that a fixed one was contemplated from the first, seems to be, as Pott observes (in Huther), "ἐπιθυμία, ἁμαρτία, et θάνατος personarum vim habent: imaginem meretricis suppeditant voces συλλαβεῖν, τίκτειν, ἀποκύειν, necnon et ἐξέλκειν atque δελεάζειν." The participles **ἐξελκόμενος** and **δελεαζόμενος** are abundantly illustrated by the Commentators, e. g. in Wetst. by Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 4, τὰ . . ζῶα . . τούτων γὰρ δήπου τὰ μὲν γαστρὶ δελεαζόμενα . . . τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τοῦ φαγεῖν ἀγόμενα πρὸς τὸ δέλεαρ, ἁλίσκεται. And Herod. ii. 70, of taking the crocodile, ἐπεὰν νῶτον ὑὸς δελεάσῃ περὶ ἄγκιστρον κ.τ.λ. . . . ὁ κροκόδειλος . . . ἐπεὰν ἐξελκυσθῇ ἐς γῆν κ.τ.λ. Schneckenburger says, "ἐξέλκειν et δελεάζειν sunt verba e re venatoria et piscatoria in rem amatoriam et inde in nostrum tropum translata:" only we must not here interpret ἐξέλκειν which precedes δελεαζ., as in Herod. above, "to draw to land," but rather as Schulthess, "elicere bestias ex tuto, ubi latent, in locum hamis retibusque expositum." But, as Huther observes, it is hardly likely that the original reference of the words would be distinctly before the Apostle as he used them. Cf. Aristot. Polit. v. 10, παρὰ τῆς γυναικὸς ἐξελκυσθείς, "ab uxore sollicitatus." In the Test. XII. Patrum, p. 702 (Kypke), Joseph says of Potiphar's wife, εἰς πορνείαν με ἐφελκύσατο. And cf. Homer's αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος, Od. π. 294: and, which is the nearest correspondence of all, Plut. de Sera Numinis Vindicta (in Huther), τὸ γλυκὺ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ὥσπερ δέλεαρ ἐξέλκειν (ἀνθρώπους). With regard to the matter treated, and the proper sense of **ἐπιθυμία** here, it seems to me that Huther is right in setting aside the difficulties which Hofmann (Schriftb. i. p. 415) and after him Wiesinger, have found in this passage as compared with Rom. vii. 7. St. James is not here speaking of the *original* source of sin in man, but of the actual source of temptation to sin, when it occurs. The ἁμαρτία of St. Paul, the sinful principle in man, is not here in question: we take up the matter, so to speak, lower down the stream: and the ἐπιθυμία here is the ἐπιθυμία there, itself the effect of sin (abstr.) in the members, and leading to sin (concrete) in the conduct):

15.] then lust having conceived, bringeth forth sin: and (**δέ** brings out the new subject) **sin, when completed, bringeth forth death** (it has been questioned whether **ἁμαρτία** is here in one, or in two senses. De Wette holds that the first ἁμαρτία is the purpose, or inner act, of sin,—the **ἀποτελεσθεῖσα** carrying this ἁμαρτία out into an act, which act brings forth death, the wages of sin. But this is decidedly wrong. Wiesinger has disputed it, and insisted rightly that the *inner act* is the union of the will with the ἐπιθυμία, the **τίκτει** denoting extrusion into outward act: then the second ἁμαρτία,—which Huther rightly maintains to be, not as Wiesinger, after Calvin, "cursus peccandi completus," but the sinful act when brought to perfection in all its consequences, in a series of results following on one another and bringing a man under bondage to his sin,—being thus perfected, brings forth eternal death. The imagery is throughout consistent. The harlot ἐπιθυμία, ἐξέλκει and δελεάζει the man: the guilty union is committed by the will embracing the temptress: the consequence is that she τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, sin, in general, of some kind, of that kind to which the temptation inclines: then, ἡ ἁμαρτία, that particular sin, when grown up and mature,—herself ἀποκύει, 'extrudit,' as if all along pregnant with it, Death, the final result of sin. So that temptation to sin cannot be from God, while trial is from Him. The one, being δοκίμιον ἡμῶν, κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν· ἡ δὲ ὑπομονή, ἔργον τέλειον ἔχουσα, τὴν ζωήν: the other, being ἐξέλκυσις κ. δέλεαρ arising from ἐπιθυμία, τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν· ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον. The English reader will not fail to remember Milton's sublime allegory in Paradise Lost, where Satan, by his own evil lust, brings forth sin: and then by an incestuous union with Sin (which doubtless may be said to lie here also in the background, no cause being assigned for the ἀποκύει) causes her to bring forth Death. As regards the single expressions, **συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει** is a regular LXX formula for וַתַּהַר וַתֵּלֶד: cf. reff. Gen., also xxx. 17 al. fr. **ἀποκύειν**, or **ἀποκυεῖν** (either is allowable, see Winer, § 15) is found principally in later Greek: Wetst. gives examples from Maximus Tyr., Herodian, Lucian, Phlegon,—all with this meaning. For **ἀποτελεσθεῖσα**, cf. Polyb. ii. 58. 7, τὸ μέγιστον ἀσέβημα κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἀπετέλεσαν).

16—18.] The idea that God tempts to sin has been as yet only negatively contradicted. But so far

[u] ἀδελφοί μου [u] ἀγαπητοί. [17] πᾶσα [v] δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν [w] δώρημα [x] τέλειον [y] ἄνωθέν ἐστιν [z] καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ [ab] πατρὸς τῶν [bc] φώτων, [d] παρ' ᾧ οὐκ [e] ἔνι [f] παραλλαγὴ

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

u 2 Pet. iii. 15. address, 1 Cor. xv. 58. ver. 19. ch. ii. 5 only. v Phil. iv. 15 only. Prov. xxi. 14. w Rom. v. 16 only +. x ver. 4 reff. y = John iii. 31. xix. 11. ch. iii. 15, 17 only. z = Matt. iii. 16 xxviii. 2. John iii. 13 al. constr., Luke i. 10, 20 al. fr. Prov. vi. 3. a = 2 Cor. i. 3. Eph. i. 17. b here only. see Ps. xxxv. 9. c = (see note) here only. (plur., Acts xvi. 29 only.) d = Matt. xix. 26. Luke ii. 52. 1 Pet. ii. 4, 20. iii. 8 al. e 1 Cor. vi. 5. Gal. iii. 28 (3ce). Col. iii. 11 only. see Luke xi. 41. f here only. 4 Kings ix. 20 only.

17. καταβαινων A 13. for ενι, εστιν [P]ℵ b[1] c d o 36.

is it from this being so, that *He is the Author of all good.* **16.]** **Do not err** (some have ended the paragraph with these words: some have begun a new one. But Theile (in Huther) rightly remarks of this formula, "Ubi antecedentia respicit, nunquam finit cohortationem, sed ita interpositum est, ut continuet et firmet, nunc illustrando, nunc cavendo." It occurs in reff.: see also 1 John iii. 7 (μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς). Still we must not take Theile's further exposition, "Nolite in alterum errorem abstrahi, ut nempe bona quoque a summo numine abjudicetis:" for this does not lie in the context), **my beloved brethren** (both this earnest address, and the caution, shew how important the Writer feels this to be, which he is about to enunciate): **17.]** **every good gift** (**δόσις**, properly *the act of giving:* but the ideas of the giving and the gift are so convertible, that it as often has the passive meaning: as πρᾶξις, and other similar words. So in ref. Prov., δόσις λάθριος ἀνατρέπει ὀργάς, δώρων δὲ ὁ φειδόμενος θυμὸν ἐγείρει ἰσχυρόν) **and every perfect gift** (we cannot express **δόσις** and **δώρημα** by two words in English. There is a slight climax in δώρημα, as there is in τέλειον compared with ἀγαθή: it brings out the gratuitous and 'proprio motu' element in the gift, as is done again by βουληθεὶς below. **πᾶσα** and **πᾶν** are taken by Raphel, Bengel, al. in an exclusive sense, "nothing but good gifts and perfect gifts" &c. This is perhaps allowable, but it weakens the force of the sentence and spoils the context, the object of which is to shew, not that God's gifts are all good, but that all good gifts come from Him. So that πᾶσα and πᾶν are better kept in their ordinary senses, and the stress laid, in each case, on the adjectives, ἀγαθόν and τέλειον) **descendeth from above** (ἄνωθέν ἐστιν καταβαῖνον belong together, not as E. V., Grot., Wolf, al., ἄνωθέν ἐστιν, καταβαῖνον. This is shewn by ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη, ch. iii. 15. ἐστιν serves to bring out the essential quality of the gift; is, by its nature, sent down from above. Wies. quotes from Bereschith Rabba, 51. 1, "Dixit R. Chanina, Non est res mala descendens desuper"), **from the Father of the lights (of heaven)** (it seems now generally agreed that by **τὰ φῶτα** here is meant the *heavenly bodies,* and by **πατήρ** the creator, originator, as in Job xxxviii. 28, τίς ἐστιν ὑετοῦ πατήρ; Being this, being the Father of those glorious fountains of light, and thus (see below) purer and clearer than they all, it cannot be that He should tempt to evil. Our very life, as renewed in Christ, is of His begetting, and we are a firstfruit of His new world.

Various meanings have been given to τῶν φώτων—spiritual light, Grot.: illumination, with reference to the Urim, Heisen: "luminum spiritualium in regno gratiæ et gloriæ," Bengel: "omnis perfectionis, bonitatis, sapientiæ et prosperitatis," Wolf, Benson, al.: "omnis et præstantiæ et bene compositi ordinis," Calv. As regards the word **φῶτα**, we have, Ps. cxxxv. 7 ff., τῷ ποιήσαντι φῶτα μεγάλα . . . τὸν ἥλιον . . . τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας κ.τ.λ.: Jer. iv. 23, ἐπέβλεψα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐθέν, καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ οὐκ ἦν τὰ φῶτα αὐτοῦ. In Gen. i. 14, 16 they are φωστῆρες), **with** ('chez,' 'apud,' bei: see reff.) **whom there is** (**ἔνι**, abbreviation of ἔνεστι: see reff. Not = ἔστι, but carrying the meaning 'inest,' 'there is in Him') **no change** (πόθεν δέ, says Arrian on Epict. i. 14, p. 62, πρὸς τὴν αὔξησιν καὶ μείωσιν τῆς σελήνης, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου πρόσοδον καὶ ἄφοδον, τοσαύτη παραλλαγὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐναντία μεταβολὴ τῶν ἐπιγείων θεωρεῖται. This sentence confirms what Gebser (in Huther, al.) has observed, that **παραλλαγή** never occurs as an astronomical term: seeing it is used in its common sense, even where the heavenly bodies are being spoken of. Besides which, it is not at all probable that St. James should write to the dispersed Jewish Christians in the technical language of astronomy. I take then the word in its ordinary sense, 'change:' that uncertainty of degree of light which we see in the material heavenly bodies, but which is not in God their Creator. So in Wetst., we have Theophrastus speaking of a παραλλαγή τις εὐοσμίας καὶ ἀοσμίας: Plato, Rep. vii., of the absurdity of one who looks on the order and

ἢ [g] τροπῆς [h] ἀποσκίασμα. 18 [i] βουληθεὶς [k] ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς [l] λόγῳ [l] ἀληθείας, [m] εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς [n] ἀπαρχήν [o] τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ [p] κτισμάτων.

g here only. = Job xxxviii. 33. Plato, Rep. p. 270, τῶν περὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν γιγνομένων τροπῶν πασῶν. h here only †. i of God, 1 Cor. xii. 11. Heb. vi. 17. 2 Pet. iii. 9 only. 1 Kings ii. 25. k ver. 15 only †. l 2 Cor. vi. 7. Eph. i. 13. 2 Tim. ii. 15 only. m constr., Heb. vii. 25 reff. n Rom. viii. 23. xi. 16. xvi. 5. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23. xvi. 15. Rev. xiv. 4 only. Num. xv. 20, 21. o see Heb. x. 27. p 1 Tim. iv. 4. Rev. v. 13. viii. 9 only †. Wisd. ix. 2.

τροπ. αποσκιασματος B$\aleph^1$: *vicissitudinis obumbratio* vulg, *conversionis obumbraculum* Jer : *modicum obumbrationis* lat-ff_1 : *momenti(ροπης) obumbratio* Aug_{saepe}.
18. *εαυτου* AC[P]$\aleph^{3b}$ 105.

symmetry of the heavenly bodies, and *νομίζοντα γίνεσθαί τε ταῦτα ἀεὶ ὡσαύτως, κ. οὐδαμῇ οὐδὲν παραλλάττειν σῶμά τε ἔχοντα καὶ ὁρώμενα*: Plotinus, Enn. vi. 6. 8, of a *παραλλαγὴ ἡμερῶν πρὸς νύκτας*: Diogenes Laert. vii. 145 Zeno, of the moon eclipsing the sun, *καὶ πάλιν παραλλάττουσα*) or **shadow** (**ἀποσκίασμα**, the dark mark of shadow,—*σκίασμα*, the result of *σκιάζεσθαι*, cast *ἀπό*, from, any object) of **turning** (arising from turning. Here again we must look for a common-sense, not for an astronomical meaning of the word. *τροπαὶ ἡλίου* are, it is true, the solstices: but they have nothing to do with any darkening of the sun. So that I would take **τροπή** in the general sense of *turning*, or *revolution*, in which the heavens are ever found: by means of which the moon turns her dark side to us, in a constant state of *παραλλαγή* and *τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα*: by means of which the moon is eclipsed by the shadow of the earth, and the sun by the body of the moon, or, if you will, though this is hardly so likely to have been in view, is hidden from us during the night. From all these God, the Father of lights, is free; as 1 John i. 5, *ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστιν, καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία*. It only remains to repudiate altogether, as inadmissible, the meaning given by Œc., the metaphorical acceptation of **ἀποσκίασμα**, *ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδὲ μέχρις ὑπονοίας τινὸς ὑποβολή*, not a shadow of any change. So Hesych. (*ἀλλοιώσεως καὶ φαντασίας ὁμοίωμα*), Wolf, Lösner, Morus, Rosenm., al.).

18.] *The greatest example of this position*, that all good and perfect gifts come from Him: mentioned not merely as an example, but as leading on to the following context. **Because He willed it** (the aor. part. is, 1. contemporary with the verb: 2. slightly causal, involving the condition of the act which follows. It was of His own mere will, 'proprio motu,' and the emphasis is on this word. "Exprimit quod Deus pro suo beneplacito nos genuerit, atque ita sibi fuerit causa. Unde sequitur, naturale esse Deo benefacere." Calvin) **begat He** (**ἀποκύειν** or **-εῖν** (see above, ver. 15), here in the sense *generare*, as there *parere*. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 23: 1 John iii. 9. The spiritual birth, not the natural, is meant, as is evident by what follows) **us** (*ἡμᾶς*, twice repeated, signifies the Writer and his readers, not Christians in general: not especially as *Jewish* Christians, *Ἰουδαίῳ πρώτῳ*,—for that is not (see below) the reference here) **with the word of truth** (the gen. is one of apposition: cf. John xvii. 17, *ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστι*. And the word of truth is the gospel, preached, and *ἔμφυτος* as below: cf. 1 Pet. i. 23, *ἀναγεγεννημένοι . . διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ*. The failure of the articles does not alter the sense. It is especially a characteristic of the abrupt sententious style of our Apostle. Cf. *ποιηταὶ λόγου*, ver. 22, where *λόγος* must be 'the word;' and indeed passim. Œc. makes *λόγος* personal: *ἵνα μή τις ὑπολάβῃ ὁμοίως ἡμῖν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀποτεκεῖν αὐτόν, καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν γεγεννῆσθαι, ἐπάγει τό, λόγῳ ἀληθείας, πάντα γὰρ κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἰωάννην διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐγένετο*: and so Athanasius, Serm. iii. advers. Arianos, vol. ii. p. 483; and Bernard, Serm. ii. ad Fratres (?): which is clearly wrong), **that we should be** (aim, but not the primary aim, of the **ἀποκυῆσαι**. His gracious purpose with regard to *us* in particular was, that we should be, &c. His great purpose with regard to *all* Christians is not here in question. Hence *ἡμᾶς* is repeated) **a kind of firstfruit** ("**τινα** similitudinis est nota, nos quodammodo esse primitias," Calv. It does not appear to be intended as Bengel, "'*Quædam*' habet modestiam, nam primitiæ proprie et absolute est Christus." Rather, I should say, it would point to the early date of our Epistle, in which an idea afterwards so familiar is thus introduced as it were with an apologetic explanation. The figure in **ἀπαρχή** is from the appointment of the law by which the firstborn of man, of cattle, of fruits &c., were to be consecrated to God; and the word must be taken with this sacred meaning, not merely as a 'verbum commune' indicating priority. The first Christians, to whom St. James is writing, were as firstborn of the

q Acts xxvi. Eph. v. 5. Heb. xii. 17 only†. r ver. 16.

19 q Ἴστε, r ἀδελφοί μου r ἀγαπητοί· ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρω-

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

19. rec (for ιστε) ωστε, with KL[P] rel syr Thl Œc: *et vos, fratres mei dilecti, quisque ex vobis sit* Syr: και νυν αδελφ. ημων εστω æth-pl: εστε αδ. ημ. κ. εστω æth-rom: ιστω ℵ[1]: txt ABCℵ[3b] latt syr-mg copt arm Bede$_1$. (13 def.) aft ιστε ins δε A. rec om δε, with KL[P[2]] rel [syrr æth arm] Thl Œc: ins BC[P[1]]ℵ latt copt Bede$_1$: και εστω A 13.

great family, dedicated as firstfruits to God. Wiesinger beautifully says, "The thought fully given would be this: they by Regeneration were dedicated as the first-fruits of a sacrificial gift which shall only be completed with the offering up of all κτίσματα") **of His creatures** (**τὰ κτίσματα αὐτοῦ** manifestly extends wider than merely to the great multitude of the regenerated whom no man can number; it embraces all creation, which we know shall partake in the ultimate glorious perfection of the sons of God: cf. Rom. viii. 20, 21. Obviously, the κτίσματα are not the καινὴ κτίσις, as Grot. and many others). Wiesinger has an important note, shewing from this verse what must be the right understanding of much which follows in this Epistle. "This passage," he says, "is among those which reveal the depth of Christian knowledge in which the practical and moral exhortations of the Writer are grounded: lying as it does expressly (διό, ver. 21) at the basis of them. We will here bring together in a few words the teaching of the passage, for the sake of its important bearing on the rest of the Epistle. It teaches us, 1. as a positive supplement to vv. 14, 15, that the life of man must be renewed, from its very root and foundation: 2. it designates this renewal as God's work, moreover as an imparting of the life of God (ἀπεκύησε), as only possible by the working of the Spirit, only on the foundation of the objective fact of our Redemption in Christ, which is the content of the λόγος ἀληθείας: 3. it sets forth this re-generation as an act once for all accomplished (ἀπεκύησεν, aor.) and distinguishes it from the gradual penetration and sanctification of the individual life by means of this new principle of life imparted in the re-generation: 4. it declares also expressly that the re-generation is a free act of God's love (βουληθείς) not induced by any work of man (Eph. ii. 8, 9: Titus iii. 5), so that man is placed by God in his right relation to God, antecedently to all works well-pleasing to God: for this the expression ἀπεκύησεν involves: cf. ἐξελέξατο, ch. ii. 5, and in so far as this ἀπεκύησεν necessarily implies the justification of the sinner (the δικαιοῦσθαι of St. Paul), it is plain also, that St. James cannot, without contradicting himself, make this δικαιοῦσθαι, in the sense of St. Paul, dependent on the works of faith. 5. λόγος ἀληθείας is specified as the objective medium of re-generation: and herewith we must have πίστις as the appropriating medium on the part of man himself: of the central import of which πίστις in St. James also we have already seen something (vv. 3, 6), and shall see more (ch. ii. 5, 14 ff.). 6. Together with this act of re-generation proceeding from God, we have also the high destination of the Christian, which the Apostle gives so significantly and deeply in εἰς τὸ εἶναι κ.τ.λ. And that which God has done to him, is now in the following verses made the foundation of that which the Christian has on his part to do: by which that which we said under (3) and (4) receives fresh confirmation. This passage is one to be remembered, when we wish to know what the Apostle understands by the νόμος τέλειος (i. 25; ii. 12), and what he means, when (ii. 14 ff.) he deduces δικαιοῦσθαι from the works of faith. As regards the dogmatical use, which some make of this passage, wishing to shew that regeneration is brought about by the word, as distinguished from the Sacrament of Baptism (Titus iii. 5—7), we may remark, that seeing that λόγος ἀληθείας designates the gospel, as a whole, without any respect to such distinction, nothing regarding it can be gathered from this passage. The word of the Lord constitutes, we know, the force of the Sacrament also. 'Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit Sacramentum.' And is it meant to be inferred that the readers of this Epistle were *not baptized?*"

19—27.] *Exhortation to receive rightly this word of truth.* (See the general connexion in the Prolegomena.)

19.] First, as to the reading. For the external evidence, see the digest. It is of a kind which can hardly be rejected. And all internal considerations make the same way. It is hardly possible that the simple and obvious ὥστε should have been altered into the difficult ἴστε. Whether the connexion with the last verse was plain, is not a consideration which usually entered into the minds of transcribers. They were much more likely to attempt to establish some connexion, plain or not, especially

πος [s] ταχὺς [t] εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, [u] βραδὺς [t] εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, [u] βραδὺς [t] εἰς ὀργήν· 20 ὀργὴ γὰρ [v] ἀνδρὸς [v] δικαιοσύνην [v] θεοῦ οὐκ [w] ἐργάζεται. 21 διὸ [x] ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν [y] ῥυ-

s adj., here only. Sir. v. 11. t Rom. xvi. 19 al. u = here bis (Luke xxiv. 25) only †. v = vv. 12, 23. ch. iii. 2. = Rom. x. 3 (2 Pet. i. 1 reff.). w = Acts x. 35. Rom. ii. 10. Heb. xi. 33 al. Ps. xiv. 2. x = Eph. iv. 22, 25. Col. iii. 9. Heb. xii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 1 (Matt. xiv. 3. Acts vii. 58) only. (2 Chron. xviii. 26.) y here only †. (-παρός, ch. ii. 2. -παίνειν, Rev. xxii. 11. -πος, 1 Pet. iii. 21.)

20. rec *ου κατεργαζεται*, with C[1]KL[P] rel Ath_1 $Ps\text{-}Ath_2$ [$Ephr_1$] Thl Œc: txt ABC[3]ℵ l[1] m 31 [$Ephr_1$].

when so unusual a word as ἴστε admitted of change to so obvious an one as ὥστε. Next, comes the question how ἴστε is to be taken, whether imperatively or indicatively. If the former, the sense will be, '*Know, my beloved brethren*' (either what has preceded or what follows: if the latter, then the introduction of ἔστω κ.τ.λ. with a δέ gives it as a generally received saying, possibly as a reference to ref. Sir., γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου, καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν: if the former, the imperative sense seems hardly applicable). On the whole I much prefer the indicative sense, for which we have a precedent in reff. Heb. and Eph., the only other places where the form occurs in the N. T. And taking this indicative sense, I refer the word not to what follows, but to what precedes, making it an appeal to their knowledge of the momentous facts which he has just stated: You are well aware of this: but (i. e. and having this knowledge &c.). Thus we bring ἴστε here into strict accord with its meaning in those two other places, where it is, "Ye are aware;" appealing to a well-known fact. **Ye know it, my beloved brethren: but** (consequently) **let every man be swift to hear** (the word of truth which has so great power for good and for life: we need not actually *supply* τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας as Est., al., De W., Wiesinger do: the verb is absolute and general, having only *reference* to the word of truth), **slow to speak** (λαλῆσαι need not refer only to the caution μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ch. iii. 1, though it includes that, being general. The meaning is, be eager to listen, not eager to discourse: the former may lead to implanting or strengthening the new life, the latter to wrath and suddenness of temper, so often found in the wake of swift rejoinder and ready chattering. Œc. reminds us that τὶς ἀνὴρ θεῖος φησίν, ὁ λαλήσας μετέγνω πολλάκις, ὁ δὲ σιωπήσας οὐδέποτε), **slow to wrath** (Bengel and others interpret ὀργή, "ira sive impatientia erga Deum," and so nearly Calvin: but the reference is more general, as the precept is. The quick speaker is the quick kindler. See below. We have in Philo de Confus. Ling. § 12, vol. i. p. 412, βραδὺς ὠφελῆσαι, ταχὺς βλάψαι: but the words occur in contrast only here in the N. T.): **20.**] **for the wrath** (any wrath, all wrath) **of man** (ἀνήρ is used by our Apostle without any such definite precision as has been supposed here by Bengel, "*Sexus virilis* maxime iram alit:" or Thomus, "Non dicit *pueri*, quæ cito transit." Cf. ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, ver. 8, and reff.) **worketh not** (ἐργάζεται and κατεργάζεται would differ here slightly in sense: the latter would signify more 'worketh out,' 'bringeth to issue or existence,' the former, 'practiseth,' 'worketh habitually,' and each of these would throw its own shade of meaning on δικαιοσύνη—see below) **the righteousness of God** (if ἐργάζεται, = that which is righteousness in God's sight = τὸ δίκαιον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ: if κατεργάζεται, = that righteousness, to produce which is God's end in begetting us to a new life. In other words, the more general ethical sense is given by ἐργάζεται: the more particular theological one by κατεργάζεται. At all events, we must not interpret δικ. θεοῦ the state of righteousness before God, as some, or that righteousness *in another*, into which God begets men by his word of truth, as Hofmann (Schriftb. 1. 548 f.) and Wiesinger. When this latter asks, What relevance here has the remark that anger doeth not that which is right in the sight of God?—an easy answer can be given. Be not intemperately zealous, hastily rash to speak and to be angered, even in God's behalf (for this is implied): be humble, ready to listen, for your angry zeal, your quick speaking, work not God's righteous purposes—serve not Him, are not carriers forward of that righteousness which is the characteristic of His kingdom, ch. iii. 18. How many an endeavour, which might have ended in ἐργάζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ, has been diverted and blighted by hasty speaking and anger, and ended only in disgracing ourselves, and Him whom we would have served, before men! So Bengel, "Ira plane impedit justitiam Dei; tametsi sibi dum fervet, quam maxime operari eam videatur. Purius sine ira

παρίαν καὶ [z] περισσείαν [a] κακίας ἐν [b] πραΰτητι [c] δέξασθε τὸν [d] ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς

ABCKL PℵA b c d f g h j k l m o 13

z Rom. v. 17. 2 Cor. viii. 2. x. 15 only. Eccl. i. 3 al.
a Eph. iv. 31. Col. iii. 8. 1 Pet. ii. 1, 16. 1 Kings xxiv. 12.
b Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 21. 2 Cor. x. 1. Gal. v. 23 al[6]. ch. iii. 13. 1 Pet. iii. 15 only. Ps. xliv. 4.
c = Luke viii. 13. Acts viii. 14. 1 Cor. ii. 21. 1 Thess. i. 6. 2 Thess. ii. 10. Prov. iv. 10.
d here only †. Wisd. xii. 10 only.

21. περισσευμα A. 13. 68. εμ πραυτ. ℵ [P adds σοφιας].

fit"). **21.**] **Wherefore** (consequence from ver. 20: seeing that ὀργή excludes you from having a share in the righteous work of God) **putting off** (reff.: aor., because it must be done as a single act, antecedently to that which follows. The previous putting off is the condition of the subsequent reception) **all filthiness** (**ῥυπαρία** is here figurative, as ῥυπαρός and ῥυπαρεύω in ref. Rev.: in the other reff. the word occurs in its literal sense. Some Commentators take it here as standing alone: others join it with καὶ περισσείαν, as belonging to the genitive κακίας, which seems better for the context, which concerns not the putting away of moral pollution of all kinds, but only of that kind which belongs to κακία: see below. And thus taken it will mean that κακία pollutes the soul, and renders it unfit to receive the ἔμφυτος λόγος. It is very possible that the agricultural similitude in ἔμφυτος may have influenced the choice of both these words, ῥυπαρία and περισσεία. The ground must be ridded of all that pollutes and chokes it, before the seed can sink in and come to maturity: must be cleaned and cleared) **and abundance** ("*superfluity*" is perhaps too strong; it is, if the above figure be allowed, the rank growth, the abundant crop. Beza, Erasm. Schmid, al. take it as = περίσσωμα, "excrementum;" Pott, Schneckenb., De Wette, al., as "*efflorescence*," as Lösner, "ramos in vite vel arbore abundantes, falceque resecandos;" Michaelis, al. take it as the remnant of κακία surviving from old times = περίσσευμα Mark viii. 8. But the usual meaning seems preferable, as being both philologically correct, and suiting in its simplicity the solemn character of the exhortation) **of malignity** (evil disposition towards one another, as in reff. The word carries on the ὀργή above: which springs from (see note on ref. Eph.) **κακία**, evil disposition, which is inherent in our hearts, and requires putting off before we can receive the word of God. That this is so, is evident from ἐν πραΰτητι which follows. However the exhortation may apply in the wider sense, it is not its sense here, as the context plainly shews), **in mildness** (towards one another, reff.: not "modestia et facilitas mentis ad discendum composita," Calv., nor "docili animo," Grot., al.: see above on κακία) **receive** (cf. reff. and παραδέχονται, Mark iv. 20, of the good ground) **the implanted word** (the word spoken of is beyond doubt the same as the λόγος ἀληθείας above—i. e. the gospel, in its fulness. But the epithet makes some little difficulty. First of all, it clearly is not, as Œc. seems to take it, "innate:" τὸν διακριτικὸν τοῦ βελτίονος καὶ τοῦ χείρονος, δι' ὃ καὶ λογικοὶ ἐσμὲν καὶ λεγόμεθα: and so in the Apostolical Constt. viii. 12, νόμον δέδωκας ἔμφυτον, for this would stultify δέξασθε, we having it already. Nor must ἔμφυτος be taken as proleptic, "ita ut inseratur," as Calvin, Semler, De Wette (but doubtfully), al. Nor again can it mean 'the word which has been planted in the whole of Christendom,' seeing that individuals are here being dealt with: but the allusion is apparently to the parable of the sower, and it is the word implanted (= which has been sown), the word whose attribute and ἀρετή it is to be ἔμφυτος, and which is ἔμφυτος, awaiting your reception of it to spring up and take up your being into it and make you new plants), **which is able to save your souls** (cf. Rom. i. 16, where the εὐαγγέλιον is said to be δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. "Magnificum cœlestis doctrinæ encomium, quod certam ex ea salutem consequimur. Est autem additum, ut sermonem illum instar thesauri incomparabilis et expetere et amare et magnificare discamus. Est ergo acris ad castigandam nostram ignaviam stimulus, sermonem cui solemus tam negligenter aures præbere, salutis nostræ esse causam. Tametsi non in hunc finem servandi vis sermoni adscribitur, quasi aut salus in externo vocis sonitu inclusa foret, aut servandi munus Deo ablatum alio transferretur. Nam de sermone tractat Jacobus, qui fide in corda hominum penetravit: et tantum indicat, Deum salutis auctorem evangelio suo eam peragere." Calvin. Observe **ψυχάς**. It is the ψυχή which carries the personality of the man: which is between the πνεῦμα drawing it upwards, and the σάρξ drawing it downwards, and is saved or lost, passes into life or death, according to the choice between these two. And the λόγος ἔμφυτος, working through the πνεῦμα and by the divine πνεῦμα, is a spiritual agency, able to save

ὑμῶν· [22] γίνεσθε δὲ [e] ποιηταὶ λόγου, καὶ μὴ [f] ἀκροαταὶ μόνον [g] παραλογιζόμενοι [h] ἑαυτούς. [23] ὅτι εἴ τις [f] ἀκροατὴς λόγου ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ [e] ποιητής, [i] οὗτος [k] ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ [l] κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς [m] γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν [n] ἐσόπτρῳ· [24] [l] κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ

e = ch. iv. 11 reff.
f ver. 25. Rom. ii. 13 only. Isa. iii. 3 only.
g Col. ii. 4 only. Gen. xxix. 25. Josh. ix. 22. Judg. xvi. 10 A. compl.
h 2nd pers., ch. ii. 4. Matt. iii. 9. Acts v. 35. Phil. ii. 12. 1 John v. 21 al. i Matt. v. 19. x. 22. xviii. 4 al. fr. k ver. 6 only. Xen. Mem. i. 6. 10. l Matt. vii. 3. Heb. iii. 1 reff. = Ps. xxxvi. 32 al. m = here (ch. iii. 1. Matt. i. 1, 18. Luke i. 14) only. gen., Phil. iii. 21. n 1 Cor. xiii. 12 only †. Wisd. vii. 26. Sir. xii. 11 only.

22. for λογου, νομου C^2 c 9. 38 æth [$Damasc_1$] Thl. rec μονον bef ακροαται, with ACKL[P]ℵ rel [$Damasc_1$] Œc: txt B a latt syrr copt [æth arm] Thl. (13 def.)
23. om οτι A 13: *si quis enim* Syr copt. κατανοουντες (sic) ℵ[1].

the ψυχή. And **σῶσαι**, the aor., because the power is to complete the work and to have done it for ever). **22.**] The **ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι** and **δέξασθε** are qualified, at the same time that they are enforced, by a caution. **But be ye** (not, '*become ye*,' any more than in Matt. vi. 16; x. 16; xxiv. 44: John xx. 27: Rom. xii. 16. In all these places no other meaning will suit the context but simply "*be ye*:" with reference indeed to some future act by which the word γίνεσθαι gets its propriety; but 'become' in English carries a very different meaning, viz. that of *change into* the state mentioned from some other previous one, which is in none of these cases implied) **doers of the word** (viz. of the λόγος ἔμφυτος, the λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας. Theile remarks well, "Substantiva plus sonant quam participia;" the substantive ποιητής carries an enduring, a sort of official force with it: 'let this be your occupation.' For the expression, see reff.), **not hearers only** (**ἀκροατής** in classical Greek carries rather the idea of attentive observance with it, which cannot be the case either here or in ref. Rom.), **deceiving yourselves** (see note on ref. Col. **παραλογίζεσθαι** is used here probably as allusive to λόγος, and means, to deceive by a false logical conclusion. The 'hearer only' does this, when he infers that the mere sound of the word received in his outward ear will suffice for him. Cf. ἀπατῶν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, ver. 26. Hesych. gives ἀπάτη λογισμοῦ as the explanation of παραλογισμός. See Suicer, sub voce). **23—25.**] *Justification of παραλογιζόμενοι, and of the foregoing exhortation.* **23.**] **Because, if any is a hearer of the word and not** (the hypothesis being one of fact, that he ἀκούει καὶ οὐ ποιεῖ, οὐ is used, where we should rather expect μή, and where in the exhortation, μή has been used. Strictly, it is 'if any one is a hearer, and a not-doer') **a doer, this man** (the demonstrative pronoun points more markedly at the individual in whom the hearing and not-doing are united: see reff.) **is like to a man** (**ἀνδρί** general again: see vv. 8, 12, &c. Huther quotes a curious comment from Paes: "Viri obiter tantum solent specula intueri, muliebre autem est curiose se ad speculum componere") **contemplating** (reff. Probably the example was meant to have a general reference: for though it may be true, as De Wette says, that many men remember well their appearance in the mirror, the common rule is that men forget it. Had a particular case of one who looks and forgets been intended, the next sentence would not surely have been introduced with the aor. and γάρ, but with καί and participles) **the countenance of his birth** (i. e. as E. V., "*his natural face:*" the face he was born with. The expression is to be explained apparently as Wiesinger: "Not that he can see in the glass any other than his natural face, but the addition τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ serves more plainly to point out the sphere of mere material perception from which the comparison is taken, as distinguished from the ethical sphere of ἀκροᾶσθαι, and at the same time hints at the easy translation of the remark from the one department to the other, in which 'the word of God is a mirror in which we may and ought to see our moral visage,' as De Wette." Various other explanations have been given: by Pott, "Formam vultus nativam transeundo animadvertit: supple, non item maculas vultui haud ἐκ γενέσεως insitas, sed propria culpa adspersas:" Luther, Michaelis, Benson, Knapp imagine a contrast to be intended between his natural face and τὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πρόσωπον: Schulthess, between the natural face and a mask: &c. Whether the gen. **αὐτοῦ** (not αὑτοῦ) belongs to πρόσωπον or to τῆς γενέσεως, is uncertain as the words stand: more probably however to the latter: cf. τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, Col. i. 13) **in a mirror** (see reff.: and Pind. Nem. vii. 20): **24.**] **for** (this seems to stamp the example as a general one, apply-

II. [1] Ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ [p] ἐν [q] προσωποληψίαις [r] ἔχετε τὴν [r] πίστιν τοῦ [s] κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς [s] δόξης.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

p = ch. i. 6. Col. iii. 16 al. q Rom. ii. 11. Eph. vi. 9. Col. iii. 25 only †. (-πτεῖν, ver. 9. -πτης, Acts x. 34. see Gal. ii. 6.) r vv. 14, 18. Matt. xxi. 21. Mark xi. 22. Rom. xiv. 22. s 1 Cor. ii. 8. see Acts vii. 2. Eph. i. 17. Ps. xxviii. 3. double gen., 2 Pet. iii. 2.

ἀπάτης αὐτοῦ φθειρόμενον: but, as in ch. iv. 4, *the whole earthly creation*, separated from God and lying in sin, which, whether considered as consisting in the men who serve it, or the enticements which it holds out to evil lust (ἐπιθυμία), is to Christians a source of continual defilement. They, by their new birth unto God, are taken out of the world; but at the same time, by sin still dwelling in them, are ever liable to be enticed and polluted by it: and therefore must keep themselves (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 14), for fear of such pollution. This keeping is indeed in the higher sense God's work: cf. John xvii. 15: but it is also our work, 1 Tim. v. 22. The Commentators compare Isocr. ad Nicocl. p. 36, ἡγοῦ τοῦτο εἶναι θῦμα κάλλιστον καὶ θεραπείαν μεγίστην, ἐὰν βέλτιστον καὶ δικαιότατον σεαυτὸν παρέχῃς. Also Ps. l. 8—15: 1 Sam. xv. 22: Ps. xl. 7 f.: Sir. xxxv. 2).

CHAP. II. 1—13.] THE SIN OF RESPECT OF PERSONS: as the first of a series of reproofs for errors in practice which spring out of the mention of the νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας: cf. ch. i. 25 and ver. 12. The Apostle begins, as is his wont, with strong blame of the sin: then illustrates it, vv. 2—4: then gives the ground of its sinfulness, vv. 5—11, and concludes, vv. 12, 13, with a reference again to the law of liberty.

1—4.] *The warning, and its practical ground.* 1.] **My brethren, do not** (ἔχετε is not, as Schneckenburger, al., interrogative, but imperative, as ch. i. 16; iii. 1. The interrogative with μή may not always require a negative answer, but it always implies a doubt as to the fact questioned: 'Surely .... not ...?' e.g. μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός; "Surely this cannot be the Christ?" John iv. 29: μὴ πλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσει; "Surely he will not do more signs?" John vii. 31: &c. See Winer, § 57. 3, *b*. And this clearly cannot be the case here) **in respectings of persons** (ἐν, 'in,' i.e. in the practice of, in the midst of: see on ἔχετε below. The subst. is plur., to point out the various kinds and occasions of the fault. The fault itself, as here intended, is easily explained by the context, where an example is taken of one kind of it. Theile says well that it is, "iniquitas singulos Christianos non virtute sua christiana, sed fortuna qualitatibusque externis metiendi atque secundum hanc normam alios aliis præferendi." Notice, that ἐν προσωπολ. is put first, as carrying the weight of the dehortation, ἔχειν τὴν πίστιν following, as matter of course and existing fact) **hold** (ἔχετε has been taken wrongly: e.g. by Grot., "detinere velut captivam et inefficacem," = κατέχειν in the saying of St. Paul in Rom. i. 18, τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων: by Pott, as ἔχειν τινὰ ἐν ὀργῇ, ἐν αἰτίαις, ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, as Rom. i. 28, explaining it "religiosis partibus nimium studere," which however this construction would hardly bear. ἔχειν is simply to have or to hold, as ever in St. James, cf. ch. i. 4; iii. 14: and see reff.) **the faith** (not merely 'faith in,' but *the faith of*, thus setting before them more forcibly the utter inconsistency of such respect of persons with the service of Christ) **of our Lord Jesus Christ, (the Lord) of glory** (such I believe, with most Commentators, to be the construction of τῆς δόξης, though it is somewhat harsh and unusual. Others have been proposed, but all of them are more objectionable still: e.g. by Erasm. ("Nolite facere discrimen personarum juxta rerum mundanarum æstimationem"), and Calvin ("ex opinione"), as if it were ἐν δόξῃ προσωποληψίας or -ῶν: by Bengel ("Est appositio, ut ipse Christus dicatur ἡ δόξα, gloria, cf. Luc. ii. 32: Is. xl. 5: Eph. i. 17: 1 Pet. iv. 14;" none of which places justify the idea, seeing that in the two former a genitive follows δόξα, and the two latter rather support the common view): by Laurentius, who unites τῆς δόξης with χριστοῦ ("Christus gloriæ = Christus gloriosus"): finally by Huther, who would join τῆς δόξης with τὴν πίστιν (differing however from Grot. who doing this had made τοῦ κυρίου dependent on it, τὴν πίστιν τῆς δόξης τοῦ κυρίου, and from Gataker and Hottinger, who also doing it, make it = τὴν πίστιν ἔνδοξον), making it a gen. of the object, and τοῦ κυρ. ἡμ. Ἰ. χρ. a gen. of the subject—the faith, resting on our Lord Jesus Christ, in the (future) glory, i.e. τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς, Rom. viii. 18. And, he adds, this belief in the glory which shall be revealed is the more naturally mentioned here, because of the contrast between it and the passing glory of this world's pomp. Exactly: but that contrast is just as vivid on the common hypothesis. This last, complicated and harsh as it is, seems to me the only admissible one of all these interpretations. But it is surely far better, either to govern τῆς δόξης

2 ἐὰν γὰρ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς [t] συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν ἀνὴρ [u] χρυσοδακτύλιος ἐν [v] ἐσθῆτι [w] λαμπρᾷ, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ καὶ πτωχὸς ἐν [x] ῥυπαρᾷ [v] ἐσθῆτι, 3 [y] ἐπιβλέψητε δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν [z] φοροῦντα τὴν [v] ἐσθῆτα τὴν [w] λαμπράν, καὶ εἴπητε Σὺ κάθου ὧδε [a] καλῶς, καὶ τῷ πτωχῷ εἴπητε Σὺ στῆθι ἐκεῖ ἢ κάθου

t = here only. (Rev. ii. 9. iii. 9.) = ἐπισυν., Heb. x. 25.
u here only †. (not elsw.)
v here 3ce. Luke xxiii. 11. xxiv. 4. Acts (i. 10 v. r.) x. 30. xii. 21 only †. 2 Macc. viii. 35.
w of clothing, here bis. Luke xxiii. 11. Acts x. 30. Rev. xv. 6. xix. 8. (xviii. 4. xxii. 1, 16) only †. (Sir. xxix. 22 al.)
x Rev. xxii. 11 only. Zech. iii. 4, 5 only. (-πος, 1 Pet. iii. 21. -παρία, ch. i. 21.)
y Luke i. 48. ix. 38 only. Lev. xxvi. 9. 1 Kings i. 11.
z Matt. xi. 8. John xix. 5. Rom. xiii. 4. 1 Cor. xv. 49 (bis) only. Prov. xvi. 23, 27. Sir. xi. 5. xl. 4 only.
a see Luke vi. 26.

CHAP. II. 2. rec ins την bef συναγωγην, with AKL[P]ℵ³ rel Cyr[-p₁ Antch₁] Thl Œc: om BCℵ¹ c.

3. rec (for επιβλεψ. δε) και επιβλεψ., with A[K]Lℵ rel [vulg Syr sah æth] Œc Bede: txt BC[P] a c lat[-ff₁] syr Thl. rec aft ειπητε ins αυτω, with KL[P] rel vulg am [demid Syr coptt æth] Œc Bede: om ABCℵ a c j 13 fuld(and harl) lat-ff₁ syr arm Hesych-int Thl. η [και C] καθου bef εκει B lat-ff₁. rec aft 2nd καθου ins ωδε, with C²KL[P]ℵ rel Syr coptt [æth] Thl Œc: om ABC¹ a c 13 latt syr arm Cyr[-p₁]

by *κυρίου*, as a second genitive, or to regard it as the epithetal genitive which so constantly follows the mention of the divine Name, as *ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης* and the like. Both these are abundantly justified: see reff. Huther's objection to the first, that the full name *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* entirely completes the idea, and forbids another genitive following, is not decisive: just for the same reason that the full Name is given, viz. to make the contrast more solemn and striking, is the additional title *τῆς δόξης* given, to increase still further that solemnity. It is to be again noticed, how expressly St. James grounds Christian practice on the faith of Christ, in all its fulness. The *θρησκεία* just spoken of is here taken up and enlarged on; but its root and ground is *πίστις*, and that, *ἡ πίστις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης*). **2—4.]** *Hypothetical example*, to explain to them that to which he especially points. The hypothesis carries however in itself a foundation of fact, and appeals (*γάρ*) to the consciences of the readers whether it were not so. **2.] For** (q. d. that which I mean, is) **if there chance to have come** (aor. because the entrance is accomplished when that which is alleged takes place. This is better than to account for the aor., with Huther, by its being St. James's manner to designate by aorists a fact habitually repeated; the examples which he gives, ch. i. 11, 24, resting on another ground: see there) **into your assembly** (some have too hastily inferred from the word *συναγωγή* that the *Jewish synagogue* is meant. This, in the face of the organization of the church implied in ch. v. 14, would be impossible. The word may well be understood of a Christian assembly, so in Test. XII. Patrum, p. 747, *ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν*,—or as merely an assembly in general, cf. ref. Heb., *μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν*. But it is most likely here, from the allusions to sitting and standing below, a place of Christian worship, the name being a natural one, considering by whom the Epistle was written and to whom it is addressed) **a man with gold rings** (this *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* is expressed by *χρυσόχειρ* in Lucian, Timon, § 20. Wetst. has accumulated evidence of the practice of overloading the fingers with rings: e. g. Lucian, Somn. (Gall) 12, *ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχων . . . . . δακτυλίους βαρεῖς ὅσον ἑκκαίδεκα ἐξημμένους τῶν δακτύλων*: Martial xi. 60, "Senos Charinus omnibus digitis gerit, Nec nocte ponit annulos, nec dum lavatur") **in a splendid garment** (glittering, either in colour, or with ornaments), **and there have come in also a poor man in a vile garment** (reff.), **3.] and** (the *δέ* just expresses the change of subject, from the persons entering in, to the congregation) **ye look upon** (with respect, see reff.: so as to take into consideration) **the man wearing a splendid garment** (thus designated, because it is this which wins for him the respect—which attracts your notice) **and say, Sit thou** (*κάθου* for *κάθησο*, occurring Matt. xxii. 44: Luke xx. 42: Acts ii. 34: 1 Kings i. 23; xxii. 5: 4 Kings ii. 6 al., is not found in pure Greek. See Winer, § 14. 4) **here** (pointing out a spot to him: and that, as the contrast between *ὧδε* and *ἐκεῖ* shews, in the midst, near (for the words must be supposed to be spoken by those who would be the mouthpiece of the assembly) those in honour) **in a good place** (not, "*honorifice*," as Wahl, still less must **καλῶς** be supposed to mean "be so good as to" &c., as Storr), **and ye say to the poor man, Stand thou there, or sit under** (i. e. not literally *underneath*; but 'on the ground beside,' 'down by') **my**

ὑπὸ τὸ [b]ὑποπόδιόν μου, [4] οὐ [c]διεκρίθητε [d]ἐν [e]ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένεσθε [f]κριταὶ [gh]διαλογισμῶν [h]πονηρῶν; [5] ἀκου-

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

b Matt. v. 35. Acts ii. 35. vii. 49. Heb. i. 13. x. 13 only. Ps. cix. 1.
c = Matt. xxi. 21 ‖ Mk. Acts x. 20. (xi. 12 v. r.) Rom. iv. 20. xiv. 23. ch. i. 6 (bis).
d Matt. xvi. 7, 8.
e 2nd pers., ch. i. 22 reff.
f ch. iv. 11.
g = Rom. i. 21. 1 Cor. iii. 20. Ps. xciii. 11. gen., ch. i. 25 reff.
h Matt. xv. 19.

[Hesych-int] Aug_1. for *υπο*, *επι* B^2(assigned by Tischdf to his B^3) [P] a c d 13 syr sah [arm]. aft *υποποδιον* ins *των ποδων* A 13 vulg syrr [æth] Aug_1 $Hesych\text{-}int_1$.
4. rec ins *και* bef *ου*, with KL[P] rel Thl_{expr} $Œc_{expr}$: om ABCℵ a b^2 c h 13. 36 vulg syrr coptt [æth] arm Cyr[-p_1] $Antch_1$ [Hesych-int] Aug Bede.—om *ου* B^1 lat-ff_1.

footstool (Wiesinger calls ὑποπόδιον an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον: but see reff. Thus it is implied that the speaker is in a good place and furnished with a footstool. The question, argued at considerable length by Wiesinger and Huther, who these incomers are supposed to be, whether Christians, or Jews who have looked in as strangers, is perhaps hardly worth the trouble spent upon it. The illustration merely requires that they should be strangers, not having a regular place in the congregation. Certainly so far I agree with Huther, that there appears nothing in the text which compels us to assume them to be Christians. They are taken merely as samples of a class, the rich and the poor: and these two are dealt with again in vv. 5 ff., as classes of persons, out of one of which God hath chosen His people for the most part, and out of the other of which the oppressors of His people arise. So that it is better to leave the examples in their general reference), 4.] (Now comes the apodosis in the form of a question)—**did ye not** (in the case supposed) **doubt** (such is the constant sense of **διακρίνομαι** in the N. T. throughout (reff.), except in two passages, Acts xi. 2: Jude 9, where it means "disputing," a sense which cannot enter here (on Jude 22, see there). And here, the sense seems very good: 'Did ye not, in making such distinction between rich and poor, become of the number of those who doubt respecting their faith, ch. i. 6? Your faith abolishes such distinction: you set it up in practice. You are not then whole in that faith.' Various other explanations have been given, which Huther enumerates thus: **διακρίνεσθαι** 1. = "*separare:*" thus Schulthess, Semler, Erasm. Schmid, al., with the verb either passive, "Nonne inter vos ipsos estis discreti et separati?" or middle, "Nonne vos discernitis inter vos ipsos?" 2. = "*discrimen facere:*" a. the verb *active*, and that, *α. interrogative:* "Nonne discrimen fecistis apud vos ipsos?" so Laurentius, Grot., Wolf, Hottinger, Knapp: thus ἐν ἑαυτοῖς = ἐν ἀλλήλοις: Schneckenburger however gives it "in animis vestris," and makes "discrimen facere" to pass into an act of individual judgment, "statuere:" *β. negative:* "Then ye have not made a sound distinction in yourselves:" so Grashof: b. the verb *passive*, "Inter vos ipsos non estis discriminati, N. E. cessat piorum et impiorum differentia," Oeder. 3. = "*judicare:*" a. the verb *active:* and that, *α. interrogative:* "Nonne judicastis, deliberastis ipsi?" i. e. are ye not yourselves persuaded how wrong this is? Augusti: *β. negative:* "Non discrevistis justa deliberatione, considerantia et æstimatione, quid tribuendum esset pauperi potius vel certe non minus quam diviti," Bengel (Luther combines this rendering with that under (2): und bedenket es nicht recht, sondern ihr werdet Richter, und macht bösen Unterschied): here also comes in the explanation of Œc.: τὸ διακριτικὸν ὑμῶν διεφθείρατε, μηδεμίαν συζήτησιν ποιήσαντες πότερον τιμητέον, ... ἀλλ' οὕτως ἀδιακρίτως κ. ἐν προσωποληψίᾳ τὸν μὲν ἐτιμήσατε . . . . . . τὸν δὲ ἠτιμάσατε: b. the verb *passive:* and that, *α. interrogative:* "Nonne vos in conscientiis dijudicati, h. e. convicti estis?" Paræus: *β. negative:* "Et dijudicati inter vos ipsos non estis ut judicastis secundum prava ratiocinia vestra," Heisen. Cajetan, somewhat differently, "Hæc faciendo non estis judicati in vobis ipsis, sed estis judicati in vestibus et divitis et pauperis:" laying the chief stress on ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. 4. διακρίνεσθαι = '*dubitare,*' to entertain doubts: *α. interrogative:* "Et non dubitastis apud vosmetipsos? et facti estis iniqui judices?" "Should you not yourselves have entertained doubts? should you actually have passed evil-minded judgment?" Theile: *β. negative:* "Non dubitastis apud animum, ne scilicet quidem hæc cogitatio, id factum forte malum esse, sed certo apud vos statuistis id jure ac bene fieri."
The meaning above given is held by Keen, De Wette, Wiesinger, Huther) **within yourselves** (in your own minds, being at issue with your own faith), **and become judges** (in the case of the rich and poor; judges of the case before you), **of evil thoughts** (the gen. is one of quality, like ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, Luke xviii. 6: ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς, ch. i. 25: not an objective

σατε, [i] ἀδελφοί μου [i] ἀγαπητοί, οὐχ ὁ θεὸς [k] ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς [l] τῷ κόσμῳ πλουσίους [m] ἐν πίστει, καὶ [n] κληρονόμους τῆς [o] βασιλείας [p] ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς [q] ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν; [6] ὑμεῖς δὲ [r] ἠτιμάσατε τὸν πτωχόν. οὐχ οἱ πλούσιοι [s] καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ [t] ἕλκουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς [u] κριτήρια; [7] οὐκ αὐτοὶ [v w] βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν

i ch. i. 16 reff. k Mark xiii. 20. John vi. 70 al. 1 Cor. i. 27 bis, 28. Eph. i. 4 only in Epp. Deut. vii. 7. l dat., Acts vii. 20. 2 Cor. x. 4 al. Winer, § 31. 4. m = 1 Tim. i. 2. (Eph. ii. 4.) n Heb. i. 2 reff. o Gal. v. 21. Matt. xxv. 34 & passim. p attr., Heb. vi. 10 reff. q ch. i. 12 reff. r Mark xii. 4. Luke xx. 11. John viii. 49. Acts v. 41. Rom. i. 24. ii. 23 only. Prov. xxii. 22. s Acts x. 38 only. Ezek. xviii. 12, 16. t Acts xxi. 30 only. Eccl. i. 5. (-κύειν. Acts xvi. 19.) u 1 Cor. vi. 2, 4 only. Judg. v. 10 B. 3 Kings vii. 7. v = Rom. iii. 8. Tit. iii. 2. 2 Pet. ii. 2. w Rom. ii. 24 (from Isa. lii. 5). Rev. xiii. 6. xvi. 9.

5. rec (for *τω κοσμω*) *του κοσμου τουτου*, with æth: *του κοσμου* A²C²KL[P] rel lat-*ff*₁ Syr copt arm Thl Œc-comm: txt A¹BC¹א [syr].—*εν τω κοσμω* 27. 43. 64: *εν τ. κ. τουτω* 29 vulg. for *βασ.*, *επαγγελιας* Aא¹.
6. *ουχι* AC¹ a c. for *υμων*, *υμας* A[א¹] 19. 65 Hr.
7. for *ουκ*, *και* A c 13 syr æth.

gen., as Elsner, "Iniquas illas cogitationes approbastis:" and Bengel, "judices, approbatores, malarum cogitationum: i. e. divitum, foris splendentium, sed malis cogitationibus scatentium." The evil thoughts are in the judges themselves, and consist in the undue preference given by them to the rich. The same blame, of being a judge when a man ought to be an obeyer of the law, is found in ch. iv. 11. Notice also the parallel containing the same paronomasia, in Rom. xiv.: *σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου;* (ver. 10:) . . . . *ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγῃ κατακέκριται* (ver. 23))?

5.] **Listen, my beloved brethren** (bespeaking attention to that which follows, as shewing them in a marked manner the sin of their *προσωποληψία*), **Did not God choose out** (in His proceeding, namely, in the promulgation of the gospel by Christ, Matt. v. 3 ff.: Luke vi. 20. See also 1 Cor. i. 27) **the poor** (*τούς*, as a class, set against *οἱ πλούσιοι* as a class, below) **as regards the world** (reff.: or, those who in the world's estimation are accounted poor; but the dative of reference is most likely here, as in *παιδία ταῖς φρεσίν*, and the like) **rich in faith** (i. e. to be rich in faith, or so that they are rich in faith: the words are not in apposition with *τοὺς πτωχούς*, as Erasmus, al., but form a predicatory specification of them. *ἐν πίστει*, as the element, *the world*, so to speak, *in which they pass for rich*, as in ref. 1 Tim.: not as the material of which their riches consist, as in ref. Eph. Wiesinger well says, "Not the measure of *faith*, in virtue of which one man is richer than another, is before the Writer's mind, but the *substance* of the faith, by virtue of which substance every believer is rich. The riches are the treasures of salvation, and especially, owing to the following *κληρονόμους*, the sonship in God's family." And similarly Calvin, "Non qui fidei magnitudine abundant, sed quos Deus variis Spiritus sui donis locupletavit, quæ fide percipimus"), **and heirs of the kingdom which He promised** (Luke xii. 31, 32 al.) **to them that love Him?** 6.] *Contrast to God's estimate of the poor.* **But ye dishonoured the poor man** (in the case just now put: with reference also to which the aor. is used. "Indignum est dejicere quos Deus extollit, et quos honore dignatur probrose tractare: atqui Deus pauperes honorat: ergo pervertit Dei ordinem quisquis eos rejicit." Calv. This is his first argument. Now, vv. 6, 7, he brings in another, deduced from the conduct of rich men towards Christians and towards Christ Himself). **Do not the rich** (opposed as a class, to *τοὺς πτωχούς* above. This serves to shew that *ὁ πλούσιος*, when generally spoken of in the Epistle, as e. g. ch. i. 10, is not the Christian rich man, but the rich man as such, in his worldliness and enmity to God) **oppress you** (see ref. So *κατακυριεύειν*, Matt. xx. 25: 1 Pet. v. 3: *κατεξουσιάζειν*, Matt. xx. 25: all signifying to use power, or lordship, or licence, against any to his hurt), **and is it not they that** (such is the force of the *αὐτοί*, again repeated below: not that they themselves *ἕλκουσιν κ.τ.λ.*) **drag you** (so "a lictoribus trahi," Livy ii. 27: see reff. The term implies violence) **to courts of judgment** (see ch. v. 6, *κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον.* The words may refer either to persecutions, or to oppressive law-suits; or perhaps to both, as Apollinarius in the Catena, *τοῦτο μὲν οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἄρχοντες, ἐκ τῶν καρποφοριῶν πλουτοῦντες· τοῦτο δὲ καὶ οἱ τὰ Ῥωμαίων διοικοῦντες πράγματα, εἰδωλολατροῦντες τότε.* See on the matter, ref. 1 Cor.)? 7.] **Is it not they that** (on *αὐτοί*, see above) **blaspheme**

[w] ὄνομα τὸ [x] ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς; [8] εἰ [y] μέντοι νόμον [z] τελεῖτε [a] βασιλικόν, [b] κατὰ τὴν [b] γραφήν, [c] Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, [d] καλῶς [d] ποιεῖτε· [9] εἰ δὲ [e] προσ-

ABCKL P[2] a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

x Acts xv. 17, from Amos ix. 12. y John iv. 27 al[4]. 2 Tim. ii. 19. Jude 8 only. z = Rom. ii. 27. Gal. v. 16. a Acts xii. 20, 21 (John iv. 46, 49) only. Num. xx. 17 (see note). b 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. c Matt. v. 43 al., from Levit. xix. 18. d = Acts x. 33. 1 Cor. vii. 37, 38. Phil. iv. 14. ver. 19. 2 Pet. i. 19. 3 Kings viii. 8. e here only †. see ver. 1 reff.

επικεκληθεν C[1].

8. βασιλικον bef τελειτε C syr Antch$_1$ [ins τον bef βασ. P]. for σεαυτ., σαυτον B: εαυτον b c d f j k m o[2] 36 [Antch$_1$]: εαυτους a.

(actually and literally, in words, it being, as we have maintained throughout, ungodly and heathens who are pointed at. Those who maintain them to be Christian rich men, would understand βλασφημεῖν, to disgrace by their lives: but apart from other objections, Huther has remarked well, that when the verb is thus used, it is ordinarily in the passive with διά,—see Rom. ii. 24: Titus ii. 5: 2 Pet. ii. 2: Isa. lii. 5,—not as a direct active governing a case, which is far more naturally taken in its literal sense) **the goodly name which was called on you** (i. e. which when you were admitted into Christ's Church by baptism was made yours, so that you are called χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. iii. 23 (not necessarily χριστιανοί: no particular form of the appropriation of the name is alluded to, but only the fact of the name being called over them. The appellation may or may not have been in use at this time, for aught that this shews). The name is of course that of *Christ:* not that of "God," as Storr and Schulthess, nor that of "brethren," as some. On the phrase ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ', see, besides reff., Deut. xxviii. 10: 2 Chron. vii. 14: Isa. iv. 1: also Gen. xlviii. 16)? So that if ye thus dishonour the poor in comparison with the rich, you are, 1. contravening the standard of honour which God sets up in His dealings: 2. opposing your own interest: 3. helping to blaspheme the name of Christ. 8—11.] *Proof that this behaviour is a transgression of God's law.* The connexion is somewhat recondite. The adversative μέντοι clearly takes exception at something expressed or understood. Calvin, Corn. a-Lap., Laurentius, al., and Theile, Wiesinger, and Huther, suppose the Apostle to be meeting an objection of his readers: "But thus, according to you, we should be breaking the injunction, Love thy neighbour &c., for we should view the rich with hatred and contempt." Then he replies, "Certainly, if ye &c. ye do well:" understanding καλῶς π. as a very feeble approbation. But this seems to me very unnatural. It contains indeed the germ of the true view, which appears to be this: The Apostle is not replying to a fancied objection on the part of others, but is guarding his own argument from misconstruction: q. d. 'All this is true of the rich. Still I do not say, hate them, drive them from your assemblies &c.: if you choose to observe faithfully the great command, Love others as yourselves, in your conduct to all, well and good (καλῶς ποιεῖτε): but respect of persons, instead of being a keeping, is a breach of this law; for I have proved it to be sin, and he who commits sin is a transgressor of the law, of the whole law, by the very terms of legal obedience.' Thus the context seems to run smoothly and naturally. 8.] **Yet** (for the connexion see above. Keen, Schneckenburger, al. try to make μέντοι mean "*igitur*," which it never can: see reff.) **if ye fulfil** (emphasis on τελεῖτε, as put before the epithet; if ye really choose to *fulfil* in its completeness that law) **the royal law** (the law which is the king of all laws, as the old saying makes law itself king of all: νόμος πάντων βασιλεύς. Love fulfils the whole law, πλήρωμα νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη, Rom. xiii. 10. See similar expressions in Wetst. and Kypke from Plato, al.: the most remarkable being this: ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασι τοῖς περὶ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων, καὶ ὅλως περὶ πόλεως διακοσμήσεώς τε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὡς χρὴ πόλιν διοικεῖν, τὸ μὲν ὀρθὸν νόμος ἐστὶ βασιλικός, τὸ δὲ μὴ ὀρθὸν οὐ δοκεῖ νόμος εἶναι βασιλικός. . . . . ἔστι γὰρ ἄνομον. Plato, Minos, pp. 566 f. The explanations, Because it proceeds from God, the great King (Raphel, Wetst., Wolf, al.), from Christ (Grot.), because it applies to kings as well as other men (Michaelis), because "reges facit" (Thomus), Calvin's, "Regia lex dicitur, ut *via regia*, plana scilicet, recte et æquabilis, qui sinuosis deverticulis, vel ambagibus tacite opponitur," &c., are all objectionable, as not bringing in any epithet contextually justified, or peculiarly belonging to this and not to other laws: whereas "that first of all laws" fits excellently the requirements of the context), **according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well** (i. e. *well and good:* see above: if you choose to do this, '*do manus,*' I have nothing to object.

ωπολημπτεῖτε, ἁμαρτίαν [f] ἐργάζεσθε, [g] ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ὡς [h] παραβάται. [10] ὅστις γὰρ ὅλον τὸν [i] νόμον [ik] τηρήσῃ, [l] πταίσῃ δὲ ἐν ἑνί, γέγονεν πάντων [m] ἔνοχος. [11] ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν [n] Μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, εἶπεν καὶ [n] Μὴ φονεύσῃς· εἰ δὲ οὐ μοιχεύεις φονεύεις δέ, γέγονας [h] παραβάτης

f = Matt. vii. 23. Acts x. 35 al. Ps. xiii. 4. xxvii. 3.
g — & constr., Luke iii. 19. [John viii. 9 v. r.] 1 Cor. xiv. 24. (Heb. xii. 5.)
h here bis. Rom. ii. 25, 27. Gal. ii. 18 only †. Ps. xvi. 4 Symm. (-βασις, Heb. ii. 2.)
i Acts xv. 5 (24 v. r.) only. see Wisd. vi. 18.
k = Matt. xix. 17. Acts xxi. 25. 1 Tim. vi. 14. 1 John ii. 3 al.
l (=) Rom. xi. 11. ch. iii. 2 (bis). 2 Pet. i. 10 only. 1 Kings iv. 2.
m constr., Matt. xxvi. 66. Mark iii. 29. xiv. 64. 1 Cor. xi. 27. Heb. ii. 15 only. (Matt. v. 21, &c.) 2 Macc. xiii. 6.
n Exod. xx. 13, 14. Deut. v. 17, 18.

10. for οστις, ος C. τον νομον bef ολον C m. rec τηρησει, with KL[P] rel coptt: πληρωσει A a c 63-9 [syr(appy)]: πληρωσας τηρησει 13: txt BCℵ Thl Œc, *servaverit* latt Jer$_1$. rec πταισει, with KL[P] rel: txt ABCℵ Thl Œc Jer$_2$, *peccaverit* lat-*ff*$_1$, *offendat* vulg.

11. ειπας A. μοιχευσις ℵ [13: -σεις L k]. transp μοιχευσης and φονευσης (*order of ref Deut and Exod*-A) C a c 69. 106 syr arm Thl. rec (2nd time) μοιχευσεις φονευσεις, with K rel Thl [-σης LP], *mœchaberis occideris* latt(*occides* vulg): txt ABCℵ 36. for γεγονας, εγενου A 13. for παραβ., αποστατης A (but not 13 as Tischdf [ed 7] from Scholz).

But then, this you can never do, as long as you respect persons): 9.] **but if ye respect persons, it is sin that ye are working** (not obedience to this royal law), **being** (i. e. seeing that ye are) **convicted by the law as transgressors** (viz. by virtue of what I have already proved as wrong in your conduct. "Deus enim proximos jubet diligere, non eligere personas." Calv.). 10.] *The fact of transgression of this law is proved* by its *solidarity*, not admitting of being broken in one point and yet kept in the whole. "Hoc tantum sibi vult," says Calvin, "Deum nolle cum exceptione coli, neque ita partiri nobiscum, ut nobis liceat si quid minus allubescit, ex ejus lege resecare." **For whosoever shall have kept** (reff.) **the whole law, but shall have offended** (stumbled) **in** (the matter of: as in ch. iii. 2: see there) **one thing** (one thing enjoined, one commandment, as by and by explained: not as Schulthess, ἑνὶ ἀνθρώπῳ; nor as Œc., al., τοῦτο περὶ ἀγάπης εἴρηκε (so the Schol.-Matthæi, ἐν ἑνὶ πταίσειν ἐστί, τὸ μὴ τελείαν ἔχειν ἀγάπην): nor is it to be limited to commandments carrying capital punishment, as Grot., al. It is better to understand ἐντάλματι than νόμῳ (as De W., Wies., Huther, al.), seeing that νόμος here is evidently used collectively for the sum of the commandments, and so πάντων τῶν νόμων could not be said), **has become guilty** (brought into the condemning power of, involved in, see reff. The more usual construction is to put the *punishment*, in which a man is involved, in the genitive, as in reff. Matt. and Mark: sometimes in the dative, as in Matt. v. 21 f. The classical construction is to put both the crime and the punishment in the dative: so ἔνοχος τῇ προδοσίᾳ, Demosth.: τῇ γραφῇ, δίκαις, ὀνείδει, &c., Plato, Xen. Sometimes however we have the gen.: as ἔνοχος λειποταξίου, Demosth. See Palm and Rost, sub voce) **of all** (things mentioned as objects of prohibition—for such is the reference here, see below—in the law). 11.] *Reason for this assertion:* the unity of the divine Author of the whole law, and of that law, as the exponent of His will: "Unus est, qui totam legem tulit: cujus voluntatem qui una in re violant, totam violant," Bengel. Cf. also Aug. Ep. ad Hieronym. on this passage. **For He who said, Commit not adultery, said also, Commit not murder; now if thou committest no adultery** (οὐ, and not μή, because the attention is fixed on the fact of *no* committal of adultery having taken place. It corresponds, *in fact*, to μὴ μοιχεύσῃς above in prohibition. See Winer, § 55. 2, *c. d:* and cf. ch. i. 23; iii. 2: 1 Cor. xvi. 22), **but committest murder, thou hast become a transgressor of the law.** (Various fanciful reasons have been given for the selection of these two commandments: "because these two were punished with death," Baumgarten: "because no one had laid a charge of adultery against the readers, but the other they violated by violating the law of love," Wiesinger. But it is far more likely that they are alleged as the two first which regard our duty to our neighbour generally: μὴ μοιχεύσῃς being put first, as in Mark x. 19: Luke xviii. 20: Rom. xiii. 9: Philo de Decalog. § 10, 12, 24, 32, vol. ii. pp. 186, 189, 201, 207, who lays a stress on this order as shewing that adultery is μέγιστον ἀδικημάτων: see also De Spec. Leg. ad 6 et 7 Dec. Cap. § 2, p. 300. So that this order must have been one preserved in

νόμου. [12] ᵒ οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε ᵒ ὡς διὰ ᵖ νόμου ᵖ ἐλευθερίας ᑫ μέλλοντες ᑫ κρίνεσθαι. [13] ʳ ἡ γὰρ ʳ κρίσις ˢ ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ᵗ ποιήσαντι ᵗ ἔλεος. ᵘ κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως.

[14] ᵛ Τί τὸ ᵛ ὄφελος, ἀδελφοί μου, ἐὰν ʷ πίστιν λέγῃ τὶς

o John vii. 46. 1 Cor. iii. 15. ix. 26. Eph. v. 28.
p ch. i. 25 reff.
q see Acts xvii. 31. 2 Tim. iv. 1. (1 Pet. iv. 5.)
r = Matt. xii. 41 ‖ L. Luke x. 14 al.
s here only †.
t Luke i. 72. x. 37. Gen. xl. 14. (l.) 11, 38. Zech. x. 12 only. constr., 1 Tim. v. 11.
u Rom. xi. 18 bis. ch. iii. 14 only. Jer. xxvii.
v ver. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 32 only. Job xv. 3 only.
w ver. 1 reff.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13 [P is much mutilated in vv. 12—21.]

13. rec ανιλεως, with L a b² d [Ephr₁ Cæs₁] Chr₁ Thl: ανιλεος b¹ l²: ανηλεος h 13: ανελεως f: txt ABCKℵ rel 36 Œc [(. . .)λεος P]. rec ins και bef κατακαυχ., with æth Thl: add δε A ℵ³(but erased) [13(Tischdf)] 40. 73. 83. 101 vulg lat-ff₁ syr Œc: txt BCKLℵ¹ rel 36 Syr coptt. [P def.] κατακαυχασθω A 13. 27-9 copt: -χασθε C² Syr: txt B(-χατε, sic: see table) KLℵ rel 36 latt Thl Œc Aug. [P def.] for 2nd ελεος, ελεον CKL rel 36 Œc: txt ABℵ a b¹ c g o Thl. [P def.]

14. om το BC¹ [arm]. τις bef λεγη AC 56 [latt coptt].

ancient tradition: or perhaps found anciently in the LXX. The Rabbis have the same sentiment as this: Wolf quotes from the Talm. Sabbath, fol. lxx. 2, where R. Jochanan says of the 39 precepts of Moses, "Quod si faciat omnia, unum vero omittat, omnium et singulorum reus est.")

12, 13.] *Concluding and summary exhortations*, to speak and act as subject to the law of liberty and love. **12.]** **So speak** (pres. as regarding a habit of life) **and so do** (οὕτως both times does not regard what has gone before, but what follows: *οὕτως, ὡς*. *Speaking* had been before hinted at in ch. i. 19: and will come again under consideration in ch. iii.), **as being about to be judged by** (by means of, as the measure by which your lives will be estimated) **the law of liberty** (the same as in ch. i. 25: that perfect expansion of God's will, resting on the free unrestrained principle of love, which is the moral code of the gospel. And the point of the exhortation is as Schol.-Matthæi, *οὕτως τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐργάζεσθε ὡς μὴ ὑπὸ νόμου ἀναγκαζόμενοι, ἀλλ' αὐθαίρετοι*). **13.]** *Reason why we should be careful thus to speak and do*: viz. that if we do not, we cast ourselves out of that merciful judgment at God's hands which is promised to the merciful: Matt. v. 7, *μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται*, which is the key to our verse. **For the judgment** (which is coming) **(shall be) unmerciful** (Luther makes *ἀνέλεος* an epithet, es wird ein unbarmherziges Gericht ergeben, which would require the absence of the article) **to him who wrought not** (the aor. is proleptical, the Writer standing at the day of the judgment and looking back over life) **mercy: mercy boasteth over judgment** (without a copula, the sentence is introduced more emphatically and strikingly. The meaning is, the judgment which would condemn any and all of us, is, in the case of the merciful, overpowered by the blessed effect of mercy, and mercy prevails over it. The saying is abstract: to turn it into a concrete, 'the merciful man,' or to appropriate the *ἔλεος*, 'the mercy of God,' is to limit that which is purposely and weightily left unlimited as an universal truth). **14—26.]** In close connexion with what has gone before, the Apostle sets forth that *bare faith without works can never save a man*. The following remarks of De Wette on the passage are important, and well condensed. They have been impugned by many, among whom are Neander, Schneckenburger, Theile, Thiersch, Hofmann: but they seem to me best to represent the simple and honest view of the matter, without any finessing to make the two Apostles in exact accord in their meaning of terms and their positions respecting them (Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. pp. 556—563, is worth consulting for a good statement of the other view): "In order rightly to understand this polemical passage, it is necessary accurately to define St. James's ideas of *faith*, of *works*, and of *justification*, and to compare them with those of St. Paul. *Faith* is, according to St. James, the result of the reception of the Word (ch. i. 22), especially in a moral point of view: *moral conviction* (Rom. xiv. 23): and although he recognizes it also as belief in Christ (ch. ii. 1), *as trust* (i. 6; v. 15), and *truth* (i. 3), yet he makes these particulars here of so little moment, that he regards it as *theoretical* belief only, and ascribes it to the evil spirits (ii. 19). Widely different from this is St. Paul's idea of faith, which presupposes self-abasement, the feeling of unworthiness and incapability (Rom. iii. 9 ff., 23), and consists in trust on the grace of God revealed in the atoning death of Christ (Rom. iii. 25; v. 8: 2 Cor. v. 18 f.). Of this faith, moral faith is a branch (Rom. xiv. 23): but this

[w] ἔχειν, [x] ἔργα δὲ μὴ [x] ἔχῃ; μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶσαι αὐτόν; [15] ἐὰν δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ [y] ὑπάρχωσιν

x ch. i. 4.
y Luke vii. 25. Acts viii. 16. Gal. i. 14. 2 Pet. i. 8. ii. 19. iii. 11.

15. om δε BℵNd m 13 lat-*ff*₁(and spec) copt arm. [P def.]

latter, which is the adoption of the working principle of love (Gal. v. 6), can only spring from the purification of the inner man by faith in the atonement. So that it is impossible to say, as some have done, that the idea of faith in the two Apostles is the same. Works, according to St. James, are not the works of the law in the lower sense, the mere observance of carnal ordinances and usages,—but an active life of practical morality, the rule of which is indeed found in the Mosaical law, and especially in the command to love one another, but so found, as apprehended and appropriated by the spirit of liberty (see ch. i. 25; ii. 12). St. Paul also understands by 'the works of the law' not merely ceremonial observances, as plainly appears from Rom. vii. 14 ff.: but when he contends against the Jewish righteousness by works, and their pride, as in Rom. ix. 30 ff., he includes these observances in that to which he refers. As regards *justification*, St. James understands it in a *proper*, or moral sense (cf. Matt. xii. 37), which St. Paul also recognizes. But in the latter Apostle's idea of justification, we must distinguish a threefold point of view: 1. the general moral, at which he stops, Rom. ii. 13 (cf. ib. ver. 5 ff.), taking no account, *how* the highest aim of morality, there indicated, is *to be* attained, and *is* attained: 2. in his polemical point of view, as combating Jewish righteousness by works, he denies that we can, by the fulfilment of the law (even of its moral part, seeing that no man fulfils it aright), attain justification or well-pleasingness to God (Rom. iii. 20: Gal. ii. 16): 3. in the third point of view also, in the Christian life itself, St. Paul recognizes the inadequacy of a good conscience to give peace and blessedness to men (1 Cor. iv. 4), and finds peace only in faith in God, who justifies him of His free grace, i. e. so looks on and accepts him, as if he were righteous. This higher kind of justification, St. James does not recognize." A good résumé of the literature of the passage will be found in Wiesinger, p. 122, note. The whole question of fact, as to whether St. Paul's teaching, or some misunderstanding of it, or neither the one nor the other, was in St. James's view here, I have discussed in the Prolegomena, § iii. 5 ff. 14.] **What is the profit** (arising from that to be mentioned: the resulting profit), **my brethren, if** (so ἐάν after τί ὠφεληθήσεται, Matt. xvi. 26: 1 Cor. xiii. 3) **any man say** (there is no emphasis on λέγῃ, as many (Vorst, Piscator, Wolf, Baumgarten, Pott, Stier) have supposed: both its place in the sentence, after πίστιν, forbids this, and more decisively still the context, in which the whole argument proceeds on the hypothesis of his *possessing* faith: and in ver. 19, faith is actually ascribed to the τίς. At the same time it is not to be wholly passed over, that the Apostle has written not ἔχῃ, but λέγῃ ἔχειν. While this does not imply any want of genuineness in the faith, it perhaps slightly distinguishes the possession of such faith from the absolute πίστιν ἔχειν: or, as Huther, belongs to the dramatic form of the hypothesis, in which the man is introduced boasting of and appealing to his faith) **that he has faith** (no stress to be laid on the failure of the art. before πίστιν, as is done by Schneckenburger, "Recte articulo caret, quum non habeat τὴν πίστιν." This is sufficiently refuted by St. Paul's similar anarthrous use of πίστις, where it is spoken of in the highest sense, and by our Lord's command, ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ, Mark xi. 22) **but have not works** (i. e. those acts in his life which are proofs and fruits of faith: not mere ceremonial works: see De Wette's remarks cited above)**?** (a note of interrogation, not a comma, is to be placed here. The sentence contains two distinct but connected questions: 'What is the profit, if' &c.? and, 'Can' &c.? Otherwise we leave τί τὸ ὄφελος insulated, and make μὴ δύναται stand unnaturally in an interrogative apodosis) **Can (his) faith** (ἡ, merely because, by the hypothesis λέγῃ πίστιν ἔχειν, the πίστις is now become definite, is appropriated, according to the general rule by which that which has been anarthrously introduced at the first mention, has the art. when next mentioned: not as Bede, "fides illa, quam vos habere dicitis:" nor as Theile, "quæ non habetur revera sed dicitur tantummodo et jactatur") **save him** (see for σῶσαι, ch. i. 21. αὐτόν is noticeable, as confining the question within the limits of the hypothesis, by making this particular man, who has faith and not works, the object of the question, and not τινα, any, or every man. Here, and not in λέγῃ, nor in ἡ πίστις, lies the true key to the nullity of the faith in question)**?** 15, 16.] *The quality, and un-*

a = ch. i. 4, 5 (reff.) only. a here only †. ἐφ. τρ., Dion. Hal. viii. 41. b see Mark v. 34. Acts xvi. 36. Luke vii. 50. c Mark xiv. 54, 67 || J. only. Job xxxi. 20. Hag. i. 6. d Matt. v. 6. xiv. 20 al. Ps. xxxvi. 19. e here only. 1 Chron. xxviii. 2 only. Wisd. iv. 5 al. f ver. 14. g = Heb. vi. 1. ix. 14. Rev. iii. 1. h Acts xxviii. 16 only. Gen. xliii. 32. see Rom. xiv. 22. i 1 Cor. xv. 35.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

καὶ a λειπόμενοι τῆς a ἐφημέρου τροφῆς, 16 εἴπῃ δέ τις αὐτοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν b Ὑπάγετε ἐν b εἰρήνῃ, c θερμαίνεσθε καὶ d χορτάζεσθε, μὴ δῶτε δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ e ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος, τί τὸ f ὄφελος; 17 οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις, ἐὰν μὴ f ἔχῃ f ἔργα, g νεκρά ἐστιν h καθ' ἑαυτήν. 18 ἀλλ' i ἐρεῖ τις Σὺ f πίστιν f ἔχεις, κἀγὼ f ἔργα f ἔχω· δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων, κἀγὼ δείξω σοι ἐκ τῶν

rec aft λειπομενοι ins ωσι, with AL[P] rel Thl Œc: om BCKℵ syrr coptt [æth arm] Antch$_1$.

16. for ειπη δε, και ειπη A d 13 Syr sah æth.—ειπει ℵ[1]. for τις, τι ℵ[1]. υπαγε C[1](appy) 63. om το BC[1]. [P def.]

17. rec εργα bef εχη, with L rel (copt) [æth] Thl Œc: txt ABCKℵ a b d m o 13. 36 latt sah, απεχη εργα c. [P def.]

18. rec (for χωρις) εκ, with KL rel Thl: om ABC[P]ℵ a m 13 latt syrr coptt [æth] arm. rec aft 1st εργων ins σου, with CKL rel [æth] Thl: om AB[P]ℵ a c 13 latt syrr coptt [arm] (om μου also (aft 2nd εργων) latt syr). σοι bef δειξω Bℵ a c j m:

profitableness, of such faith shewn, as in vv. 2, 3, *by a familiar example*. 15.] **But** (δέ takes up the argument against the person supposed, or against his fautors: and is not, as Wiesinger, merely transitional [it is best rendered in English by beginning the sentence abruptly, not giving any word for it]) **if a brother or a sister** (the case of a Christian brother or sister is supposed, to bring out more strongly the obligation to help, as a duty) **be** (found, on your access to them: see, on ὑπάρχω and εἰμί, reff.: and note, Acts xvi. 20) **naked** (there is no need to interpret γυμνοί "*male vestiti*," as so many Commentators: extreme destitution and nakedness in the literal, or almost literal sense, might well go together) **and destitute of** (reff.: Pind. Isthm. ii. 18, κτεάνων λειφθεὶς ἅμα καὶ φίλων: Soph. Trach. 932, οὔτ' ὀδυρμάτων ἐλείπετ' οὐδέν. The usage is confined to St. James in the N. T.) **daily food** (the food for each day, τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν ἀναγκαίας τροφῆς: not "*quod in unum diem sufficit*," as Morus, nor "for the current day," as Hottinger), 16.] **and** (δέ brings in the slight contrast between the want and the manner of its supply) **some one from among you** (not, as Grot., of you "qui fidem creditis sufficere ad salutem," but generally; and put in this form to bring the inference nearer home to themselves) **say** (rather, '*shall have said*,' not λέγῃ: but the force of the aor. cannot be given in English without overdoing it), **Go in peace** (see, besides reff., Judg. xviii. 6: 2 Kings xv. 9 LXX. The words would imply, that the wants were satisfied), **be warmed** (as being γυμνοί) **and filled** (both are in the present, as indicating the state in which),—**but ye** (answering to the τὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν, and now applying the hypothesis to all) **give them not** (*have not given them*: but see above on εἴπῃ) **the necessaries of the body** (so Herod. ii. 174, ὅκως μιν ἐπιλείποι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια κ.τ.λ.: Thuc. ii. 23, ὅσον εἶχον τὰ ἐπιτήδεια. See Kypke's note here, and Wetstein), **what is the profit** (τό, see above, ver. 14)? 17.] *Application of the similitude*. **So also faith, if it have not** (be not accompanied by as its proper result. Here, again, the quasi-identification of the πίστις with the man, and ascription of the ἔργα to it as a possession, shew in what relative places the two stand in the Apostle's estimate) **works, is dead** (so Plautus in a remarkably similar passage, Epidic. i. 2. 13, "Nam quid te igitur retulit Beneficum esse oratione, si ad rem auxilium emortuum est?") **in itself** (not as E. V., "being alone," καθ' ἑαυτὴν οὖσα: nor, "against itself" = καθ' ἑαυτῆς, as Möller, al.; nor is it to be joined to πίστις, "fides sola," as Knapp and Baumgarten ("*in as far as it is alone*"): but the words belong to and qualify νεκρά, as De W., Huther, al.; it is dead, not merely "ad rem," as Plaut. above, but absolutely, καθ' ἑαυτήν, in itself: has no living root whereby it energizes. Cf. Palm and Rost under ἑαυτοῦ, καθ' ἑαυτό, an und für sich). 18.] **But** (in any case of faith without works, analogous to that supposed above, of one of you having dismissed the naked and hungry with mere words) **some one will say** (he will be liable to this reproach from any one who takes the more effectual and sensible method, of uniting faith with works), **Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me** (not, '*prove*

ἔργων μου τὴν πίστιν. 19 σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς ὁ θεός ἐστιν. [j] καλῶς [j] ποιεῖς· καὶ τὰ [k] δαιμόνια [l] πιστεύουσιν, καὶ [m] φρίσσουσιν. 20 [n] θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι, ὦ ἄνθρωπε

j ver. 8 reff. k Gospp. passim. Acts xvii. 18. 1 Cor. x. 20 bis. 1 Tim. iv. 1. Rev. ix. 20. Deut. xxxii. 17. l plur., Matt. vi. 28. 1 Cor. x. 11. Rev. i. 19 al. Ps. cxliv. 10. Winer § 58. 3, a. m here only. Job iv. 15. Jer. ii. 12. n John v. 40. 1 Pet. iii. 10 reff.

om δ. σ. lat-ff_1 æth. [P def.] rec aft 3rd πιστιν ins μου, with AKL [P(.)ου] rel Thl Œc: om BCℵ a c 13 lat-ff_1 [arm].

19. rec ο θεος bef εἷς, with L rel Did_1 Œc: εἷς εστ. ο θ. Aℵ 68 vulg Syr coptt æth-pl arm Cyr_1[-p]: ο θ. εστ., addg εἷς in marg bef εστ., K: txt (B)C (a c) lat-ff_1 syr æth [-rom] Thl.—om ο B a c l m [Thl].—om εστιν lat-ff_1 æth-rom Cyr_1. [P def.]

to me,' but 'exhibit to me,' 'ostenta mihi') **thy faith without the works** (which ought to accompany it), **and I will shew thee my faith by** (from the evidence of, out of, as the ground of the manifestation) **my works.** The whole difficulty found in this verse by Commentators has arisen from overlooking the fact that it continues the argument from the previous verses, and does not begin a new portion of the subject. And the reason why this has been overlooked, is, the occurrence between the two of the general clause in ver. 17. The same mistaken person is in the Apostle's view throughout, down to ver. 22: and it is as addressed to him, on the part of a chance objector to his inconsistency, that the **ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις** is introduced: the **ἀλλά** conveying the opposition of an objection not to the Apostle himself, but to him whom the Apostle is opposing. For the various and curious difficulties and confusions which have been raised on the verse, see Huther's note. **19.**] Still addressed to the same soli-fidian, but now directly, and not in the person of the ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις. This is better than to suppose the τις still speaking; on account of the length of argumentation before the second person singular is dropped, and the analogy of the two arguments drawn from Abraham and Rahab, both of which most naturally come, as the latter on any view does, from the Apostle himself. **Thou believest** (better without an interrogation: see John xvi. 31, note) **that God is one** (or with the reading εἷς θεός, 'that there is one God.' The Apostle selects, from all points of dogmatic belief, that one which stands at the head of the creed of Jews and Christians alike. Cf. especially Deut. vi. 4: Neh. ix. 6: Mark xii. 29, 32: Rom. iii. 30: 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6: ch. iv. 12: and the Shepherd of Hermas, ii. 1, p. 914, πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός. De Wette and Wiesinger have noticed that the construction with ὅτι after πιστεύεις instead of εἰς or ἐν, implies that merely a theoretical faith is spoken of. But against this view there are two objections: 1. that εἰς or ἐν could hardly have been used in this case, where the existence (εἷς θεός) or the unity (εἷς ὁ θεός) of God is spoken of as the object of belief: 2. that ὅτι after πιστεύω does undoubtedly elsewhere express the highest kind of realizing faith: e. g. Mark xi. 23, 24: John vi. 69; xi. 27, 42; xiv. 10, 11; xvii. 8, 21; xx. 31 al.): **thou doest well** (i. e. either understood simply, 'so far is well:' 'it is a good faith, as far as it goes:' or understood ironically, as Calv. al., "ac si dixisset, Hoc magnum est, infra diabolos subsidere:" only that "*infra* diab." is further than the text assumes: rather, 'diabolis, quod ad fidem, æquari.' The former seems preferable; it is hardly likely that the Apostle would speak slightingly even 'argumenti causa,' of so fundamental an article of the faith): **the dæmons also** (not, the *dæmoniacs*, as Wetst., though his explanation is specious, "qui per exorcismos et pronuntiationem nominum Dei Hebræorum sanari dicuntur:" nor as Schneckenburger, al., the *dæmons in the possessed*, who trembled at the sacred Name: but simply, as usually, the evil spirits) **believe** (the verb is purposely used absolutely: not merely, 'believe this truth,' but, '*thus far, are believers* in common with thyself'), **and** (not to be diluted into ἀλλὰ καί, as Pott, or "*atqui*," as Theile: the keenness of the sarcasm lies in the simple copula) **shudder** (**φρίσσω**, properly of the hair standing on end with terror. Their belief does nothing for them but certify to them their own misery. "Hoc, præter exspectationem lectoris additum, magnam vim habet." Bengel). **20—23.**] *Proof of the uselessness of faith without works, from the example of Abraham: introduced by a severe and triumphant appeal to the objector.* **20.**] **But** (passing on to another example which is to prove it even more certainly) **wilt thou know** (the use of θέλεις serves to shew that the knowledge itself is plain and palpable, and the resisting it can only arise from perversity), **O** (this interjection is generally found, in the N. T., in conjurations or vituperations: e. g. Rom. ii. 1, 3;

o = here only. (see Acts iv. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 10, &c.)
p = 2 Pet. i. 8 (reff.). Wisd. xiv. 5.
q Luke i. 73. John viii. 53. Rom. iv. [1.] 12.
r vv. 24, 25.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

[o] κενέ, ὅτι ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων [p] ἀργή ἐστιν; 21 Ἀβραὰμ ὁ [q] πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ [r] ἐξ ἔργων [rs] ἐδικαιώθη [t] ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον; 22 [u] βλέπεις ὅτι ἡ πίστις [v] συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ [r] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις [w] ἐτελειώθη, 23 καὶ [x] ἐπλη-

Rom. iii. 20. iv. 2. Gal. ii. 16 (3ce). s = Luke xviii. 14. Rom. ii. 13 al. fr. (chiefly Paul.) Ps. cxlii. 2. t = Heb. vii. 27 reff. Gen. xxii. 2. u = 2 Cor. vi. 8. Heb. iii. 19. v Mark xvi. 20. Rom. viii. 28. 1 Cor. xvi. 16. 2 Cor. vi. 1 only†. Esdr. vii. 2. 1 Macc. xii. 1 only. dat., as 2 Tim. i. 8. w see Heb. ii. 10 reff. 1 John ii. 5 al. x = Matt. i. 22 al. fr. in Gospp. 2 Chron. xxxi. 21, 22.

20. rec (for *αργη*) *νεκρα*, with AC[3]KL[P]ℵ rel vulg copt [syrr arm-usc (Orig$_1$ Cyr$_2$?)] Thl Œc: txt BC[1] am[2](with demid fuld) lat-*ff*$_1$ sah arm-zoh(1805) Bede$_1$.

22. *συνεργει* Aℵ[1], *cooperatur* vind.

ix. 20: 1 Tim. vi. 20: Gal. iii. 1: see also Luke xxiv. 25: Acts xiii. 10) **empty** (void of knowledge and seriousness: content with a dead and bootless notion: *κενὸν ἐκάλεσεν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ψιλῇ τῇ πίστει αὐχοῦντα, μηδὲν τῆς διὰ τῶν ἔργων ὑποστάσεως κεκτημένον εἰς πλήρωσιν,* Œc.) **man** (so in Rom. ix. 20), **that faith** (here abstract: all faith, faith *αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτό*: not merely *πίστις*, faith, in any supposed case) **separate from works** (here again, **τὰ ἔργα,** abstract; and therefore, in subordination to the former abstract noun, the works which belong to it, which might be expected from it) **is idle** (bootless, without result: see reff. So Demosth. p. 815, *ἀργὰ χρήματα*: Isocr. Panegyr. p. 49, § 48, *μήτε τοῖς ἰδιώταις μήτε . . . . ἀργὸν εἶναι τὴν διατριβήν.* The idea is much the same if we read *νεκρά*; but seeing that none read *ἀργή* in vv. 17, 26, and it was hardly likely that the easy *νεκρά* here would be changed into the difficult *ἀργή*, this latter is beyond reasonable doubt the genuine reading)? 21.] *The example of Abraham.* **Was not Abraham our father** (the Apostle and his readers being all Jews) **justified** (accounted righteous before God. No other meaning will satisfy the connexion, inevitable to any intelligent reader, between this **ἐδικαιώθη** and the *σῶσαι* of ver. 14: which again is connected with the *μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι* of ver. 12. Commentators have endeavoured to evade this full meaning, in various ways. Thus e. g. Calvin, "Notanda est hæc amphibologia; justificandi verbum Paulo esse gratuitam justitiæ imputationem apud Dei tribunal: Jacobo autem esse demonstrationem justitiæ ab effectis, idque apud homines, quemadmodum ex superioribus verbis colligere licet: ostende mihi fidem tuam" &c. It is manifest, that by such "amphibology," any difficulties whatever may be explained away. On the difficulty itself, see in the Prolegomena) **by** (out of, as the ground of the justification: precisely as St. Paul so constantly uses the phrase *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως*) **works** (the category to which the ground of his justification belonged. It was one especial work, in matter of fact: and that work, itself springing out of pre-eminent faith) **when he offered** (not, as E. V., al., "*had* offered:" the aor. part., as so often, is synchronous with the aor. itself in the same sentence. **ἀναφέρω** in this reference with **ἐπί** is not 'to offer up in sacrifice,' but simply to offer, to bring as a sacrifice to the altar: whether the entire 'offering up' takes place or not. Where it did take place, the general meaning may be given: where it did not, as here, the particular one must be kept. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 24) **Isaac his son at the altar?**

22.] **Thou seest** (better not a question: in which case the *καί* of ver. 23 does not follow so naturally as when we couple the direct verb *βλέπεις* with the direct verb *ἐπληρώθη*) **that** (not, "*how*," as E. V.: it is not the manner in which, nor even "how" in the sense of '*how that*,' which is meant. The assertion is, that the inference is indubitable, that the fact was as stated) **faith** (the art. is abstract here, not possessive, as *αὐτοῦ* being expressed below shews) **wrought** (at the time, 'was working,' imperf.) **with his works** (**τοῖς ἔργοις** again categorical, the work in the example being but one), **and by** (*out of*, as the ground and source) **works** (again categorical; the general proposition proved by the particular case. Doubtless this second time it *might be* 'by his works, his faith,' &c.: but the other is more like St. James, who is singularly given to introduce abstract propositions as applicable to particular cases) **faith** (see above) **was made complete** (in one act, once for all: not imperf. as *συνήργει*, but aor.: not, as again many Commentators, even Bengel and De Wette, and so Calvin, "quod vera esse inde comprobetur;" an impossible meaning, and very far from the context of the Apostle's argument; which is, that faith is developed and brought to perfection by obedience: see below on ver. 26. And

ρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα [y] Ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ [z] ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην· καὶ [a] φίλος [a] θεοῦ ἐκλήθη. 24 [b] ὁρᾶτε [b] ὅτι [r] ἐξ ἔργων [rs] δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐκ [r] ἐκ πίστεως μόνον. 25 [c] ὁμοίως [c] δὲ

y John v. 24, 38. Acts v. 14. Rom. iv. 3, & Gal. iii. 6, from Gen. xv. 6.
z = Rom., Gal., Gen. as above. Acts xix. 27. Rom. ii. 26 al. Ps. cv. 31.
a (Gen. xviii. 17.) see note.
b constr., here only. Exod. iii. 2 al. see Heb. ii. 8.
c Matt. xxvii. 41 (|| Mk. v. r.) . Luke v. 10. x. 32. 1 Cor. vii. 3, 4 only.

24. rec aft *ορατε* ins *τοινυν*, with KL rel Œc: om ABC[P]ℵ c d 13. 36 latt syrr copt æth [arm] Thl.
25. for *ομοιως*, *ουτως* C Syr copt [(æth) arm]. om *δε* C 5. 6. 76 [vulg-clem]

hence also is it evident, how faith *συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ*. By the Apostle's own comparison, ver. 26, faith is the body, obedience the spirit: faith without obedience is dead, until obedience, the spirit, sets faith in motion: then faith, like the limbs of the body, moves with and works with the acts of obedience. Which is prior in time, which the ground of the other, is a point not touched by St. James at all. Pool collects well in his Synops. ad loc., the opinions of others: "Opera autem fidem perficiunt ratione operationis et consummationis, quum per opera fides ad maturitatem pervenit, quomodo arbor perfecta sit quum ita excrevit ut fructum ferat, Num. xvii. 8; et peccatum perficitur, Jac. i. 15, quum in habitum evasit . . . Fides tum demum consummata redditur, postquam bonos fructus protulit." But when he goes on to say, "Fides est causa: opera, effectus. Causa autem non perficitur a suo effectu, sed perfecta declaratur: ut fructus boni arborem bonum non efficiunt, sed indicant," he is travelling out of the record, and giving meanings unknown to this passage): **23.**] **and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, But** (*καί*, LXX) **Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness** (i. e. that saying of Scripture, which long preceded the offering of Isaac, received its realization, not, it may be, its only realization, but certainly its chief one, in this act of obedience. It was not, until this, fulfilled, in the sense of being entirely exemplified and filled up. Wiesinger combats this sense as an unworthy one, and follows Wolf and Knapp in understanding **πληρωθῆναι** and **τελεσθῆναι** not only "cum illud ipsum quod prædictum erat evenit, sed etiam ubi tale quid accidit quo ejusmodi dicta . . . . quoquo modo vel confirmantur et illustrantur." But this is not satisfactory, unless the case in point be such a prominent illustration as to constitute the main fulfilment; and then we come to much the same point. No such objection as that which Wiesinger brings (viz. that we make thus the truth of God's saying depend on Abraham's subsequent conduct) lies against our view, that the saying received on and not till this occasion its entire and full realization. It was true, when uttered: but it became more and more gloriously true of Abraham's life and acts till it reached this its culminating point, in his chief act of self-denying obedience): **and he was called** (couple with *ἐπίστευσεν* not with *ἐλογίσθη*) **God's friend** ('amatus a Deo,' not 'amans Deum.' This appellation of Abraham is not found in the LXX. In ref. Gen., where they have *Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδός μου*, Philo, De Resip. Noë, § 11, vol. i. p. 401, cites it *Ἀβρ. τοῦ φίλου μου*. And in Isa. xli. 8 the words *σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ ὃν ἠγάπησα* are rendered by the vulg. "semen Abraham amici mei," and by the E. V. "the seed of Abraham my friend." So also in 2 Chron. xx. 7). **24.**] *General inference from the example of Abraham.* **Ye see** (not imperative, nor interrogative) **that by** (from, out of, as a source) **works a man is justified** (accounted righteous before God, as above: not, as Calvin, "Fructibus cognoscitur et approbatur ejus justitia"), **and not by** (from) **faith only** (notice *μόνον*: St. James never says that a man is not justified by faith, provided that faith include in it the condition of obedience: but by faith *μόνον*, *χωρὶς ἔργων*, is no man justified. *μόνον* must be joined with *πίστεως*, not with *οὐκ*, as Theile, "Appositionis lege explenda est oratio: non solum fide, sed etiam operibus . . . . nempe cum fide conjungendis:" see similar instances of adverbs joined to substantives in 1 Cor. xii. 31: 2 Cor. xi. 23: Gal. i. 23: Phil. i. 26: and cf. Winer, § 54. 2, *b*). **25.**] *The example of Rahab.* Various reasons have been assigned for this example being added. Bede says, "Ne se causarentur opera tanti patris Abrahæ imitari non valere, præsertim cum nullus eos modo cogeret Deo filios offerre perimendos, ... addit et mulieris exemplum, mulieris criminosæ, mulieris alienigenæ, quæ tamen per opera misericordiæ, per officium hospitalitatis, etiam cum periculo vitæ suæ Dei famulis exhibitum, justificari a peccatis meruit" &c. Grotius, "Abrahami exemplum Hebræis ad Chris-

[c] *καὶ Ῥαὰβ ἡ* [d] *πόρνη οὐκ* [r] *ἐξ ἔργων* [m] *ἐδικαιώθη,* [e] *ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους, καὶ ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ* [f] *ἐκβαλοῦσα;* 26 *ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς* [g] *πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστιν, οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων* [h] *νεκρά ἐστιν.*

III. 1 *Μὴ πολλοὶ* [i] *διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου, εἰδότες ὅτι μεῖζον* [k] *κρῖμα* [k] *λημψόμεθα.* 2 [l] *πολλὰ γὰρ*

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

d Heb. xi. 31 reff. Josh. ii. 1. e Luke x. 38. xix. 6. Acts xvii. 7 only +. Tobit vii. 8. 1 Macc. xvi. 15 only. f = Matt. ix. 25. Mark i. 43. Acts ix. 40 al. 2 Chron. xxiii. 14. g = Matt. xxvi. 41. xxvii. 50 al. h = ver. 17. Heb. vi. 1. ix. 14. i = Acts xiii. 1. 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29. Eph. iv. 11. k Mark xii. 40 ‖ L. Rom. xiii. 2. l = Matt. ix. 14. 1 Cor. xvi. 12. Job xxxv. 5.

Syr copt arm (but not 13 as Scholz [and Tischdf]). for *αγγελους*, *κατασκοπους* C K-marg L d g lat-ff_1 Syr syr-mg[(addg *ιησου*) arm æth].
26. for *γαρ*, *δε* lat-ff_1 $Orig_1$: om B Syr æth arm. om *των* Bℵ a 69 $Orig_1$.

tum conversis sufficere debebat, sed quia etiam alienigenis scribebat, adjunxit exemplum fœminæ extraneæ:" and similarly Hofmann, Schriftb. i. 557. Schneckenburger, "Novum additur exemplum e sexu muliebri sumptum:" and so Bengel, "Post virum ponitur mulier: nam viros et mulieres appellat," ch. iv. 4 (see note there). When Delitzsch, on Heb. xi. 31, assigns as a reason that der Paulinismus had already used this example to prove justification *sola ex fide*, he does not necessarily assume the later date for our Epistle. See the whole matter discussed in the Prolegomena. **And** (the **δέ** brings out the contrast of the example, again affirming the Apostle's proposition, to the *ἐκ πίστεως μόνον*, which has been just denied. Huther understands the δέ as bringing out the dissimilarity between the examples implied in πόρνη) **in like manner** (with Abraham) **was not Rahab the harlot** (not "caupona" or "hospita," as Grot., not "idololatra," as Rosenmüller, but to be taken literally: see on Heb. xi. 31) **justified by works, when she received** (not necessarily "*clam excepit*," as Theile, see reff. It may be so, but the *word* does not express it. The word in Heb. is δεξαμένη) **the messengers** (κατασκόπους, Heb. xi. 31), **and thrust them forth** (in haste and fear, Josh. ii. 15, 16: **ἐκβάλλειν** is not simply 'emittere:' see reff.) **by another way** (viz. διὰ τῆς θυρίδος, Josh. ii. 15 LXX. For the local dative, see Rom. iv. 12: Rev. xxii. 14: and Winer, § 31. 9)? 26.] *General conclusion to the argument*, but in the form of a comparison, as in ver. 17. **For** (**γάρ** binds the verse on to the foregoing, and makes *it* rather depend on this axiom, than this axiom a conclusion from it: 'it must be so, Rahab must have been thus justified, seeing that' &c.) **just as the body without** (separate from) **spirit** (or, the spirit) **is dead, so also faith without works** (or without its works, the works belonging to it: as in ver. 20) **is dead.** This comparison has been found matter of surprise to some Commentators, inasmuch as the things compared do not seem relatively to correspond. Faith is unquestionably a thing spiritual: works are external and material: so that it would seem as if the members of the comparison should have been inverted, and works made the body, faith the spirit. But the Apostle's view seems rather to be this: Faith is the body, the sum and substance, of the Christian life: works (= obedience), the moving and quickening of that body; just as the spirit is the moving and quickening principle of the natural body. So that as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is also dead.

CHAP. III. *a.* 1—12.] *The danger*, as connected with the upholding of faith without works, *of eagerness to teach:* and, by occasion, *the manifold and irrepressible sins of the tongue.* Then follows, *b.* 13—18.] *an exhortation, to prove a man's wisdom by mildness, not by a contentious spirit.* 1.] The more the idea prevailed, that faith, without corresponding obedience, was all that is needful, the more men would eagerly press forward to teach: as indeed the Church has found in all ages when such an opinion has become prevalent: for then teachers and preachers of their own appointing have rapidly multiplied. **Be not** ('*become not:*' let not that state of things prevail among you in which you become) **many teachers** (**πολλοί** belongs not to the predicate, as Schneckenb. al., so that πολλοὶ γίνεσθαι should = *multiplicari:* nor does it mean "nimii in docendo," as Baumgarten: nor = πάντες, as Grotius: but is to be taken with διδάσκαλοι, and in its proper meaning. And **διδάσκαλοι** is not, as E.V., "masters," which conveys a wrong idea: but *teachers*, persons imparting knowledge in the congregation. This in the primitive times might be done by all in turn, as we know from 1 Cor. xiv. 26—33: and St. James exhorts against the too eager and too general assumption of this privilege), **my**

[m] πταίομεν ἅπαντες. εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ [m] πταίει, οὗτος [no] τέλειος [o] ἀνήρ, δυνατὸς [p] χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα. [3] εἰ δὲ τῶν ἵππων τοὺς [q] χαλινοὺς εἰς τὰ στόματα [r] βάλλομεν [s] εἰς τὸ πείθεσθαι ἡμῖν αὐτούς, καὶ

m ch. ii. 10 reff.
n ch. i. 4 reff.
o Eph. iv. 13. 2 Kings xxii. 26.
p ch. i. 26 only † (ref.).
q Rev. xiv. 20 only. Zech. xiv. 20.
r = Mark vii. 33. John xviii. 11. xx. 25 bis, 27 al.
s = ch. ii. 17 reff.

Chap. III. 2. [for απ., παντες P.—om 1st clause K.] δυναμενος ℵ a c h [Cyr$_1$ Damasc$_1$ Thl]. aft δυν. ins τε C(appy) vulg.

3. rec (for ει δε) ιδου, with f: ιδε C[P] rel [arm] Thl: ειδε γαρ ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving γαρ): om o: *ecce* syr sah, *ecce enim* Syr, *et ecce* æth-pl: txt ABKL 1 m 13. 36(sic) Damasc Œc, *si autem* vulg lat-*ff*$_1$, *quare ergo* spec, *et insuper* æth-rom. rec (for εις) προς, with AKL[P] rel [Thl Œc]: txt BCℵ Damasc$_1$. rec αυτους bef ημιν, with BKL[P]ℵ rel Damasc$_1$ Thl Œc: txt AC 13.

brethren, knowing (as ye do: or, as ye ought to do: it is a good remark of Huther's, that **εἰδότες**, being closely joined to the imperative, is itself hortatory: 'knowing, as ye might know') **that we** (i. e. as many of us as are teachers) **shall receive greater condemnation** (than others who are not teachers: κρῖμα, in the phrase κρῖμα λαμβάνειν, according to N. T. usage, is not a 'vox media,' but signifies *condemnation* only: see besides reff. 1 Tim. v. 12. This being so, it has surprised some Commentators, that the Apostle includes himself with those whom he is dissuading: and Grot., al. would understand κρῖμα as meaning "responsibility:" but the solution is easy,—viz. that he includes himself out of humility, and obviously on the assumption that the office of teacher is not faithfully performed. The sense might be thus filled up, as, indeed, it is virtually filled up in ver. 2: 'be not many teachers, for in such office there is great danger of failing, and if we teachers fail, our condemnation will be greater'). **2.**] **For** (see above: this supplies the ellipsis) **oftentimes** (adverbial: see reff. and Winer, § 54. 1) **we all** (without exception: **ἅπαντες** is a stronger form than πάντες, being originally contracted from ἅμα πάντες) **offend** (**πταίω**, cognate with πίπτω, πέπτωκα, πτῶσις, see Buttmann, Lexil. i. p. 295, to stumble, fall: cf. the proverb, μὴ δὶς πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λίθον πταίειν: hence figuratively, to err or offend morally. The present assertion is to be taken in the widest moral sense, as an axiom applying to our whole conduct. It is in the next clause limited to the subject in hand, viz. the tongue): **if any man** (see ch. i. 5, 23, 26) **offendeth not** (is void of offence: **οὐ**, because the negative belongs, not subjectively to the hypothesis, but objectively to the fact included within the hypothesis) **in word** (in speaking: and therefore the hypothesis is applicable to these many who set up for teachers, seeing that thus their chances of offence would be multiplied many fold), **he (is) a perfect man** (explained by what follows), **able to bridle the whole body also** (I cannot see the force of De Wette's objections against the general sense of the πολλὰ πταίομεν ἅπαντες. The sense surely runs well thus: We all oftentimes offend: and of those frequent offences, sins of the tongue are so weighty a part and so constant a cause, that he who is free from them may be said to be perfect, inasmuch as he is able to rule every other minor cause of offence: 'the whole body' standing for all those other members by which, as by the tongue, sin may be committed: which may be ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ or ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ, Rom. vi. 13). **3—6.**] *The importance and depravity of the tongue, so small a member, is illustrated by comparisons: 1. with the small instrument, the horse-bit*, ver. 3: 2. *with the small instrument, the ship-rudder*, ver. 4: 3. *with a small fire burning a great forest*, vv. 5, 6. **3.**] This mention of **χαλιναγωγῆσαι**, and the situation of the tongue where the χαλινός also is placed, introduce this similitude: which circumstances will also account for **τῶν ἵππων** standing first and emphatic, χαλινός and στόμα being ideas already given by the context. **But** (transitional) **if** (as we do: = in our vernacular, '*when*,' '*as often as*') **of horses** (this would not be English, but indicates the emphatic place of τῶν ἵππων. The gen. depends on τὰ στόματα, not on τοὺς χαλινούς) **we put** (so χαλινὸν ἵππῳ ἐμβάλλειν, Ælian V. H. ix. 16) **bits** (**τούς**, which are in common use: the bits, of which every one knows) **into the mouths, in order to their obeying us** (thus shewing, by the expression of this purpose, that we recognize the principle of turning the whole body by the tongue),—(now comes the apodosis after the **εἰ**: see below) **we turn about also** (in turning the bit one

t here bis only ‡. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 3 al.
u 2 Cor. i. 10. Heb. ii. 3. Rev. xvi. 18 only †. 2 Macc. xii. 6.
v = here (Matt. xxi. 24. John vi. 60. Acts xxvi. 14. Jude 15) only. Prov. xxvii. 16.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

ὅλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν [t] μετάγομεν. [4] ἰδοὺ καὶ τὰ πλοῖα [u] τηλικαῦτα ὄντα καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων [v] σκληρῶν [w] ἐλαυνόμενα [t] μετάγεται ὑπὸ ἐλαχίστου [x] πηδαλίου, ὅπου ἂν ἡ [y] ὁρμὴ τοῦ [z] εὐθύνοντος βούληται· [5] οὕτως καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα μικρὸν [a] μέλος ἐστίν, καὶ μεγάλα [b] αὐχεῖ. ἰδοὺ [c] ἡλίκον πῦρ [c] ἡλίκην [d] ὕλην [e] ἀνάπτει, [6] καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα

w = Luke viii. 29. 2 Pet. ii. 17 (Mark vi. 48. John vi. 19) only. Sir. xxxviii. 25. 2 Macc. ix. 4. x Acts xxvii. 40 only †. y Acts xiv. 5 only. Prov. iii. 25. z = here (John i. 23) only. Num. xxii. 23. a here bis. ch. iv. 1. Matt. v. 29, 30. Paul, Rom. vi. 13 bis al27. Lev. i. 6. b here only †. see Ps. ix. 18 (38). Ezek. xvi. 50. Zeph. iii. 11. Isoc., Lysias, Plato, in Wetst. c here bis. Col. ii. 1 only †. d here only. = Isa. x. 17. Sir. xxviii. 10. e Luke xii. 49. (Acts xxviii. 2 v. r.) only. 2 Chron. xiii. 11.

μεταγομεν bef *αυτων* A 13. 36: om *αυτων* 2. 30 spec Œc.

4. ins *τα* bef *τηλικαυτα* B. rec *σκληρων* bef *ανεμων*, with AL rel æth Thl: txt BCK[P]ℵ a b c h m o 36 latt Damasc$_1$. om *αν* Bℵ sah. *βουλεται* B[L]ℵ Damasc$_1$: *βουληθη* 13: *βουλοιτο* a.

5. for *ουτως*, *ωσαυτως* A d 5. 64-5. 71. 133. rec (for *μεγαλα αυχει*) *μεγαλαυχει*, with KLℵ rel, *magna exaltat* vulg Bede, *magna gloriatur* latt-ff_1, *magna exultat* fuld: *magne exultat* harl: *magniloqua* spec: txt A B(see table) C[1][P Ephr$_1$]. rec (for *ηλικον*) *ολιγον*, with A[1](as origly written) C[2]KL rel lat-ff_1(with spec) [syrr coptt æth arm] Damasc$_1$ Thl: txt A(as corrd by origl scribe) BC[1][P]ℵ vulg Antch$_1$ Œc.

6. om 1st *και* ℵ[1].

way or the other) **their whole body** (cf. Soph. Antig. 473, *σμικρῷ χαλινῷ δ' οἶδα τοὺς θυμουμένους ἵππους καταρτυθέντας*). 4.] The *second comparison* takes up, not the protasis with its *εἰ δέ*, but only the apodosis foregoing. **Behold, even** (or also) **the ships, though so great** (the participle carries a slightly ratiocinative force, illative or exceptive according to the circumstances), **and driven by fierce** (see reff.: and cf. Ælian de Animal. v. 13, *σκληρὸν πνεῦμα*: and Hist. Var. ix. 14, *ἵνα μὴ ἀνατρέπηται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνέμων, εἴποτε σκληροὶ κατέπνεον*. See other citations in Wetst.) **winds** (Bede interprets this as having a meaning respecting ourselves: "Naves magnæ in mari, mentes sunt hominum in hac vita, sive bonorum sive malorum. Venti validi, a quibus minantur (?), ipsi appetitus sunt mentium, quibus naturaliter coguntur aliquid agere" &c. But it is not likely that the Apostle had any such meaning), **are turned about by a very small rudder, whithersoever** (**οπου** for *ὅποι*, which is not used in N.T. So also in the classics: e. g. Soph. Trach. 40, *κεῖνος ὅπου βέβηκεν*) **the desire** (not, as many Commentators, the external impulse given by the hand. Cf. Plato, Phileb. p. 35 D, *ξύμπασαν τήν τε ὁρμὴν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ζώου παντός*) **of the steersman** (him who actually handles the tiller) **may wish.** The same thought occurs in Aristot. Quæst. Mechan. 5, *τὸ πηδάλιον, μικρὸν ὄν, καὶ ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ τῷ πλοίῳ, τοσαύτην δύναμιν ἔχει, ὥστε ὑπὸ μικροῦ οἴακος, καὶ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου δυνάμεως, καὶ ταύτης ἠρεμαίας, μεγάλα κινεῖσθαι μεγέθη πλοίων*. Philo, In Flacc. 5, vol. ii. p. 521, joins the two ideas together, *ἐμπειροτάτους κυβερνήτας, οἳ καθάπερ ἀθλητὰς ἵππους ἡνιοχοῦσιν, ἀπλανῆ παρέχοντας τὸν ἐπ' εὐθείας δρόμον*. Cf. also Lucret. iv. 899, and other examples in Wetst. 5.] *Application of the comparison*. **Thus also the tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things** (**μεγάλα αὐχεῖ** (or *μεγαλαυχεῖ*) is interpreted by Œc., *μεγάλα ἐργάζεται*, and so Thl., Calv., De Wette, al., in the Homeric sense of *εὔχεται εἶναι*. But Huther well observes that there is no need for thus forcing the word out of its ordinary meaning, for the *deeds* of the tongue follow. This *μεγάλα αὐχεῖ* is the method which it uses to accomplish its deed; it vaunts great words which bring about great acts of mischief). **Behold, how small** (**ἡλίκος** is 'quantulus' as well as 'quantus,' e. g. in Lucian, Hermot. 5, *παπαί, ὦ Ἑρμότιμε, ἡλίκους ἡμᾶς ἀποφαίνεις, οὐδὲ κατὰ τοὺς πυγμαίους ἐκείνους, ἀλλὰ χαμαιπετεῖς παντάπασιν ἐν χρῷ τῆς γῆς*. De Wette however understands it here "how great," and thinks that not the smallness of the first spark, but the greatness of the fire in its ultimate extent, is intended. Against this, as Wiesinger and Huther observe, is **ἀνάπτει**, which can hardly mean 'consumes,' but must be said of the first lighting up. Seneca has the very similar words, "quam lenibus initiis quanta incendia oriantur," Contr. v. 5) **a fire kindleth how great a forest** (**ὕλη** is taken by some Commentators to mean "materia, lignorum congeries," as in ref. Sir. So Jerome on Isa. lxvi. 15, 16, vol. iv. p. 813, "Parvus ignis quam grandem succendit

πῦρ, ὁ [f] κόσμος τῆς [g] ἀδικίας. ἡ γλῶσσα [h] καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς [a] μέλεσιν ἡμῶν ἡ [i] σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, καὶ [j] φλογίζουσα τὸν [k] τροχὸν τῆς [l] γενέσεως, καὶ [j] φλογι-

f = Prov. xvii. 6 (4). see John xxi. 25. g gen., ch. i. 25 reff. h = ch. iv. 4. Rom. v. 19. 2 Pet. i. 8. 3 Macc. iii. 5. i Jude 23 only †. Wisd. xv. 4 only. (-λος, 1 Pet. ii. 13. -λάς, Jude 12.) j here bis only. Exod. ix. 24. k here only (see note). Ps. lxxvi. 18. Isa. xxviii. 27 al. l = here (ch. i. 23 reff.) only (see note).

rec ins *ουτως* bef 2nd *η γλωσσα*, with [P] rel syr-w-ast Thl Œc: *ουτως και* L 106: om ABCKℵ c latt Syr coptt arm Antch, Damasc$_1$. [*καθισται* B[1].] for 3rd *η*, *και* ℵ[1]. aft *γενεσεως* ins *ημων* ℵ [7. 25. 33-marg. 68. 83. 96[2] vulg Syr æth].

materiam:" Erasm., Grot., al. But the ordinary meaning gives a far livelier and more graphic sense here. Cf. also Hom. Il. β. 455, ἠΰτε πῦρ ἀΐδηλον ἐπιφλέγει ἄσπετον ὕλην, and λ. 155, ὡς δ' ὅτε πῦρ ἀΐδηλον ἐν ἀξύλῳ ἐμπέσῃ ὕλῃ. The comparison is beautifully used in a good sense by Philo, De Migr. Abr. § 21, vol. i. p. 455, σπινθὴρ γὰρ καὶ ὁ βραχύτατος ἐντυφόμενος ὅταν καταπνευσθεὶς ζωπυρηθῇ, μεγάλην ἐξάπτει πυράν· καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον οὖν ἀρετῆς, ὅταν ἐλπίσι χρησταῖς ὑποθαλπόμενον ἀναλάμψῃ, καὶ τὰ τέως μεμυκότα καὶ τυφλὰ ἐξωμμάτωσε, καὶ τὰ ἀφαυανθέντα ἀναβλαστεῖν ἐποίησε, καὶ ὅσα ὑπὸ ἀγονίας ἐστείρωτο εἰς εὐφορίαν εὐτοκίας περιήγαγεν [Tischdf. in his 8th edn., omitting with ℵ[1] the καί in ver. 6, carries on the sentence to ἡ γλῶσσα, construing ἡλίκον πῦρ as an accusative, and ἡλίκην ὕλην as in apposition with it]).

6.] **Likewise the tongue is a fire, that world of iniquity** (these latter words are still in apposition with ἡ γλῶσσα (and belong appositionally to the *subject*, not to πῦρ the predicate: as e.g. in Æsch. Choeph. 529 f., ἐν σπαργάνοισι παιδὸς ὁρμήσαι δίκην, τινὸς βορᾶς χρῄζοντα, νεογενὲς δάκος); not, as many Commentators, an elliptical clause requiring ὕλη to complete it—"igni respondet lingua, materiæ seu silvæ respondet mundus improbus," Morus, in Huther. But, when taken as a designation of ἡ γλῶσσα, the interpretations are various. 1. Œc. mentions as an alternative the signification "adornment" for κόσμος. After giving the ordinary interpretation, he says, ἢ κόσμος ἐστίν, ἤτοι κοσμοῦσα τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν κ.τ.λ., and before, κοσμεῖ τὴν ἀδικίαν διὰ τῆς τῶν ῥητόρων εὐγλώττου δεινότητος. And so it is taken by Wetst., Elsner, Wahl, and others. But it is rightly objected by Huther, that κόσμος never signifies that which (actively) adorns, but that wherewith a thing or person is adorned, as in 1 Pet. iii. 3: so that it would be here that *wherewith*, not that *whereby*, iniquity is adorned. 2. Estius makes the words mean, a world of iniquity, "quia (lingua) peccata omnigena parit." 3. Le Clerc, Hammond, Kuinoel, al. hold the words to be spurious, and a gloss: but most absurdly. We have the similar use of ὁ κόσμος in ref. Prov., τοῦ πιστοῦ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος τῶν χρημάτων, τοῦ δὲ ἀπίστου οὐδὲ ὀβολός: and the Latins often use 'abyssus,' 'mare,' 'oceanus,' in the same sense [a complete repertory of all wickedness, as the world is of all things]. The use of the art. in titular appositional clauses of this kind is natural as designating the thing pointed at—'mundus ille iniquitatis'): **the tongue** (we must not, although we omit οὕτως, follow Lachmann, and Tischdf. [edn. 7], in destroying the stop at ἀδικίας and carrying the sense on to this clause: for thus we make a very lame sentence, with the subject, ἡ γλῶσσα, twice repeated. The new sentence begins here) **is** (perhaps we cannot find in English a better word for καθίσταται, though it does not give the exact meaning, which is as in vulg., "*constituitur.*" Any rendering of this in English would be too forcible; as if some divine arrangement were spoken of: "collocata est" (Beza, Piscator, Schneckenburger, al.) is not exact. See reff.) **among our members that one which** (De Wette compares for the construction, Phil. ii. 13, ὁ θεὸς . . . ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν) **defileth** (ref.) **the whole body** (thus justifying the title given to it of ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας) **and setteth on fire** (the other clause, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, is now taken up. By the construction, strictly considered, these two participles, φλογίζουσα and φλογιζομένη, are (as Wiesinger) subordinated to ἡ σπιλοῦσα, there being no articles before them. But forasmuch as thus we should find a difficulty in the sense, in that the action indicated by the first of these participles can hardly take place within our members, it is better, with Huther, to regard the participles as new particulars, and the construction as not a strictly exact one. Something of the same inaccuracy is found in ch. iv. 11, but not in iv. 14, as Huther also alleges) **the orb of the creation** (in interpreting the difficult words τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως, one thing must especially be borne in mind: that like ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, they designate some material thing which agreeably to the figure used may be set on

ζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς [m] γεέννης· [7] πᾶσα γαρ [n] φύσις [o] θηρίων

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

m Gospp., Matt. v. 22 al. fr. Epp., here only †. n = (see note) here only †. Wisd. vii. 20 only. Jos. B. J. vii. 5. 5, ζώων τε πολλαὶ φύσεις παρήγοντο. so Soph. Antig. 356, εἰναλίαν φύσιν. o Acts xi. 6.

fire. This would at once set aside all figurative explanations, such as "rotam originis nostræ, quæ, simul atque nati sumus, cursum suum auspicatur," Gebser, al.,—τὸν χρόνον, τὸν τροχοειδῆ δηλονότι, τῆς ζωῆς, Isidor.-pelus.,—founded on the parallel in Anacreon (iv. 7), τροχὸς ἅρματος γὰρ οἷα βίοτος τρέχει κυλισθείς. So likewise Œc., τροχός, ὁ βίος εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀνελιττόμενος, illustrating it by the Psalmist speaking of ὁ στέφανος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ: such again as that of Wolf, "indesinens successio hominum aliorum post alios nascentium," after the Syr., "It turneth the course of our generations which run as a wheel." In seeking then for some material interpretation, we come first to that of Wiesinger,—*the whole body—the circumference of our corporeal being*, the τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως, as the πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως in ch. i. 23: *the circumference* (of the body) *which is congenital with us*. But, as Huther has observed, it would be in the highest degree unnatural, when the Writer has just expressed ὅλον τὸ σῶμα without a figure, that he should again express it *in a figure*, and that without the least indication of the identity of meaning. The same objection is fatal to Bengel's view, who also understands it of the body, but gets this meaning by an allegorical method, "Rota sive sphæra superior est ipsa natura humana rationalis: gehenna vero est pars profundior, cor: lingua in medio ex inferioribus inflammatur et superiora inflammat." More ingenious is the idea of Beza (ed. 1598), "Jacobus mihi videtur alludere ad rapiditatem circumactæ rotæ, suo motu flammam concipientis:" and this is followed by Benson, who says, "The present life of man is here compared to a wheel, which is put in motion at our birth, and runs swiftly till death puts a stop to it. By the rapidity of its (?) motion the tongue sets this wheel in a flame, which sometimes destroys the whole machine." Cf. Hor. Od. i. 1. 3, "metaque fervidis evitata rotis:" but it seems to lie too far from the words for us to suppose that the Apostle can have thus intended to express it. And besides, the propriety of the comparison is not satisfied: for in the case of a wheel, it is set on fire by *its own* rapid motion, not by any thing without it. It appears then to me that we are driven to the rendering given above, on which Beza says (ed. 1565), "Mihi videtur minus dura explicatio, si τὸν τροχὸν accipiamus ἀντὶ τοῦ κύκλου, et τῆς γενέσεως pro τῆς κτίσεως, ut significetur linguam posse vel totum orbem conditum accendere." In favour of this, we have, that τροχός is used for "orbis" in Aristoph. Thesmoph. 17: for circular enclosures, Plato, Critias, p. 113 ff.; Soph. frag. 222 d; Schol. on Plato, Legg. iii. p. 451: see also Odyss. μ. 173; φ. 178, 183: and that γένεσις is used in the concrete sense of "creation" by Plato, Tim. p. 29 D, E (λέγωμεν δὴ δι' ἥντινα αἰτίαν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πᾶν τόδε ὁ ξυνιστὰς ξυνέστησεν), and by other writers. And it is remarkable also (De W.), that just below, when St. James would speak of men as created after God's image, he uses not κτισθέντας but γεγονότας. Cf. also his use of τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως, before cited, in ch. i. 23, "the face wherewith he was created." This sense, *the whole orb* or *cycle of creation*, is not, as Wiesinger affirms, "at least not favoured" by ver. 7, but on the contrary agrees exceedingly well with it. After the mention of the τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως, it is natural that the Apostle should take up with the γάρ the details of creation, and assert that they might all be tamed by man, but that the tongue is untameable. Again, such sense is most agreeable to the similitude just used, of a small spark kindling a vast forest. This sense is found in Syr., æth., Crusius, Cocceius, and De Wette [the expression in E. V., **the course of nature**, is sufficiently near the meaning, and expresses it in better English, perhaps, than any other]), **and itself set on fire** (notice the *present*, indicating that it is habitually, continually, so set on fire: see below) **by hell** (which is itself γέεννα τοῦ πυρός, ref. and al. These words are not to be explained away, as Theile, "igne fœdissimo ac funestissimo:" such is not St. James's teaching, cf. ch. iv. 7, where the devil, as a tempter to evil, is personally contrasted with God: but are to be literally taken. It is the devil, for whom hell is prepared, that is the tempter and instigator of the habitual sins of the tongue. It is out of the question (see above) to regard φλογιζομένη as alluding to the original temptations of the fall: equally so, to suppose it to have a future reference, and to imply that the tongue shall be tormented in (ὑπο?) hell: as some in Œc., ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτή φησι φλογίζεται ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης, ὡς δῆλον ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀποτηγανιζομένου πλουσίου: so also Grot., Benson, Semler, Storr, Rosenmüller. I need hardly add, that the foolish conjectural emendation γέννης, "*a* (ὑπο?) *nativitate*," insisted on with much confidence in a note to an

τε καὶ [opq] πετεινῶν [opr] ἑρπετῶν τε καὶ [s] ἐναλίων [t] δαμάζεται καὶ [t] δεδάμασται τῇ [n] φύσει τῇ [u] ἀνθρωπίνῃ, [8] τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς [t] δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων· [v] ἀκατάστατον κακόν, [w] μεστὴ [x] ἰοῦ [y] θανατηφόρου. [9] [z] ἐν αὐτῇ

p as above (o). Acts x. 12. Rom. i. 23. Ps. cxlviii. 10.
q as above (o, p) Matt. vi. 26 al. in Gospp. Ps. viii. 8.
r as above (o, p) only. Gen. i. 24.
s here only †. Soph. as above (n).
t here 3ce. Mark v. 4 only. Dan. ii. 40 (bis Theod.) only.
u 1 Pet. ii. 13 reff.
v ch. i. 8 only. Isa. liv. 11 only.
w Matt. xxiii. 28. John xix. 29. xxi. 11. Rom. i. 29. xv. 14. ver. 17. 2 Pet. ii. 14 only. Ezek. xxxvii. 1.
x = Rom. iii. 13 (ch. v. 3) only. Ps. cxxxix. 3.
y here only. Num. xviii. 22. Job xxxiii. 23.
z = Matt. v. 13 al. fr.

7. om 2nd τε A a 11. 47 [arm: και ερπ. c]. transp δαμαζεται and δεδαμασται C b o [arm(Tischdf)]: om κ. δεδ. Syr.

8. [om δε P.] rec δυναται ανθρωπων bef δαμασαι, with L rel [arm] Cyr[-p_1] $Damasc_1$ Thl Œc: δυναται bef δαμασαι AK[P]א a c m: δαμασαι bef ουδεις 18: txt BC syr. rec ακατασχετον, with CKL rel spec syrr [æth arm(Treg) Cyr-p_1] $Epiph_1$ $Damasc_{alic}$ Thl Œc: txt AB[P]א vulg lat-ff_1 copt arm[(Griesb) Damasc-ms_1] Jer. (13 def.)

anonymous version of St. James and St. Peter (Hatchard, 1842), is quite out of the realm of, as the construing proposed on its adoption is beneath, legitimate criticism [though it can claim the support of spec '*a genitura*']. Wiesinger says, "This passage reminds us, in its general sense, of the O. T. sayings, Prov. xvi. 27: Ps. cxx. 2—4: Sir. xxviii. 11 ff." The last clause, καὶ φλογ. ὑπὸ τ. γ., is strikingly paralleled by the Targum on Ps. cxx. 2, where the deceitful tongue is compared "cum carbonibus juniperi, qui incensi sunt in gehenna inferne." But none of these passages treats of the destruction which the tongue brings on its own body (cf. Wiesinger's interp. above)). 7, 8.] *The untameableness of the tongue.* The thought in ver. 3, though not directly leading on to this, yet is a hint tending towards it. 7.] **For** (a fresh fact is adduced, substantiating the strong terms used of the mischief of the tongue) **every nature** (natural generic disposition and character; and so below, when joined to ἀνθρώπινος: not, "*kind*," "genus," as E. V. and many Commentators) **of beasts** (quadrupeds, see below) **and winged things, of creeping things and things in the sea** (creation is divided into four classes: θηρία, πετεινά, ἑρπετά, and ἐνάλια. The first then is not to be taken in its wide sense, as Acts xxviii. 4, 5, but as distinguished from the other three, i. e. as = quadrupeds, beasts of the earth, proper. The classification in Peter's vision, ref. Acts, is different: τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία κ. τὰ ἑρπετὰ κ. τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, θηρία there at least including the fishes) **is** (habitually, pres.) **tamed and hath been tamed** (has long ago been reduced into subjection: such taming has become (perf.) an enduring fact in the world's history, exemplified (pres.) every day) **by** (not, '*to*,' as a 'dativus commodi:' it is the dat. of the agent, after a passive verb, = the construction with ὑπό and a gen., as is shewn by the following active construction with οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων) **the nature** (not, "ingenii sollertia," as Schneckenb., al.; but **φύσις** as before, natural generic character) **of man:** 8.] **but** (exception) **the tongue no one of men can tame** (the assertion is absolute, not to be weakened by εὐκόλως κ. ἄνευ πόνου, as the Schol. in Matthæi. And it is plain that to read it, as Œc., interrogatively (εἰ τὰ ἀτίθασσα θηρία ὁ ἄνθρωπος τιθασσεύει καὶ χειροήθη ποιεῖ, ἆρα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γλῶσσαν οὐ δαμάσει;), is quite out of the question. Observe **δαμάσαι**, aor., 'even to tame once,' not habitually, pres. Now we see fully the meaning of ver. 2): **it is a restless mischief** (ἀκατάστατον expresses both fickleness and restlessness, see above on ch. i. 8 and Dio Chrys. there, who calls a democracy ἄστατον κακόν. The figure here seems to correspond nearly to what is related of Proteus, that he eluded the grasp of Menelaus under many various shapes. Cf. Hermas, Pastor ii. 2, p. 916, ὡ πόσον πονηρά ἐστιν ἡ καταλαλιά, καὶ ἀκατάστατον δαιμόνιον), (**it is**) (the supply of a copula is necessary on account of the change of gender, referring back again to γλῶσσα. Or, the two clauses may be rendered without any copulæ, as quasi-exclamations) **full of death-bringing poison** (cf. ref. Ps., ἠκόνησαν γλῶσσαν αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ ὄφεως, ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν). I cannot forbear referring the reader to Erasmus's very elegant paraphrase of these two verses, 7, 8; and thanking Wiesinger for directing attention to it. 9, 10.] *Exemplification of* **ἀκατάστατον κακόν**, *by the inconsistent use of the tongue.* 9.] **Therewith** (there could not be a word more accurately expressing the instrumental sense, as it is called, of ἐν: it is as *clad in*, and working in the realm and sphere of, that this use is found, as we say 'a man in armour,' 'in a helmet:' ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς)

[a] εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν [b] κύριον καὶ [b] πατέρα, καὶ [a] ἐν αὐτῇ [c] καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς καθ' [d] ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ [e] γεγονότας· 10 [f] ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ [f] στόματος [f] ἐξέρχεται [g] εὐλογία καὶ [h] κατάρα. οὐ [i] χρή, ἀδελφοί μου, ταῦτα οὕτως γίνεσθαι. 11 [j] μήτι ἡ [k] πηγὴ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς [l] ὀπῆς [m] βρύει τὸ [no] γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ [np] πικρόν; 12 μὴ δύναται, ἀδελφοί μου, [q] συκῆ [r] ἐλαίας [s] ποιῆσαι ἢ ἄμπελος [t] σῦκα; οὔτε [u] ἁλυκὸν [o] γλυκὺ [s] ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ.

ABCKL ℵP a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

a = Luke ii. 28. xxiv. 53 al. Gen. xxiv. 48. b here only. c Matt. (v. 44 v. r.) xxv. 41. Mark xi. 21. Luke vi. 28. Rom. xii. 14 only. Eccl. vii. 22, 23. d here only. Gen. i. 26. e = Gen. ii. 7 al. fr. f Matt. xv. 18. g 1 Cor. x. 16. Gal. iii. 14. Rev. v. 12, 13. vii. 12. Neh. ix. 5. h Heb. vi. 8 reff. i here only. j Matt. vii. 16. John iv. 29. Mal. iii. 8. k 2 Pet. ii. 17 reff. l Heb. xi. 38 only. Exod. xxxiii. 22. Obad. 3. m here only †. n neut. adj., so Matt. x. 42. o here bis. Rev. x. 9, 10 only. Judg. xiv. 14. p here bis only. Jer. xxiii. 15. (-ρῶς, Matt. xxvi. 75 ‖ L.) q Matt. xxi. 19 al. Judg. ix. 10 al. r = here only. Mic. vi. 15. s = Matt. iii. 8, 10 al. fr. Isa. v. 2, 4. t Matt. vii. 16. Mark xi. 13. Luke vi. 44 only. 4 Kings xx. 7. u here only. Num. xxxiv. 3, 12.

9. rec (for κυριον) θεον, with KL rel vulg syr Epiph$_1$ Damasc$_2$ Thl: txt ABC[P]ℵ 13 vulg-ms lat-ff$_1$ Syr copt arm Cyr$_1$. for γεγονοτας, γεγενημενους A d 13 Damasc$_1$.
12. rec (for ουτε) ουτως ουδεμια πηγη, with KL [P(ουτε μια)] rel (syr) Thl Œc (οὐδὲ μία h j k l o): οὔτε μία πηγη, omg ουτως, c: ουτως ουδε ℵ [Cyr-p$_1$]: ουτως ουτε C^3 13(sic) Syr copt æth [arm]: txt ABC^1.—rec aft αλυκον ins και, with KL[P] rel [syr] Thl Œc: om ABC^{1}ℵ c m 13 latt Syr (æth) Cyr$_1$.

bless we (i.e. as applied to God, 'praise we:' cf. Ps. cxliv. 21 LXX. The first person is used of mankind in general, considered as one agent) **the Lord and Father** (an unusual connexion to designate God: cf. ch. i. 27, where we have the more usual one, found also here in the rec. Both terms are to be taken of the Father: the former, on the side of His Power: the latter, on that of His Love), **and therewith curse we men** (generic), **which** (not, *who*, which would personally designate *certain men* thus made; but *which*, generic. This distinction, which some modern philologists are striving to obliterate, is very important in the rendering of Scripture, and has been accurately observed by our English translators) **have been created** (and are still, as the perf. part. shews. See below) **after the likeness of God** (which remains in us, marred indeed, but not, as is sometimes carelessly said, destroyed. This likeness we ought to revere, in ourselves and in others: and he who curses, despises it. Not man's original state, but man's present state is here under consideration: and on that consideration depends the force of the Apostle's argument). **10.**] **Out of the same mouth cometh forth blessing and cursing** (by this resuming and collocation of the two opposite acts, the inconsistency is further shewn). **These things, my brethren, ought not** (χρή is not elsewhere found in the N.T., but always δεῖ) **so to take place.** **11.**] *Illustration from nature, that such conduct is unnatural.* **Doth a fountain** (the fountain, generically, as ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου, John xii. 24: ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι, Matt. xiii. 3: τὰ κοινοῦντα τον ἄνθρωπον, ib. xv. 19, 20 al. freq.) **out of the same chink** (hole, from which the water flows, in a rock, or in the earth. The word is probably connected with ὄψ, ὄπτομαι) **send forth** (βρύω, which is generally intransitive,—cf. Soph. Œd. Col. 16 f., χῶρος δ' ὅδ' ἱερός, ὡς σάφ' εἰκάσαι, βρύων | δάφνης ἐλαίας ἀμπέλου,—is used transitively by Anacreon, 37. 2, ἴδε πῶς, ἔαρος φανέντος, χάριτες ῥόδα βρύουσιν) **the sweet and the bitter** (water, of course: but there is no need to supply any thing: the contrast is in the contrary nature of the two)? **12.**] Shews further that *natural organizations do not bring forth things opposite to or inconsistent with their usual fruits*, but each one has one result, and that always. **Can, my brethren, a fig-tree bring forth** (see on the whole, and on ποιῆσαι in this sense, Matt. vii. 16 ff. But De Wette is wrong, when he says that thistles or the like would be here, as there, more agreeable to the similitude. For the reasoning is not here, that we must not look for good fruit from a bad tree: but that no tree can bring forth fruit inconsistent with its own nature: as in Arrian, Epict. ii. 20, πῶς δύναται ἄμπελος μὴ ἀμπελικῶς κινεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐλαϊκῶς; ἢ ἔλαια πάλιν μὴ ἐλαϊκῶς ἀλλ' ἀμπελικῶς; ἀμήχανον, ἀδιανόητον) **olives, or a vine figs? Nor** (as if the former sentence had been a negative one) **can salt (water) bring forth sweet water** (i.e. if the mouth emit cursing, thereby making itself a brackish spring, it cannot to any purpose also emit the sweet stream of praise and good words: if it appear to do so, all must be hypo-

13 Τίς [v] σοφὸς καὶ [vw] ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν; [x] δειξάτω [x] ἐκ τῆς καλῆς [y] ἀναστροφῆς τὰ [z] ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν [a] πραΰτητι [b] σοφίας. 14 εἰ δὲ [cd] ζῆλον [p] πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ [de] ἐριθείαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν, μὴ [f] κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ [g] ψεύδεσθε [g] κατὰ τῆς [h] ἀληθείας. 15 οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ [b] σοφία [i] ἄνωθεν

v Deut. i. 13, 15. iv. 6. w here only. x ch. ii. 18. y Heb. xiii. 7 reff. z = John iii. 19, 20, 21. a ch. i. 21 reff. b = ch. i. 5. c = Acts v. 17. xiii. 45. Rom. x. 2 al. Sir. xxx. 24. d here bis. 2 Cor. xii. 20. Gal. v. 20. e as above (d). Rom. ii. 8. Phil. i. 17. ii. 3 only †. f ch. ii. 13 reff. g see Matt. v. 11. h James, ch. i. 18. v. 19 only. i = ch. i. 17 reff.

14. aft ει δε ins αρα A[P] 13. 56. 106(sic). ταις καρδιαις ℵ [b j o 4. 16. 27-9. 66². 106 latt syrr copt arm Antch₁]. καυχασθε A a m 14¹-6-9. 22-3-6. 37. 46. 69. 78. 123-77. (κατα) της αληθειας bef και ψευδεσθε ℵ [Syr].—om κατα ℵ¹.
15. η σοφια bef αυτη C a c Did₁ [Ephr₁] Thl: om αυτη lat-ff₁.

crisy and mere seeming). 13—18.] *Wisdom must be shewn by meekness and peaceableness, not by contentiousness.* This paragraph is closely connected with the subject of the chapter as enounced in ver. 1. Where that ambition, and rivalry to be teachers, existed, there was sure to be contentiousness and every evil thing.
13.] **Who is** (cf. the similar question in Ps. xxxiii. 12, τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζωὴν κ.τ.λ.; παῦσον τὴν γλῶσσάν σου ἀπὸ κακοῦ κ.τ.λ.) **wise and a man of knowledge** (the same adjectives are joined in reff. It is not easy to mark the difference, if any is here intended. Wiesinger says, "σοφός is a general term for the normal habit as regards intelligence, cf. ch. i. 5: while ἐπιστήμων denotes the practical insight which in any given case judges rightly and teaches the right way to put σοφία in practice." Rather would it follow the general analogy of the words to regard σοφία as denoting general ability backed by knowledge, ἐπιστήμη as acquaintance with particular facts and departments of knowledge. The σοφός is an able man, the ἐπιστήμων a well-informed man. But the distinction must be very uncertain: for while Plato says, Rep. v. p. 477 B, ἐπιστήμη ἐπὶ τῷ ὄντι πέφυκε γνῶναι ὡς ἔστι τὸ ὄν, in the Phædrus, p. 96 B, he says again, οἱ σοφοὶ ἐπιστήμῃ σοφοί εἰσιν . . . . . . ἐπιστήμη ἄρα σοφία ἐστί(ν)) **among you? Let him shew** (aor. because referring to each individual ἔργον when performed, rather than to his general habit) **out of** (ref.: to which passage and its reasoning the Apostle seems again to be referring. The σοφία and ἐπιστήμη would be dead without this exhibition, as faith without works) **his good conduct** (in life: see reff.) **his works** (the good conduct is the general manifestation: the works, the particular results of that general manifestation. The sum of both makes up the ἔργα in the former case, ch. ii.) **in meekness of wisdom** (an adverbial clause belonging to δειξάτω: not to be tamed down into πραεία σοφία as Beza, Grot., al., nor into πραΰτης σοφή as Laurentius: meekness is the attribute, σοφία the character to which it belongs: 'in that meekness which is the proper attribute of wisdom').

14—16.] *Consequences of the opposite course.* 14.] **But if ye have** (as is the fact: this is implied by the indic.: cf. Col. iii. 1, εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ χριστῷ κ.τ.λ.) **bitter emulation** (πικρόν seems to refer back to the example in vv. 11, 12. "Non damnatur," says Bengel, "zelus dulcis et ira dulcis, ex fide et amore") **and rivalry** (see on ἔριθος and ἐριθεία in note, Rom. ii. 8. Beware of confounding ἐριθεία with ἔρις, as is very generally done) **in your heart** (*out of which* come thoughts and words and acts, see Matt. xv. 18, 19), **do not** (in giving yourselves out for wise, which (cf. ver. 15) you cannot really be) **boast against** (ref.) **and lie against the truth** (q. d. κατακαυχᾶσθε κ. καταψεύδεσθε, but the latter compound is resolved to bring out more forcibly the ψεῦδος in their conduct. Some, as De W. and Wiesinger, suppose κατακαυχ. κατά to belong together, and καὶ ψεύδεσθε to be an insertion of the Apostle further to define the κατακαυχᾶσθε. Others again have taken pains to excuse the imagined tautology in ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, which however is no tautology at all. ἡ ἀλήθεια, from its following κατακαυχᾶσθε, is necessarily not subjective, '*truth*' merely, as a quality absent from the conduct of those thus acting, but objective, '*the truth*,' of which their whole lives would be thus a negation and an opposition;—which would be in their persons vaunted against and lied against).

15.] *Designation of such pretended wisdom.* **This wisdom is not one descending from above** (the verb is purposely resolved, to throw out the negation οὐκ ἔστιν, and to put the categorical κατερχομένη into prominence as a class to which this σοφία does not belong. So that we must not miss this purpose by making ἐστιν κατερχομένη = κατέρχεται, as does E. V., Schneckenb., al.: still less must we with Luth., al.,

[k] κατερχομένη, ἀλλʼ [l] ἐπίγειος, [m] ψυχική, [n] δαιμονιώδης. 16 [o] ὅπου γὰρ [cd] ζῆλος καὶ [de] ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ [p] ἀκαταστασία καὶ πᾶν [q] φαῦλον [r] πρᾶγμα. 17 ἡ δὲ [i] ἄνωθεν [b] σοφία πρῶτον μὲν [s] ἁγνή ἐστιν, ἔπειτα [t] εἰρηνική, [u] ἐπιεικής, [v] εὐπειθής, [w] μεστὴ [x] ἐλέους καὶ [y] καρπῶν [y] ἀγαθῶν, [z] ἀδιάκριτος,

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

k = here only. particip. constr., ch. i. 17 reff. l John iii. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 40 bis. 2 Cor. v. 1. Phil. ii. 10. iii. 19 only †. m 1 Cor. ii. 14. xv. 44 bis, 46. Jude 19 only †. n here only †. Ps. xc. 6 Symm. o Heb. ix. 16 reff. p Luke xxi. 9. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. 2 Cor. vi. 5. xii. 20 only. Prov. xxvi. 28. Tobit iv. 13 (not in ℵ) only. (-τατος, ch. i. 8.) q John iii. 20. v. 29. Rom. ix. 11. Tit. ii. 8 only. Prov. xxii. 8. r = Heb. vi. 18. x. 1. xi. 1 al. s 2 Cor. vii. 11. xi. 2. 1 John iii. 3 al. Ps. xviii. 9. (-νότης, 2 Cor. vi. 6.) t Heb. xii. 11 only. Deut. xxiii. 6 al. u 1 Pet. ii. 18 reff. v here only †. εὐπειθεστέρῳ πρὸς τὸ παρακαλούμενον, Polyb. i. 68. 3. w ver. 8. x ch. ii. 13. y here only. elsw. κ. καλός, as Matt. iii. 10. vii. 16 &c. z here only ‡. Prov. xxv. 1 only.

αλλα B[ℵ].
16. for εριθεια ⌊-ρειθ- B[1]], ερεις C [ερις P Antch$_1$.] aft εκει ins και Aℵ 4. 13. 73. 101 vulg-mss Syr.
17. aft καρπων ins εργων C(erased by C[3]?) 27-9. 66[2]. 106 Did$_1$. rec ins και

render ungrammatically, "this is not the wisdom which cometh down" (ἡ ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη)), **but earthly** (as the sharpest contrast to ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη: belonging to this earth, and its life of sin and strife), **sensual** (it is almost impossible to express satisfactorily in English the idea given by **ψυχικός**. Our '*soul*' is so identified with man's spiritual part in common parlance, that we have lost the distinction between ψυχή and πνεῦμα, except when we can give a periphrastic explanation. The idea here is, belonging to the unspiritual mind of man. See the whole treated in the note on Jude 19, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔχοντες), **devilish** (like, or partaking of the nature of, the devils. This word must not be figuratively taken, as by Hottinger (in Huther), "impuro genio magis quam homine digna:" it betokens both the origin of this hypocritical wisdom (cf. φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης above, ver. 6), and its character: it is from,—not God, the giver of all true wisdom, ch. i. 5, but—the devil,—and bears the character of its author). 16.] *Justification of the foregoing assertion.* **For where is emulation** (in a bad sense) **and rivalry** (see above), **there is confusion** (ref. 1 Cor.: anarchy, restless disturbance. Cf. ref. Prov., στόμα ἄστεγον ποιεῖ ἀκαταστασίας), **and every evil** (reff.) **thing** (or, deed). 17, 18.] *Character and praise of heavenly wisdom.* 17.] **But** (contrast) **the wisdom from above is first of all pure** ("Ad duplex genus qualitas revocatur: altero interna vis uno vocabulo exprimitur, quippe una ipsa cæterarumque effectrix, altero externæ rationes sex notationibus describuntur, quæ ad primarium scriptoris consilium invidiæ rixisque occurrendi omnes redeunt." Theile. ἁγνή, καθαρὰ καὶ ἀρύπαρος, μηδενὸς τῶν σαρκικῶν ἀντεχομένη, Œc. It is hardly necessary to guard any scholar against the abuse of this text often found, when it is made to signify that the heavenly-wise must be pure, i. e. free from all contact with any thing that offends, *before he can be* peaceable: and thus it is used to further, instead of to discourage, an uncharitable spirit), **then** (= in the second place: its external qualities are now enumerated) **peaceable, forbearing** (μὴ ἀκριβοδίκαιος ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, Aristot. Eth. Nic. x. 6. See note on Phil. iv. 5), **easily persuaded** ("suadibilis," vulg. The word occurs in the active sense of "easily persuading," in Æschyl. Agam. 274, πότερα δʼ ὀνείρων φάσματʼ εὐπειθῆ σέβεις: and Choeph. 259, πέμπειν ἔχοις ἂν σήματʼ εὐπειθῆ βροτοῖς: but not, that I am aware, in this passive sense), **full of compassion** (the great triumph of the Christian practical life is won by ἔλεος: see ch. ii. 13) **and good fruits** (contrast to πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα above), **without doubting** (as might be expected, from the various meanings of διακρίνεσθαι, this word has been variously interpreted. Luther, E. V., and most Commentators render it "*without partiality,*" unparteiiſch, thus giving to a passive adjective an active meaning: and in the same spirit, Œc., μὴ διακρίνουσα παρατηρήσεις βρωμάτων κ. διαφόρων βαπτισμάτων: Beza, "*absque disceptatione:*" vulg., "*non judicans:*" Calvin, "Nimis anxiam et scrupulosam inquisitionem notat, qualem fere in hypocritis cernere licet, qui dum nimis exacte inquirunt in fratrum dicta et facta, nihil non in sinistram partem rapiunt:" Bengel, "Non facit discrimen ubi non opus est, v. gr., inter potentes et tenues." The passive sense is kept by Gebser, who understands "undivided:" the heavenly-wise keeping banded together in love: Wetst., "*non duplex.*" Two considerations contribute to substantiate the rendering given above, which is that of De Wette, Wiesinger, and Huther. 1. The word would seem, from its close junction with ἀνυπόκριτος, rather to betoken an inner

[a] ἀνυπόκριτος. 18 [b] καρπὸς δὲ [b] δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς [d] ποιοῦσιν [d] εἰρήνην.

IV. 1 [e] Πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ [e] πόθεν [f] μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν; οὐκ [g] ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν [h] ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν τῶν [i] στρατευο-

a Rom. xii. 9. 2 Cor. vi. 6. 1 Tim. i. 5. 2 Tim. i. 5. 1 Pet. i. 22 only +. Wisd. v. 18. xviii. 16 only.
b Phil. i. 11. Heb. xii. 11. Prov. xi. 30.
c = Gal. vi. 8 al. Prov. xxii. 8.
d Eph. ii. 15 only. Isa. xlv. 7. see Matt. v. 9.
e Epp., here bis only. = Luke i. 43 al.
f 2 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Tim. ii. 23. Tit. iii. 9 only. Gen. xiii. 7.
g = (& Epp.) here only. (John xviii. 36 al.)
h = here bis (Luke viii. 14. Tit. iii. 3. 2 Pet. ii. 13) only.
i 1 Pet. ii. 11 reff.

bef ανυποκριτος, with KL rel Syr [æth] Thl Œc: om ABC[P]ℵ a 13 latt syr copt arm Did$_1$ [Ephr$_1$ Antch$_1$] Damasc$_1$.

18. rec ins της bef δικαιοσυνης, with K rel Œc: o(but erased) ℵ: om ABCL[P] a c d h k [arm Ephr$_1$ Antch$_1$ Damasc$_2$] Thl.

Chap. IV. 1. rec om 2nd ποθεν, with KL rel vulg vind Syr [æth] Œc: ins ABC[P]ℵ a c m 13 lat-ff$_1$(and spec) syr copt arm Antch$_1$ Thl. εν υμ. bef κ. ποθ. μαχ. A [arm-mss]; bef μαχαι 13 [Syr].

quality than (as Gebser above) an outward circumstance: 2. when thus used of an inner quality, cf. ch. i. 6 and ii. 4, our Apostle, in common with other N.T. writers, signifies by it '*to doubt*.' So that I would understand by it "expers omnis cujuscunque ambiguitatis et simulationis," as Huther), **without feigning** ("These two characteristics are also added with especial reference to the state of things among the readers: on **ἀδιάκριτος**, cf. ch. i. 6—8; ii. 4: on **ἀνυπόκριτος**, ch. i. 22, 26; ii. 1." Huther). **18.**] Before, in ver. 16, after the characterization came the *statement of the result:* and so now here. That result was designated as a present one, ἀκαταστασία κ. πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα: this is a future one, but beautifully anticipated by the pregnant expression καρπὸς σπείρεται: see below. **But** (δέ passes from the subjective character to the objective result) **fruit** (or, *the fruit*, καρπός being in the emphatic place and therefore losing its article) **of righteousness** (genitive of apposition: that fruit which is righteousness: see ref. Heb. and cf. Isa. xxxii. 17: righteousness in its wider sense: in themselves and in others; in practice and in reward; in time and in eternity) **is sown** (in saying **καρπὸς σπείρεται** the Apostle uses a prolepsis, as if a husbandman should this autumn be said to sow next year's bread) **in peace** (not as De W., for εἰς εἰρήνην, but betokening the spirit and mode in which the sowing takes place, as opposed to ὅπου ζῆλος κ. ἐριθεία) **by them who work** (better than "make," which seems to confine the meaning to the reconciling persons at variance. So also in ref. Matt. The dative participle is not a 'dativus commodi,' but the dat. of the agent: the former view would leave out of the proposition that which is in fact its necessary and most important feature, viz. that the peace-workers themselves are the sowers of the fruit) **peace.**

Chap. IV. 1—10.] *Exhortations and pleadings, as connected with what preceded, first against wars and fightings, then against the lusts and worldly desires out of which these spring.* And herein, 1—3.] *against wars and fightings, the origin of which is detailed and exposed.*

1.] **Whence are wars, and whence fightings among you** ("By what follows, it is not contentions *between teachers* that are meant, as Schneckenb., al., or *sects*, as Semler, al.,—but concerning 'meum' and 'tuum.' Grot. refers them to the tumults which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem. **πόλ.** and **μάχ.** are strong expressions, as in Arrian, Epict. iii. 21 in Raphel, and Wetst. πρὸς τὸ παιδάριον πόλεμος, πρὸς τοὺς γείτονας κ.τ.λ." De Wette. The above assertion, that these are strifes about mine and thine, confines them perhaps to too narrow a space; they seem rather, as Huther, to represent all those quarrels which spring up about common worldly interests from selfish considerations of pride, envy, covetousness, and the like)? **Are they not from hence** (this second question contains in fact the answer to the former, in an appeal to the consciences of the readers), **from your lusts** (an unusual sense of **ἡδοναί**, hardly distinguishable from ἐπιθυμίαι: in fact taken up by ἐπιθυμεῖτε) **which militate** (campaign, have their camp, and, as it were, forage about. There seems no need, with De W., Calov., al., to supply κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς or κατὰ τοῦ νοός, as in ref.: Huther observes well, that, had this been intended, it would have been more plainly expressed. Schneckenb., Theile, al. understand it of militating *one against another*, but this again is not consistent with the context, in which αἱ ἡδοναὶ ὑμῶν are treated as a class, united for one purpose, cf. ver. 3 fin. Wiesinger thinks that the adversaries are to be found in

k ch. iii. 5, 6 reff.
l absol., Gal. v. 17. 2 Kings xxiii. 15.
m Matt. xix. 16.
n Acts vii. 9. xvii. 5. 1 Cor. xiii. 4. Gen. xxxvii. 11.
o Rom. xi. 7 bis. Heb. vi. 15. xi. 33 only. Gen. xxxix. 2. Prov. xii. 27 only.
p John vi. 52. Acts vii. 26. 2 Tim. ii. 24 only. Gen. xxvi. 20.
q here only, exc. Rev. ii. 16 al5. Ps. xxxiv. 1 al. fr.
r of prayer, ch. i. 5 reff. Matt. vii. 7.
s = John xviii. 23. Acts xxiii. 5 (from Exod. xxii. 28) only. 1 Macc. vii. 42.
t Mark v. 26. Luke xv. 14. Acts xxi. 24. 2 Cor. xii. 15 only †. Judith xii. 4 al.

μένων ἐν τοῖς [k] μέλεσιν ὑμῶν; 2 [l] ἐπιθυμεῖτε, καὶ οὐκ [m] ἔχετε· φονεύετε καὶ [n] ζηλοῦτε, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε [o] ἐπιτυχεῖν· [p] μάχεσθε καὶ [q] πολεμεῖτε. οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ [r] αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς· 3 [r] αἰτεῖτε, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι [s] κακῶς [r] αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς [h] ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν [t] δαπανήσητε.

...πολεμειτε C. ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h-j k l m o 13

2. rec aft 2nd ουκ εχετε ins δε: pref και [P]ℵ a b[2] c f g k l[2] 36 latt syrr copt [(æth) arm] Thl Œc: om ABKL rel fuld(with tol).

3. [aft αιτειτε add δε P d m.] καταδαπανησητε ℵ[1]: δαπανησετε B.

the fact of the ἐπιθυμεῖν having set over against it an οὐκ ἔχειν, an οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν. But this again would not, except by implication (this οὐ δύνασθε implying a neighbour who is the obstacle), touch the point of wars and fightings. It is far better therefore to see as the adversaries, our fellow-men, against whom, to put down whom and set ourselves up, our lusts are as it were an army of soldiers ever encamped within us and waging war) **in your members** (see a remarkable parallel in Plato, Phædo, p. 66 c: *καὶ γὰρ πολέμους καὶ στάσεις καὶ μάχας οὐδὲν ἄλλο παρέχει ἢ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἱ τούτου ἐπιθυμίαι*)?

Ver. 2 *carries on the assertion in detail.* **Ye desire** (generally: it is not said what: but evidently worldly possessions and honours are intended by the context, vv. 4 ff.), **and possess not** (lust of possession does not ensure possession itself, then comes a further step, out of this lust): **ye murder** (but how comes **φόνος** to be introduced at this early stage of the development of ἐπιθυμία, before ζῆλος, which itself leads on to μάχαι κ. πόλεμοι? Three solutions of this difficulty may at once be set aside, as out of the question: 1. that which makes the words mean "*ye envy even unto death,*" giving the so-called adverbial meaning to φονεύετε καί. So Carpzov, Pott, Schneckenburger, al. Against this, besides its exceeding lameness and clumsiness, is, that in this case the subordinate verb φονεύετε must come *last*, not first. 2. That which gives to φονεύετε the unexampled sense, "*ye murder in thought,*" have the intent to murder. So Estius, Calov., Bengel, De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger. But even if such a meaning might be justified, which I doubt, by the strong figurative cast of the passage, yet the matter of fact character of the following clause, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν, makes it more probable that a matter of fact is here also pointed at, and that φονεύετε is rather qualified by καὶ ζηλοῦτε than strictly parallel with it. 3. That of Œcum., which as far as I know stands alone: *ἐπιστατέον δὲ ὡς φόνον ἐνταῦθα καὶ πόλεμον οὐ τὸν σαρκικόν φησι. τοῦτο γὰρ βαρὺ καὶ κατὰ λῃστῶν ἐννοεῖν, μὴ ὅτι κατὰ πόσως πιστῶν καὶ τῷ κυρίῳ προσερχομένων. ἀλλ' ὥς γέ μοι δοκεῖ, φονευειν φησὶ τοὺς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ψυχὴν ἀποκτιννυντας ταῖς τολμηραῖς ταύταις ἐπιχειρήσεσι, δι' ἃς καὶ ὁ πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῖς πόλεμος.* Another inadmissible expedient is, to suppose **φθονεῖτε** to be the true reading; there being no authority whatever for it in manuscripts. Thus Erasm., Luther, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Benson, and many others. It only remains then to take the word literally, and understand it to allude to such cases, e. g. as those in the O.T. of David and Ahab, who, in their desire to possess, committed murder. And if it be said, as Œc. above, that this is a hard saying of those who feared the Lord, be it remembered that the Apostle is speaking of πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι, and though he may include under these terms the lesser forms of variance, the greater and more atrocious ones are clearly not excluded. In the state of Jewish society during the apostolic age, it is to be feared that examples of them were but too plentiful, and there is no saying how far the Christian portion of Jewish communities may have suffered themselves to become entangled in such quarrels and their murderous consequences) **and envy, and are not able to obtain: ye fight and make war** (these words form the final answer to the πόθεν κ.τ.λ. with which the section begins: and are therefore not to be joined with the following as by δέ in the rec.).

Reason why ye have not. **Ye have not, because ye ask not** (in prayer to God: in the following verse he explains, and as it were corrects this): 3.] **ye ask** (notice the unaccountable interchange of active and middle, αἰτεῖσθαι . . . αἰτεῖτε . . . αἰτεῖσθε, all referring to the same act) **and do not receive, because ye ask amiss** (with evil intent, see below), **that ye may spend**

4 [u] μοιχαλίδες, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἡ [v] φιλία τοῦ κόσμου [w] ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν; ὃς ἂν οὖν [x] βουληθῇ φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ [y] καθίσταται. 5 [z] ἢ [z] δοκεῖτε [z] ὅτι [a] κενῶς ἡ [b] γραφὴ [b] λέγει [c] Πρὸς [cd] φθόνον [e] ἐπιποθεῖ

u Matt. xii. 39. xvi. 4 ‖ Mk. Rom. vii. 3 bis. 2 Pet. ii. 14 only. Mal. iii. 5 al. v here only. Prov. x. 12. w Rom. viii. 7. Luke xxiii. 12. Gal. v. 20. Eph. ii. 15, 16 only. Gen. iii. 15. x = 1 Tim. vi. 9. y = ch. iii. 6 reff. z Matt. xxvi. 53. a here only (see 2 Cor. vi. 1 al.). Isa. xlix. 4 only. ἀσήμως καὶ κενῶς, Arrian, Epict. ii. 17. Wetst. b Rom. iv. 3. 1 Tim. v. 18 al. c = here only. so πρὸς ὀργήν, Soph. El. 372. Winer. d 1 Pet. ii. 1 reff. e w. πρός, here only. Ps. xli. 1. — 2 Cor. ix. 14. Phil. i. 8. (1 Pet. ii. 2 reff.) w. ἐπί, Deut. xiii. 8. Ps. xli. 1.

4. rec ins *μοιχοι και* bef *μοιχαλιδες*, with KL[P]ℵ[3] rel syr Thl Œc: om ABℵ[1] 13 Syr copt æth arm, *adulteri* vulg, *fornicatores* lat-ff_1.—B joins *μοιχαλιδες* with the precedg. aft 1st *κοσμου* ins *τουτου* ℵ [68 vulg Syr æth arm Orig-int_1]. *εστιν* bef *τω θεω* ℵ. om *ος* ℵ[1]. for *αν*, *εαν* B[P]ℵ[1] a c 5. 22. 69 [Cyr-p_1 $Damasc_1$]. *βουληθης*(but *ς* erased) ℵ[3]. *εχθρα* ℵ[1].

5. *λεγει* is joined to *πρ. φθον.* follg in A h j [4. 10-1-4-5-6. 21. 38] 40. 66. 73-8. 97. 104

(it) (that which ye ask for) in ('in the exercise of,' 'under the dominion of:' *ἐν* does not belong to the verb (*δαπανᾶν ἐν*, 'to spend on,' "that ye may consume it upon" as E. V., which would be *δαπανᾶν εἰς*), but to the state in which the spenders are, q. d. in the course of satisfying) **your lusts.** The general sense is: if you really prayed aright, this feeling of continual craving after more worldly things would not exist: all your proper wants would be supplied: and these improper ones which beget wars and fightings among you would not exist. Ye would ask, and ask aright, and consequently would obtain.

4.] **Ye adulteresses** (the occurrence of the fem. only is rightly explained by Theile: "A fœm. nec vero a masc. facta denominatio suppeditari poterat ipsa imagine. Ea quum Deum sistat *maritum*, homines *fœminam*, non minus recte singuli homines *scorta* dicentur, quam totum genus atque universa aliqua gens *scortum*." Nor is De Wette's protest needed that only das Volk im Ganzen, only the entire people, is thus called: nor Huther's consequent modification of Theile, that St. James is addressing Churches here. For God is the Lord and husband of every soul that is His, as much as of every church; and the indignant *μοιχαλίδες* of the Apostle is just as applicable to every one who forsakes his or her God, as to an apostate church. This is one of those cases where the testimony of our ancient MSS. is so valuable, in restoring to us the nervous and pregnant rebuke of the original), **know ye not that the friendship of the world** (*ὁ κόσμος* here, precisely as in ch. i. 27, men, and men's interests and ambitions and employments, in so far as they are without God. So that we must not understand merely *worldly goods*, as Schneckenburger, Theile, al., nor merely *worldly desires* (Didymus, Laurentius), nor both of these together (De Wette), to neither of which will *φιλία* properly fit) **is enmity** ('the state of being an enemy:' not *ἐχθρά*, "inimica," as vulg., which destroys the parallelism and force) **of God** (the man who is taken out of the world by Christ, cannot again become a friend and companion of worldly men and their schemes for self, without passing into enmity with God, of whose family he was a reconciled member. God and the world stand opposed to one another: so that a man cannot join the one without deserting the other. This is further stated in what follows)? **whoever therefore** (particular consequence on the general axiom just stated, carried however further, into all approach to, and not merely the completion of, the outward state) **shall be minded** (no *stress* on *βουληθῇ*: it is a mere statement of fact as to the man who becomes a friend of the world, and therefore, in so doing, sets his mind and thought and wish that way. So that we need not say with Laurentius, "Non is tantum est inimicus Dei, qui est ipso opere amicus mundi, sed etiam ille qui cum non possit, vult tamen." But he is so far right, that the Apostle certainly means to say, He that *would be* a friend of the world, must make up his mind to be God's enemy) **to be a friend of the world, is** (thereby, by the proceeding in the direction indicated by that *βουλή*) **constituted** (as above, ref.; not merely "is," or 'becomes:' 'becomes ipso facto,' 'then and there,' is rather the meaning of *καθίσταται*) **an enemy of God.**

5, 6.] *Testimony from Scripture* to convince further those who might question what has just been stated. 5.] **Or** (ref. the formula puts a hypothetical alternative, the assumption of which negatives itself) **do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, The Spirit that He** (God) **placed in us** (viz. when the Spirit descended on the church. We have *κατοικίζω* somewhat

f here only. Gen. iii. 24 al. fr. τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ f κατῴκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν; 6 μείζονα δὲ g δίδωσιν ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

g see below (m).

arm Œc. rec κατωκησεν (*itacism*), with KL[P] rel Thl Œc, *habitat* latt syrr copt: κατωκεισεν A: txt Bℵ.

similarly used Æsch. Prom. 250, τυφλὰς ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς ἐλπίδας κατῴκισα) **jealously** (**πρὸς φθόνον**, as πρὸς βίαν and the like: see below) **desireth** (us for his own)? These words connect naturally with the foregoing. We are married to one, even God, who has implanted in us His Spirit: and He is a jealous God, who will not suffer us to be friends of His enemy and His friends at the same time. The only difficulty seems to be, to trace this latter saying in any part of Scripture. For that this is the quotation, and no other, must be maintained against very many Commentators (see below) on account of **λέγει**, which can hardly be otherwise used than at introducing the thing said. I will state the solution which seems to me the most probable, and then give an account of other methods of solving it. The emphasis of this clause lies on the **πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ**: and, interpreting those words as above, we are naturally led to ask, is there any chapter or passage especially, where such a mind towards His people is ascribed to God? And this directs our thoughts at once to Deut. xxxii., where the love of Jehovah for Israel, and His jealousy over them is described. In that song of Moses we have this very word used of God, ver. 10 f., ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπαίδευσεν αὐτόν, καὶ διεφύλαξεν αὐτὸν ὡς κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ· ὡς ἀετὸς σκεπάσαι νοσσιὰν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς νοσσοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπεπόθησεν: and ver. 19, καὶ εἶδεν κύριος καὶ ἐζήλωσεν, καὶ παρωξύνθη δι' ὀργὴν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρων· καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ' αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. So that here we have the elements of the sense of that which is cited, viz. the jealous desire of the Lord over His people. And for the rest, τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατῴκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν, the only solution seems to be, that the Apostle translates into the language of the Gospel the former declarations of the God of Israel, e.g. such as that Num. xxxv. 34, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι κύριος κατασκηνῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, combining them with such prophecies as Ezek. xxxvi. 27, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν. I own that such a solution does not seem to me wholly satisfactory: still there is nothing improbable in the idea that St. James may have combined the general sense of Scripture on the point of God's jealousy over His people, and instead of the God who dwelt in Israel, may have placed the Holy Spirit who dwelleth in us. At all events it is better to understand it thus, than to make λέγει mean 'speaks,' or to force the words of the citation from their simple meaning. I now proceed to state other interpretations. And 1. of those who have recognized the fact that the words πρὸς φθόνον κ.τ.λ. *are a citation*. Of these, understanding the words variously (see below), Grotius believes them to refer to Gen. vi. 3, 5: Beza, Erasm. Schmid, to Gen. viii. 21: Witsius, to Num. xi. 29: Schneckenb. to Deut. v. 9 ff.: Le Clerc, to Ps. cxix. 20 ff.: Michaelis, to Prov. xxi. 10: Cocceius, to Cant. viii. 6: Wetstein, to Wisd. vi. 12. Others have supposed the N. T. to be intended by ἡ γραφή. Thus Benson believes the reference to be to Matt. vi. 24: Storr, al., to Gal. v. 17: Bengel, to 1 Pet. ii. 1 ff.: and Semler again, to a passage in the apocryphal book called the Testament of the XII Patriarchs. Bewildered by these differences, many Commentators, among whom are Œc., Bede, Calv., Est., Wolf, al., either deny the fact of a citation altogether, or refer the λέγει either on to the citation following in ver. 6, or back to what went before,—or, as I have done above, believe that the general sense of Scripture on the subject, and not any particular text, is adduced. Before passing from this part of my note, I may remark that Huther's objection, that against the view here given, the formula citandi, ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, is decisive, is not valid: see Wolf's Curæ, vol. v. p. 66: and cf. John vii. 38, 42, where though the formula εἶπεν ἡ γραφή is used, the general sense, and not the exact words, is given.

2. The sense of the words themselves, **πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατῴκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν**, is very variously given. *a*. **πρὸς φθόνον** is by some referred back to **λέγει**,—ἡ γρ. λέγει πρὸς φθόνον: "An putatis, quod scriptura in vanum loquatur adversus invidiam? Spiritus *desideria excitat*, sed meliora desideriis carnis:" so Du Mont, in Huther. But this "*desideria excitare*" is an unexampled sense of ἐπιποθεῖν. Gebser takes this connexion, and renders, "Think ye, that the Scripture speaks in vain, and enviously?" And nearly so Œcumenius, ἢ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, ἢ πρὸς φθόνον; οὐδὲν τούτων· ἀλλ' ἐπιποθεῖ κ.τ.λ. But, as Huther remarks, this necessity for ἢ sufficiently condemns this view: and

[g] χάριν· [h] διὸ [h] λέγει, [i] Ὁ θεὸς [j] ὑπερηφάνοις [k] ἀντιτάσσεται, [l] ταπεινοῖς δὲ [m] δίδωσιν [m] χάριν. 7 [n] ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ. [o] ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ [p] καὶ [q] φεύξεται

h Eph. iv. 8. v. 14. i Prov. iii. 34. j Luke i. 51. Rom. i. 30. 2 Tim. iii. 2. 1 Pet. v. 5 only. Ps. cxviii. 21. k 1 Pet. v. 5 reff. l = Matt. xi. 29. 1 Pet. v. 5 al. Ps. xxxiii. 18. m = Eph. iv. 29. 1 Pet. v. 5 from l. c. (1 Cor. i. 4 al.) see Exod. iii. 21. n Rom. viii. 7. = Heb. xii. 9 reff. o Matt. v. 39. Eph. vi. 13. 1 Pet. v. 9. Job xli. 2. p = John ii. 19. Eph. v. 14. Rev. ii. 10. q mid., John x. 5 only. Lev. xxvi. 17 al. fr.

7. rec om δε, with KL[P] f h k 36 Thl Œc: ins *et* bef *αντιστ.* spec Syr æth [arm]: txt ABℵ rel [latt] syr copt.

thus ἐπιποθεῖ would be left here without any qualifying adverb to fill out its sense. β. Taking then **πρὸς φθόνον** with **ἐπιποθεῖ**, we have the following various views taken: I. **πνεῦμα** as the *subject*. And herein A. **τὸ πν.** = the human spirit, in its natural condition. So Hottinger, "Animus hominis natura fertur ad invidendum aliis:" so also Beza, Laurentius, Grot., al., and E. V. B. **τὸ πν.** = the Spirit of God, whom God hath caused to take up His dwelling in us: and then a. **πρὸς φθ.** = "*ad invidiam:*" in which case the clause is interrogative: "Num ad invidiam proclivis est Spiritus, qui nobis inest? minime:" similarly Bede ("Numquid spiritus gratiæ, quo significati estis in die redemptionis, hoc concupiscit ut invideatis alterutrum"), Witsius, Calv., Wolf, al. b. **πρὸς φθ.** = "*contra invidiam:*" so Luther, der Geist .... gelüstet wider den Haß,—Pareus, Bengel, al. c. **πρὸς φθ.** = "*invidiose:*" so De Wette, much as the interp. given above, neidisch liebt (uns) der Geist: so Schneckenburger, and in substance many old Commentators (see Pol. Synops. v. p. 1459, col. 1), rendering it "*usque ad invidiam:*" e. g. Tirinus, Menochius, Cajetan, al. II. **πνεῦμα** as the *object*, supplying ὁ θεός as the subject, understanding πν. the human spirit, and taking πρὸς φθόν. adverbially. So Wiesinger, "The Love of God jealously desires as an object your love:" so Theile, supplying however ἡ γραφή as the subject, as also does Œcumenius, continuing from the words cited above, οὐδὲν τούτων· ἀλλ' ἐπιποθεῖ ἤτοι ἐπιζητεῖ τὴν διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως αὐτῆς ἐγκατοικισθεῖσαν ἡμῖν χάριν: and below, πνεῦμα τὴν ἀγαθήν φησι προαίρεσιν. In judging of the above interpretations (the classification of which I have mainly taken from Huther), we may notice, that to interpret πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ, as if it were κατὰ φθόνου ἐπιθυμεῖ, see Gal. v. 17, is to do violence to the construction and meaning of the words: besides which, there is no mention here of envy, as a human passion, the discourse being of the enmity to God incurred by those who would be friends to the world; of God's enmity to the proud and upholding of the humble. So that God must be the subject of this clause, as expressed by τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατῴκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν. This being so, our only rendering of **πρὸς φθόνον** will be as above, adverbially, as so very frequently, e. g. πρὸς δίκην, πρὸς ἡδονήν, πρὸς χάριν, πρὸς λύπην, πρὸς ὀργήν, πρὸς βίαν, πρὸς ὕβριν, &c. &c. See Palm and Rost's Lex. under πρός, vol. ii. p. 1138, col. 2, where many examples are given, e. g. πρὸς χάριν ἢ πρὸς ἀπέχθειαν δικάζειν, Lucian: πρὸς ὀργὴν ἀκούειν, &c. With regard to the sense above given, as fitting into the context, Theile well says, **ἐπιποθεῖν** with an accusative, "desiderio alicujus teneri," to love eagerly, as reff. 2 Cor., Phil., introduces us into the same figurative realm of thought in which μοιχαλίδες placed us before. The Apostle is speaking of the eager and jealous love of God towards those whom He has united as it were in the bond of marriage with Himself. 6.] **But He** (God, by His Holy Spirit dwelling in us, the same subject as in the previous sentence) **gives the more grace** (the more and greater, for this longing and jealous desire): **wherefore he saith** (the Spirit, again: for it is the same Spirit who is implanted in us that speaks in Scripture. This is better than to supply 'the Scripture;' far better than to take λέγει impersonally, "it is written," as Kern), **God** (κύριος, LXX: and the same variation is found where the words are again cited in 1 Pet. v. 5) **is set against the proud** (reff.), **but giveth grace to the lowly** (see Rom. xii. 16. This is a proof that the ambitious and restless after worldly honours and riches, are God's enemies, whereas the humble and lowly are the objects of His gifts of ever-increasing grace. The inference follows in the shape of *solemn exhortation* (vv. 7—10)). 7.] **Submit yourselves therefore to God** (addressed mainly to the proud—the μοιχαλίδες above; but also to all): **but resist the devil** (the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) **and he shall flee** (better than E. V., "*will flee,*" which is merely an assurance as from man to man: this is a divine promise. Huther refers to Hermas, Pastor ii. 12. 5, p. 949,

r = Heb. vii. 19 reff.
s = Acts xv. 9. 2 Cor. vii. 1. Eph. v. 26. Tit. ii. 14. Sir. xxxviii. 10.
t John xi. 55. Acts xxi. 24, 26. xxiv. 18. 1 Pet. i. 22. 1 John iii. 3 only. Num. xxxi. 23.

ABKLP ℵabcd fghjk lmo13

ἀφ' ὑμῶν, 8 [r] ἐγγίσατε τῷ θεῷ [p] καὶ [r] ἐγγιεῖ ὑμῖν. [s] καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, ἁμαρτωλοί, καὶ [t] ἁγνίσατε καρδίας, [u] δίψυχοι. 9 [v] ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ [wx] πενθήσατε καὶ [wy] κλαύσατε· ὁ [z] γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς [a] πένθος [b] μεταστραφήτω, καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς [c] κατήφειαν. 10 [de] ταπεινώθητε [f] ἐνώπιον κυρίου, καὶ [d] ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς. 11 Μὴ [g] καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων, ἀδελ-

u ch. i. 8 only †. v here only. = Ps. xxxvii. 6. (-ρία, ch. v. 1.) w Mark xvi. 10. Luke vi. 25. Rev. xviii. 11, 15, 19. 2 Kings xix. 1. x as above (w). Matt. v. 4. ix. 15. 1 Cor. v. 2. 2 Cor. xii. 21 only. y ch. v. 1 al. fr. z here only. Eccl. ii. 2. (-λᾶν, Luke vi. 21, 25.) a Rev. xviii. 7 bis, 8. xxi. 24 only. Gen. l. 4. b Acts ii. 20 (from Joel ii. 31). Gal. i. 7 only. Amos viii. 10. 1 Macc. ix. 41. c here only †. (-φής, Wisd. xvii. 4.) d Matt. xxiii. 12 bis. Luke xiv. 11 bis. xviii. 14 bis. 2 Cor. xi. 7. 1 Pet. v. 6. Job xxii. 23. Sir. ii. 17. e as above (d). Matt. xviii. 4. Luke iii. 5 (from Isa. xl. 4). 2 Cor. xii. 21. Phil. ii. 8. iv. 12 only. f James, here only. al. freq. g here 3ce. 1 Pet. ii. 12. iii. 16 only. Job xix. 3. (-λος, Rom. i. 30. -λία, 2 Cor. xii. 20.)

8. *εγγισει* B.
9. om *και* (bef *κλαυσατε*) Aℵ: om *κ. κλαυσ.* 15-8. 36 Syr Aug₁. for *μεταστραφ.*, *μετατραπητω* B[P] a c 69 Thl.
10. rec ins *του* bef *κυριου*, with L rel Thl Œc: om ABK[P]ℵ a c 13 Orig₁ Hesych₁.
11. *αδελφ. μου αλληλων* A 13(sic).

δύναται ὁ διάβολος παλαῖσαι, καταπαλαῖσαι δὲ οὐ δύναται. ἐὰν οὖν ἀντίστῃς αὐτόν, νικηθεὶς φεύξεται ἀπὸ σοῦ κατῃσχυμμένος) **from you**: 8.] **draw near to God, and He will draw near** (here better '*will*:' in speaking of the divine dealings, positive declarations are better softened: cf. John xvi. 23, E. V. Not that this is always observed: cf. Rev. vii. 17, E. V.) **to you.** But it is only the pure in heart and hand that can approach God: therefore—**Purify your hands** (the hands being the external organs of action, and becoming polluted by the act, as e. g. by blood in the act of murder: cf. Isa. i. 15, *αἱ γὰρ χεῖρες ὑμῶν αἵματος πλήρεις*: lix. 3: 1 Tim. ii. 8. And, for both the particulars here mentioned, Ps. xxiii. 4, *ἀθῷος χερσὶ καὶ καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ*), **ye sinners**: **and make chaste your hearts** (in allusion to *μοιχαλίδες* above), **ye double-minded** (ye whose affections are divided between God and the world. The Apostle is addressing not two classes of persons, but one and the same: "Eosdem vocat *peccatores* et *duplices animo*," Calv.). 9.] This cannot be done without *true and deep repentance*, leading them through *deep sorrow*. **Be wretched** (in your minds, from a sense of your sinfulness. That such feeling will have its outward demonstrations is evident: but this word itself does not allude to them, as Grot., "Affligite vosmetipsos jejuniis et aliis corporis *σκληραγωγίαις*:" so likewise Est., al. Beza also misses the point of the exhortation, when he says, "*ἀναλγησίαν* primum reprehendit in adversis, deinde immoderatam in rebus prosperis exultationem." "Vestram persentiscite miseriam," of Theile, is nearest the mark) **and mourn and weep** (here again Grot. refers the exhortation to outward things—"Lugubrem habitum induite, saccum et cilicia." These may follow on that which is here commanded, but are not the thing itself): **let your laughter** ("lautæ vitæ," Theile) **be turned into mourning** (these more of the outward manifestations) **and your joy into humiliation** (*κατήφεια*, lit. casting down of the eyes: hence shame or humiliation, which produces such downcast looks: cf. Il. γ. 51, where Hector, addressing Paris, calls Helen *πατρί τε σῷ μέγα πῆμα, πόληΐ τε παντί τε δήμῳ, Δυσμενέσιν μὲν χάρμα, κατηφείην δέ σοι αὐτῷ*. These latter, more of the inner states of mind). 10.] *Conclusion of the exhortation*: the true way to exaltation, through humility. Calvin quotes from Augustine, "Sicuti arborem, ut sursum crescat, profundas subtus radices agere oportet, ita quisquis in humilitatis radice fixum animum non habet, in ruinam suam extollitur." **Be humbled before the Lord** (ref. Matt. and 1 Pet. v. 6: but *ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ* there is not = *ἐνώπιον κυρίου* here. This latter gives more the realization in the soul of the presence of God, as drawing near to Him in humility: that, the subjection to Him in recognition of His providence and His judgments. **κυρίου**, not Christ, but the Father: see on ch. i. 7), **and He shall exalt you** (both here and hereafter: by His grace and counsel here (not exactly as Grot., who is too external throughout this passage, "Sublimes faciet donis suis") to the hidden glory of His waiting children, and by His fruition and presence hereafter (*ἐν καιρῷ* as 1 Pet. v. 6) to the ineffable glory of His manifested children. Cf. besides reff. Luke i. 52: Job v. 11: Ezek. xxi. 26). 11, 12.] *Exhortation against evil speaking and*

φοι· ὁ [g] καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ [h] κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ [g] καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ [h] κρίνει νόμον· εἰ δὲ νόμον [h] κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ [ik] ποιητὴς [l] νόμου ἀλλὰ [l] κριτής. [12] εἷς ἐστιν ὁ [m] νομοθέτης καὶ [n] κριτής, ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ [o] ἀπολέσαι· σὺ δὲ [p] τίς εἶ ὁ [p] κρίνων τὸν πλησίον;

h = Matt. vii. 1. John vii. 24. Rom. xiv. 3. Col. ii. 16.
i Rom. ii. 13 only. 1 Macc. ii. 67 only.
k =. as above (i). ch. i. 22. v. 6 (Acts xviii. 28) only.
l ch. ii. 4.
m here only. Ps. ix. 20 only. (-τεῖν, Heb. vii. 11.)
n = Acts x. 42. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Heb. xii. 23. ch. v. 9. Isa. xxxiii. 22.
o = Rom. xiv. 15. 1 Cor. viii. 11. xv. 18. 2 Pet. iii. 9. Matt. x. 28.
p Rom. xiv. 4.

rec (for η) και, with KL rel flor lat-ff_1(and spec) [æth(Tischdf) $Antch_1$] Œc: txt AB[P]ℵ c j o 13 vulg syrr coptt arm [$Damasc_1$] Thl.
12. [om 1st ο BP.] rec om και κριτης, with KL c d f k l Thl-comm Œc: ins AB[P]ℵ rel 36 latt Syr syr-w-ast coptt [æth arm Cyr-p_1] Did_3 $Antch_1$ Thl[-txt] $Cassiod_1$. [om 2nd ο A.] rec om δε, with a b c g h sah [arm] Œc: ins ABKL[P]ℵ rel 36 latt Syr syr[-w-ast] copt $Antch_1$ Thl. rec (for ο κρινων) ος κρινεις, with KL rel Œc: txt AB[P]ℵ a c m 13 coptt Thl. rec (for πλησιον) ετερον, with KL rel [æth] Œc: txt AB[P]ℵ a c 13 latt syrr coptt [$Antch_1$] Thl. add οτι ουκ εν ανθρωπω αλλ' εν θεω τα διαβηματα ανθρωπου κατευθυνεται (see Ps xxxvi. 23) K $Euthal_1$.

uncharitable judgment. Some have thought that there is no close connexion with the preceding: and Huther urges this from the milder word ἀδελφοί being here used, whereas before it was μοιχαλίδες, ἁμαρτωλοί, δίψυχοι. But it may be observed, that St. James frequently begins his exhortations mildly, and moves onward into severity: in this very paragraph we have an example of it, where unquestionably the σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον; is more severe than the ἀδελφοί with which it began. The connexion is with the whole spirit of this part of the Epistle, as dissuading mutual quarrels, undue self-exaltation, and neighbour-depreciation. Chap. iii. dealt with the sins of the tongue: and now, after speaking against pride and strife, the Apostle naturally returns to them, as springing out of a proud, uncharitable spirit. 11.] **Do not speak against one another** (it is evident what sort of καταλαλεῖν he means, by the junction of κρίνειν with it below: it is that kind which follows upon unfavourable judgment: depreciation of character and motive), **brethren** (ἀδελφοί prepares the way for the frequent mention of ἀδελφός below): **he that speaketh against a brother** (but not necessarily indefinite: the relations of life, πατήρ, μήτηρ, ἀδελφός &c. frequently lose their articles even when put definitely), **and judgeth his brother** (the expression of αὐτοῦ in this second case brings out more strongly the community under the νόμος, which such an one violates), **speaketh against the law** (of Christian life: the old moral law glorified and amplified by Christ: the νόμος βασιλικός, ch. ii. 8; νόμος τῆς ἐλευθερίας, i. 25), **and judgeth the law** (viz. by setting himself up over that law, as pronouncing upon its observance or non-observance by another. This is far better, than with Grot., al., "Doctrinam evangelicam homo talis spernit et damnat ut imperfectam: Christus enim tales non damnat:" or than Laurentius, cited with approbation by Huther, "Is qui detrahit proximo, detrahit legi, quia lex prohibet omnem detractionem: sed et judicat idem legem, quia hoc ipso quod contra prohibitionem legis detrahit, judicat quasi, legem non recte prohibuisse." This is condemned by the word *quasi*: for such an argument might be used of every transgressor. See below): **but if** (as thou dost) **thou judgest the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge** (seeing that he who judges, judges not only the man before him, but the law also: for he pronounces not only on the fact, but on that fact being, or not being, a breach of the law. So that thus to bring men's actions under the cognizance of the law, is the office of a judge. There is no need to supply νόμου after κριτής: indeed it destroys the sense by removing the point of the assertion. That the evil speaker *judges the law*, was before asserted; *now*, he is stated to be thereby removed from the Christian brotherhood of doers of the law, and become categorically *a judge*. And then in the next verse, the inconsistency and absurdity of his placing himself in that category is shewn). 12.] **One** (God) **is the lawgiver and judge** (unites these two offices in His own person: the latter of them depending on the former), **He who is able to save and destroy** (this second clause, ὁ δυνάμ. κ.τ.λ., is an epexegesis of εἷς, and belongs closely to the subject, not to the predicative part of the sentence, as De Wette gives it, Einer ist der Gesetzgeber und Richter, der da vermag zu retten und zu verderben. ὁ δυνάμενος, because

q ch. v. 1 only. Judg. xix. 6 B.
r = 1 John ii. 28.
s Luke xiii. 32, 33. Exod. xix. 10. xiii. 23. 3 Symm.

13 [q]Ἄγε [r]νῦν οἱ λέγοντες [s]Σήμερον καὶ [s]αὔριον πορευσόμεθα εἰς [t]τήνδε τὴν πόλιν καὶ [u]ποιήσομεν ἐκεῖ ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα καὶ [v]ἐμπορευσόμεθα καὶ [w]κερδήσομεν, 14 [x]οἵτινες

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

t = (see note.) u = Acts xv. 33. xviii. 23. xx. 3. 2 Cor. xi. 25. Rev. xiii. 5 (?). Prov. v = here (2 Pet. ii. 3) only. Gen. xxxiv. 10, 21. w Matt. xvi. 26 al. fr.† Job xxii. x Heb. viii. 5 reff.

13. elz (for 1st και) η, with Bℵ 13 latt Syr coptt [æth] Jer_1: txt AKL[P] rel 36 syr [arm] Cyr[-p_1] Thl Œc. Steph πορευσωμεθα and ποιησωμεν, with AKL rel 36 Œc: -σωμεθα and -σομεν Thl: -σομεθα and -σωμεν ℵ b^1 g: txt B[P] b^2 (c?) d l latt Cyr[-p_1]. om εκει A 13 Cyr_1. om ἕνα B[P]ℵ 36 latt coptt Jer_1. Steph. εμπορευσωμεθα κ. κερδησωμεν, with KL rel 36 Thl: -σομεθα and -σωμεν b^1 13: txt AB[P]ℵ b^2 (c?) d l &c.

He alone has the power to carry out His judgment when pronounced: "Nostrum non est judicare, præsertim cum exequi non possimus," Bengel. On σῶσαι, see on ch. i. 21 and ii. 14, as relating to ultimate salvation: and on κ. ἀπολέσαι, ref. Matt., to which this is the key text, fixing the reference there to God, and not to God's Enemy): **but thou, who art thou** (thou, feeble man, who hast no such power, and who art not the lawgiver) **that judgest thy neighbour** (see ref. Rom., the influence of which on our readings here it is, as usual in such cases, very difficult to estimate)?

13—17.] *Against ungodly and presumptuous confidence in our worldly plans for the future.* This again falls into the previous context, where we are warned against hearts divided between God and the world. But, as has been rightly remarked as early as Bede, and by many since, e. g. Œc., Semler, al., St. James, though carrying on the same subject, is no longer, from this place to ch. v. 6, addressing members of Christ's church, but those without: the ungodly and the rich in this world. This however must be taken with just this reservation,—that he addresses Christians in so far as they allow themselves to be identified with those others. This first paragraph, for example, might well serve as a warning for Christians who are in the habit of leaving God out of their thoughts and plans. That it is still *Jews* who are addressed, appears from ver. 15, and ch. v. 4.

13.] **Go to now** ("interjectio ad excitandam attentionem," Beng. This seems to be the true view of it: 'come on,' q. d. let us reason together: cf. δεῦτε, διελεγχθῶμεν, Isa. i. 18. The νῦν serves to mark the time, as noted by the point to which the argument of the Epistle has arrived. It is hardly purely temporal, but as so often, slightly ratiocinative, = 'rebus sic stantibus,' 'quæ cum ita sint:' see on 1 Cor. xiii. 13), **ye that say** (no stress on λέγοντες: not as Theile, "qui non solum cogitare soletis, sed etiam dicere audetis." The fault is even oftener perhaps committed in word than in thought. We speak more presumptuously before men than we think in our own hearts; though there also we are too liable to forget God), **To-day and to-morrow** (the ἤ of the rec. would suppose an alternative, "to-day, it may be, or to-morrow:" with καί, the two days are assigned for the journey, without any alternative. Bengel and Wiesinger take καί, as in δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν, 2 Cor. xiii. 1, as combining two possible cases: "Nunc dicit *hodie*, idem aliusve *cras*, ut commodum est," Beng. This is possible: but I prefer the other) **we will go** (the indic. fut. (see var. readd.) gives the fixed certainty of the assumption) **into this** (most Commentators render, "*this or that*," = "such a," as E. V.: and Winer, Gramm. § 23. 5, refers to Plutarch, Sympos. i. 6. 1, for this usage of ὅδε. But his reference does not quite bear him out. Plutarch is proving the vinosity of Alexander from the βασιλικαὶ ἐφημερίδες, in which is found very often written ὅτι τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκ τοῦ πότου ἐκάθευδεν, ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ τὴν ἐφεξῆς: where τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν is clearly a quotation from the diary, not 'this or that day,' but "this day:" and then τὴν ἐφεξῆς is an improper elliptical way of recording, that against the next day a similar entry was made. So that I should much doubt this usage of ὅδε, there being no mention of it in the best Lexx., and apparently no other example: and should consider τήνδε τὴν πόλιν as a sort of 'oratio mixta,' to express in general terms the city then present to the mind of the speaker) **city, and will spend** (reff. for this temporal sense of ποιέω) **there one year** (ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα is the accus. not of duration, but of the object, after ποιήσομεν. So that the E. V. "continue there a year," is not accurate. It should have been 'spend a year there,' which savours of presumption much more strongly and vividly. ἐνιαυτ. ἕνα: "Sic loquuntur, quasi mox etiam de insequentibus annis deliberaturi." Beng.), **and** (Bengel remarks well: "καί frequens:

οὐκ [y] ἐπίστασθε τὸ τῆς [z] αὔριον· [a] ποία γὰρ ἡ [b] ζωὴ ὑμῶν; [c] ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε ἡ [d] πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη ἔπειτα καὶ [e] ἀφανιζομένη. 15 [f] ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς [g] Ἐὰν ὁ [g] κύριος [g] θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσομεν καὶ ποιήσομεν [h] τοῦτο ἢ [h] ἐκεῖνο. 16 νῦν δὲ [i] καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς [k] ἀλαζονείαις ὑμῶν· πᾶσα [l] καύχησις τοιαύτη πονηρά ἐστιν. 17 [m] εἰ-

y Acts xviii. 25. xix. 15. Jude 10.
z Matt. vi. 34.
a = John xii. 33. xxi. 19. 1 Cor. xv. 35.
b = 1 Cor. xv. 19. Phil. i. 20. 1 Pet. iii. 10 (from Ps. xxxiii. 12).
c Acts ii. 19 (from Joel ii. 30) only. Lev. xvi. 13.
d = Luke viii. 13. 1 Cor. vii. 5. Heb. xii. 10 al.
e Matt. vi. 16, 19, 20. Acts xiii. 41 (from Hab. i. 5) only. Hos. ii. 12.
f = here only. (Ps. cviii. 4.)
g 1 Cor. iv. 9.
h see Wisd. xvi. 4.
i Rom. ii. 17. 2 Cor. x. 15. Gal. vi. 13, 14 al. Sir. xi. 4.
k 1 John ii. 16 only †. Wisd. xvii. 7. (-ζων, Rom. i. 30.)
l here only, exc. Paul, Rom. iii. 27 al[10]. Jer. xii. 13.
m constr., Phil. iv. 12. Job xxxiv. 19.

14. for το, τα A[P] a c 13 [syr]: om B. om 1st γαρ B‭א‬[1] c syr æth-rom arm. om 1st η B [Damasc$_1$]. om ατμις γαρ A‭א‬ vulg copt: om γαρ 13. rec (for εστε) εστιν, with L rel latt [Damasc$_1$] Thl Jer Bede: om ‭א‬: txt B d syr æth [arm], εσται AK[P] f g j k m 36 Œc. om η (bef προς) B[P]. rec (for και) δε, with l 13 sah Thl Œc: δε και L[P] rel: om a c h 38. 69 fuld(with harl tol) syr copt: txt ABK‭א‬ lat-ff_1 Damasc, so vulg(*et deinceps*) æth [and (omg επειτα) Syr arm].
15. for θεληση, θελη B[P] a c d 69. rec ζησωμεν, with KL rel 36 [vulg] Thl Œc: txt AB[P]‭א‬ c d k l, *vivemus* lat-ff_1. Steph ποιησωμεν, with KL rel Thl Œc: txt AB[P]‭א‬ c d k l 36 Cyr, *faciemus* lat-ff_1.
16. κατακαυχασθε ‭א‬. [απασα ‭א‬.]

polysyndeton exprimit libidinem animi securi") **will traffic** (this word brings up the worldly nature of the plan) **and get gain:** 14.] **whereas ye know not** (so, admirably, the E. V.: exactly hitting the delicate force of οἵτινες, '*ut qui*,'—'belonging, as ye do, to a class which') **the (event)** (or, *matter*, or *content*: the more general and indefinite, the better) **of the morrow: for** (γάρ substantiates the ignorance just alleged) **of what sort** (depreciative, as in 1 Pet. ii. 20) **is your life? for** (γάρ refers to the depreciative force in ποία: 'I may well pour contempt on it, for,' &c.) **ye are** (ye yourselves: so that any thing of yours, even your life, must partake of the same instability and transitoriness. ἐστε, so in ch. i. 10 the πλούσιος is said to pass away as the flower of the grass. It is not your *life*, which is not a thing seen, but *ye*, that πρὸς ὀλίγον φαίνεσθε) **a vapour, which appeareth for a little time, afterwards as it appeared, so** (this is the force of καί, 'vanishing as it came;' which not having been seen, δέ has been substituted, or the two, καὶ δέ, combined. It is not a case where (Bloomf.) the variations point to the original absence of a particle: for the καί in the text is not a particle of connexion, as the δέ is. For it to be so, the var. read. must have been καὶ ἔπειτα, not ἔπειτα καί) **vanishing:** 15.] (ver. 14 was parenthetical, and demonstrated the folly of their conduct. Now the sense proceeds, but with ὑμᾶς inserted by way of taking it up, after the parenthesis, direct from λέγοντες above) **instead of (your) saying, If the Lord** (God, as usual in this Epistle: see on ver. 10) **will** (not θέλῃ, but aor.: properly, shall have willed; i. e. have so determined it in His counsel), **we shall both live** (with the reading ζήσομεν, it would be hardly grammatically allowable to make this clause part of the hypothesis, 'and if we live.' With the subjunctive ζήσωμεν of the rec., this will be the right rendering: but even then it is more probable that the ἐάν would have been repeated, than that two such incongruous members as κύριος θελήσῃ and ζήσωμεν should be included under one hypothetical ἐάν. The escape from this, "si Deo placet ut vivamus" (Schneckenb., so Grot., al.), is clearly unallowable) **and shall do this or that.** 16.] **But** (contrast to the spirit of resignation to the divine will just recommended) **now** (as things now are, see 1 Cor. v. 11; xiv. 6) **ye boast in** (not, as in ch. i. 9, "make your boast in:" the ἐν indicates the state, as in ch. iii. 18, and iv. 3 especially. The ἀλαζονεία is the source, but not the material of the boasting) **your vaingloriousnesses** (see note on ref. 1 John. Here ἀλαζονεία is the self-deceived and groundless confidence in the stability of life and health on which the worldly pride themselves. On this, as on its foundation, your boastful speeches, σήμερον καὶ αὔριον κ.τ.λ., are built): **all such boasting** (all boasting so made and so grounded) **is wicked.** 17.] This conclusion is most naturally understood to refer to the universal notoriety of the shortness of human life, and to apply only to the subject just treated. Otherwise, if, as many Commentators, we take it for a *general* conclusion to all that has gone before, we must understand it as Estius, "Jam de his omnibus satis vos admonui, vobis bene

δότι οὖν καλὸν ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι, ἁμαρτία [n] αὐτῷ ἐστιν.

V. 1 [o] Ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, κλαύσατε [p] ὀλολύζοντες [q] ἐπὶ ταῖς [r] ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς [s] ἐπερχομέναις. 2 ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν [t] σέσηπεν καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν [u] σητόβρωτα γέγονεν· 3 ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος [v] κατίωται,

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

n dat., Rom. xiv. 14. 1 Cor. iv. 3.
o ch. iv. 13 only. Judg. xix. 6 B.
p here only. Isa. xiv. 31. xv. 3 al.
q = Acts xx. 38 al.
r Rom. iii. 16 (from Isa. lix. 7) only. Isa. xlvii. 11 al.
s = Luke xxi. 26, 35. Acts viii. 24. xiii. 40. Judg. ix. 57. absol., Eph. ii. 7.
t here only. Ps. xxxvii. 5 al.
u here only. Job xiii. 28 only. (Matt. vi. 19, 20.)
v here only. Sir. xii. 11 only.

Chap. V. 1. at end ins *υμιν* ℵ 5. 8. 25 vulg Syr copt æth arm: *divitiis vestris*, omg *πλουτος υμων*, spec.
3. *κατιωται* bef *και ο αργυρος* A 13.

nota sunt:" in which case this would hardly be the place for it, considering that more exhortations follow, ch. v. Grotius takes it to mean, "Moniti estis a me, ignorantiam non potestis obtendere, si quid tale posthac dixeritis, gravior erit culpa:" and so Theile, Wiesinger, De Wette, al. But in this case, why should such a conclusion follow this, rather than any other exhortation? **So that** (*οὖν* here does not prove what follows, but refers the particular case to the general principle; q. d. therefore we see 'hoc exemplo' the truth of the general axiom, &c.) **to him who knoweth to do good** (not *τὸ καλόν*: *καλόν* is not any positive good, as beneficence; but merely the opposite of *πονηρόν*. So Wiesinger, rightly: and *ποιεῖν* is the object after *εἰδότι*, not the epexegetic inf. as De Wette, "knows the good, that he must do it") **and doeth it not** (not merely, *omits to do it*, as might be the case if it were some one definite deed that was spoken of. It is not sins of *omission* that men are here convicted of, as so often mistakenly supposed: but the doing *πονηρόν*, as in the case of the speech above supposed, where *καλόν* is easy and obvious), **it is sin to him** (i. e. reckoned to him as sin. Schneckenburger well remarks, "Videre licet, Jacobum omnia . . . . ad thema suum primarium revocare, recti scientiam requirere recti exercitationem").

Chap. V. 1—6.] *Denunciation of woe on the rich in this world.* These verses need not necessarily be addressed (as Huther) to the same persons as ch. iv. 13 ff. Indeed the **ἄγε νῦν** repeated seems to indicate a fresh beginning. Commentators have differed as to whether this denunciation has for its object, or not, exhortation to repentance. I believe the right answer to be, much as De Wette, that in the outward form indeed the words contain no such exhortation: but that we are bound to believe all such triumphant denunciation to have but one ultimate view, that of grace and mercy to those addressed. That such does not here appear, is owing chiefly to the close proximity of judgment, which the writer has before him. Calvin then is in the main right,—when he says, "Falluntur qui Jacobum hic exhortari ad pœnitentiam divites putant: mihi simplex magis denuntiatio judicii Dei videtur, qua eos terrere voluit *absque spe veniæ*,"—except in those three last rather characteristic words. 1.] **Go to now** (see above, ch. iv. 13), **ye rich, go weep** (the imper. aor. gives the command a concentrated force, as that which ought to be done at once and without delay), **howling** (the part. is not merely a rhetorical reduplication of *κλαύσατε*, but describes the mode of the *κλαῦσαι* by a stronger and more graphic word, in the present, as thus habitual during the *κλαῦσαι*. **ὀλολύζειν** (reff.) is a word in the O. T. confined to the prophets, and used, as here, with reference to the near approach of God's judgments. Thus in Isa. xiii. 6, *ὀλολύζετε, ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου*) **over your miseries which are coming on** (no supply of *ὑμῖν* (see digest) is required after *ἐπερχ.* These miseries are not to be thought of as the natural and determined end of all worldly riches, but are the judgments connected with the coming of the Lord: cf. ver. 8, *ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἤγγικεν.* It may be that this prospect was as yet intimately bound up with the approaching destruction of the Jewish city and polity: for it must be remembered that they are Jews who are here addressed). 2.] *The effect of the coming judgment is depicted as already present*, and its material as already stored up against them. What is meant by the figure used, we learn in ver. 4. **Your riches are corrupted** (see besides reff., Job xxxiii. 21; xl. 7. **σήπω** is transitive—*σῆψον δὲ ἀσεβεῖς παραχρῆμα*, Job xl. 7 (12),—but **σέσηπα** the perf. middle. The expression is figurative, and **πλοῦτος** to be understood of *all* riches: 'your possessions') **and your garments** (the general term *πλοῦτος* is now split into its component parts.

καὶ ὁ [w] ἰὸς αὐτῶν [x] εἰς [x] μαρτύριον ὑμῖν ἔσται, καὶ [y] φάγεται τὰς [y] σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ. [z] ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν [a] ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. [4] ἰδοὺ ὁ μισθὸς τῶν [b] ἐργατῶν τῶν [c] ἀμησάντων τὰς [d] χώρας ὑμῶν ὁ [e] ἀπεστερημένος [f] ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν

w = here (ch. iii. 6. Rom. iii. 13) only. Ep. Jer. 12, 24. see Ezek. xxiv. 6, 11, 12.
x Heb. iii. 5 reff.
y (plur.) Rev. xvii. 16. xix. 18, 21 only. Lev. xxvi. 29. 4 Kings ix. 36. Mic. iii. 2, 3.
z Matt. vi. 19, 20. Luke xii. 21. Rom. ii. 5. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. 2 Cor. xii. 21. 2 Pet. iii. 7 only. Mic. vi. 10.
a Acts ii. 17. 2 Tim. iii. 1. (Heb. i. 1.)
b Matt. xx. 8. Luke x. 7 al.† Wisd. xvii. 17 al.
c here only. Mic. vi. 15.
d = Luke xii. 16. John iv. 35. Acts viii. 1. 2 Chron. xxxii. 13.
e = here (Mark x. 19. 1 Cor. vi. 38. vii. 5. 1 Tim. vi. 5) only. Mal. iii. 5.
f = (see note) Exod. ii. 23. (see Gen. iv. 10. Hab. ii. 11.)

for φαγεται, φαινετε ℵ[1]. aft σαρκ. υμ. ins ο ιος A[P]ℵ[3] 13 syr [Damasc$_1$]. AL k o have a stop bef ως πυρ. ημεραις bef εσχαταις A 13.
4. αφυστερημενος B[1]ℵ: αποστερημενος [K]L [Damasc$_1$-ms].

clothing and treasure) **are become moth-eaten** (ref.: see also Isa. li. 8: Acts xii. 23. The reference to Matt. vi. 19, 20 is obvious): 3.] **your gold and your silver is rusted through** ("Loquitur populariter, nam aurum proprie ærugiuem non contrahit." Horneius, in Huther. In ref. Ep. Jer., we have of golden and silver images of idols, *οὐ διασώζονται ἀπὸ ἰοῦ*. Rust, happening generally to metals, is predicated of gold and silver without care for exact precision. So that there is no need to seek for some interpretation which may make the *κατίωται* true of gold, as that (Bretschn.) copper vessels plated with gold are intended. The stern and vivid depiction of prophetic denunciation does not take such trifles into account. In **κατ-ίωται**, the prep. gives the sense of entireness; 'thoroughly rusted'), **and the rust of them shall be for a testimony to you** (not, as Œc., *καταμαρτυρήσει ὑμῶν, ἐλέγχων τὸ ἀμετάδοτον ὑμῶν*,—the rust which you have allowed to accumulate on them by want of use, shall testify against you in judgment,—but, as Wiesinger and Huther rightly, seeing that the rust is the effect of judgment begun, not of want of use,—the rust of them is a token what shall happen to yourselves: in the consuming of your wealth, you see depicted your own), **and shall eat** (**φάγεται** is a well-known future, contracted from *φαγήσεται*: cf. John ii. 17, and the prophecy ref. 4 (2) Kings, *καταφάγονται οἱ κύνες τὰς σάρκας Ἰεζαβέλ*) **your flesh** (plur. in reff. Huther remarks that in almost all the places cited, the same verb is used with the noun) **as fire** (i. e. as fire devours the flesh; which will account for the use of **τὰς σάρκας**, without giving it any emphatic meaning ("your bloated bodies," "your flesh of which alone you consist," and the like: see De Wette), seeing that fire consumes the flesh first). The Syr., Œc., Grot., Knapp, Wiesinger, al. place the period at **ὑμῶν**, and connect *ὡς πῦρ* with *ἐθησαυρίσατε*, explaining it, *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις εὑρήσετε τὸν πλοῦτον ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ ταμιευθέντα ὑμῖν εἰς ὄλεθρον* (Œc.),—"quasi ignem in vestro malo asservastis" Grot.). But the reasons given for this are not satisfactory. There is in reality no confusion of metaphor in *φάγεται τ. σάρ. ὑμ. ὡς πῦρ*, and no want of an expressed object in *ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχ. ἡμ.*, the verb **θησαυρίζειν** containing its object in itself. **Ye laid up treasure in the last days** (i. e. in these, the last days before the coming of the Lord, ye, instead of repenting and saving your souls, laid up treasure to no profit; employed yourselves in the vain accumulation of this world's wealth. The aor., as so often when the course of life and action is spoken of, is used as if from the standing-point of the day of judgment, looking back over this life. **ἐν** is not for **εἰς**, here or any where: nor is the meaning *'for'* or *'against'* the last days. Estius, Calvin, al., with this idea, follow the vulg. in supplying "iram" after "thesauravistis," as in Rom. ii. 5. Wolf and Morus understand by *the last days*, the last days of life: "Accumulavistis divitias extremæ vitæ parti provisuri:" but this is clearly wrong in N. T. diction: cf. reff.).

4—6.] *Specification of the sins, the incipient judgments for which hitherto have been hinted at* under the figures of rust and moth. And 4.] *the unjust frauds of the rich*, in non-payment of just debts. **Behold** (belongs to the fervid graphic style), **the hire of the workmen** (the sentence would be complete without the words **τῶν ἐργατῶν**: but probably there is tacit reference to the well-known saying (see on 1 Tim. v. 18) used by our Lord, ref. Luke (Matt. x. 10), *ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ*) **who mowed** (**ἀμάω**, from **ἅμα**, properly to gather together; but commonly used as here of reaping or mowing corn for harvest. So Il. *σ*. 551, *ἔνθα δ᾽ ἔριθοι ἤμων, ὀξείας δρεπάνας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες*. See Soph. Antig. 598, and Hermann's note) **your fields** (reff.), **which has been held back** (for the sense cf. Levit. xix. 13: Jer. xxii. 13, and esp. ref. Mal. In Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.)

[g] κράζει, καὶ αἱ [h] βοαὶ τῶν [i] θερισάντων εἰς τὰ [k] ὦτα [l] κυρίου [l] Σαβαὼθ [m] εἰσελήλυθαν. [5] [n] ἐτρυφήσατε [o] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ [p] ἐσπαταλήσατε, ἐθρέψατε τὰς [q] καρδίας ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ [r] σφαγῆς. [6] [s] κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε [t] τὸν δίκαιον· οὐκ [u] ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

g = here only. (see Gen. iv. 10. Deut. xxiv. 17 [15].) h here only. Exod. ii. 23. 1 Kings iv. 14. i Matt. vi. 26 ‖ L. Lev. xxiii. 10, 22. k 1 Pet. iii. 12. Isa. v. 9. l Isa. as above (k) and generally. (elsw. usually, = παντοκράτωρ or τῶν δυνάμεων.) m Ps xvii. 6. n here only. Neh. ix. 25. Isa. lxvi. 11. Sir. xiv. 1 only. (-φή, 2 Pet. ii. 13.) o Matt. vi. 10 al. p 1 Tim. v. 6 only. Ezek. xvi. 49. Sir. xxi. 15 only. (-λη, Sir. xxviii. 13. κατασπαταλάω, Prov. xxix. 21. Amos vi. 4. see Wetst.) q = Luke xxi. 34. Ps. ciii. 15. r Acts viii. 32 (from Isa. liii. 7). Rom. viii. 36 (from Ps. xliii. 22) only. Jer. xii. 3 al. s Matt. xii. 7, 37. Luke vi. 37 (bis) only. Ps. xxxvi. 33. t so 2 Pet. ii. 8. u 1 Pet. v. 6.

rec εισεληλυθασιν, with KLℵ rel [Thl Œc]: txt B[P], -θεν A [Damasc$_1$].

5. om και A 73 copt [-p$_1$]. rec ins ως bef εν ημερα, with KLℵ[3] rel syrr [arm Ephr$_1$ Antch$_1$] Cyr$_1$ Thl Œc: om AB[P]ℵ[1] 13 latt copt.

22, we have ἐκχεῶν αἷμα ὁ ἀποστερῶν μισθὸν μισθίου), crieth out ("Vindictam quasi alto clamore exposcit," Calv. Cf. Gen. iv. 10) from you (this, which was suggested by Huther, is better than to take refuge in the idea that ἀπό = ὑπό, and to render, "which has been held back by you:" or than Wiesinger's interpretation, which, recognizing the difference between the two prepositions, makes ἀπό designate, not the direct origin of the act, but the proceeding of the act of robbery from them: and so Winer, § 47, ἀπό, note [2, p. 464, Moulton's Edn.]: but none of the examples which he gives at all come near this one. The most plausible, Luke ix. 22 and xvii. 25, ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων κ.τ.λ., differs in this, that a *Person* is spoken of, whose ἀποδοκιμασία will come from the πρεσβύτεροι: whereas here, where a *thing* is in question, with which the ἀποστεροῦντες deal, we can hardly say that *its* ἀποστέρησις proceeds from them. The other construction is amply justified by reff. The μισθός, which was kept back, and rests with you, cries out *from you*, your coffers, where it lies): **and the cries of them who reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of hosts** (not only does the abstracted hire cry out from its place, but the defrauded victims themselves join, and the cry is heard of God. For the expressions see reff. This is the only place in the N. T. where κύριος Σαβαώθ is used by any writer: Rom. ix. 29 is a citation. The Jewish character of the whole will sufficiently account for it. Bede gives another reason, which also doubtless was in the Apostle's mind: "Dominum exercituum appellat, ad terrorem eorum, qui pauperes putant nullum habere tutorem").

5.] *Second class of sins: luxury and self-indulgence.* **Ye luxuriated on the earth** (the last words of ver. 4 placed the thought in heaven, where the judgment is laid up) **and wantoned** (ἐτρυφ., ἐσπαταλ., "luxuriare, lascivire: alterum deliciarum, alterum prodigentiæ," Theile. See on ref. 1 Tim.), **ye nourished** (satiated, fattened) **your hearts** (καρδίας as in reff., and in Acts xiv. 17, ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς . . τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. Although the body is really that which is filled, the heart is that in which the satisfaction of repletion is felt) **in the** (the omission of the art. as so common before ἡμέρα, ὥρα, καιρός: cf. Matt. viii. 29: Winer, § 19. 1) **day of slaughter** (i. e. as Theile, "Similes sunt pecudibus quæ ipso adeo mactationis die se pascunt saginantque lætæ et securæ." Cf. ref. Jer. ἐν is again not for εἰς. This seems the simplest and most obvious interpretation. It need not be dependent on the insertion of the ὡς; the sudden and direct application of the image to the persons addressed requires no particle of comparison. And it is no reason against it, which Huther somewhat petulantly alleges against De Wette, that beasts do not eat more greedily on the day of their slaughter than on any other day; for this is not implied. Even if we grant Huther's own view, that ἡμέρα σφαγῆς is an expression for the day of judgment, this expression derives its force from the above comparison, and will not let us forget it. Many Commentators, as Calvin, Beza, Grot., Laurentius, Bengel, al., understand ἡμ. σφαγῆς to mean a day of banqueting, when oxen and fatlings are slain. Calvin says, "Solebant in sacrificiis solemnibus liberalius vesci quam pro quotidiano more. Dicit ergo divites tota vita continuare festum." This might be allowable, were it not that the analogy of ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις above seems to demand the other. It is no objection to it (Huther), that thus all allusion to the judgment is lost; this comes in with the other interpretation, and appositely: but is not absolutely required by the sentiment of the verse, which regards the self-indulgence, &c., of the rich while on earth).

6.] *Third class of sins: condemning the innocent.* **Ye condemned, ye murdered the**

7 [v] Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς [w] παρουσιας τοῦ κυριου. ἰδοὺ ὁ [x] γεωργὸς [y] ἐκδέχεται τὸν [z] τίμιον καρπὸν τῆς γῆς, [va] μακροθυμῶν [a] ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ ἕως λάβῃ [bc] πρώϊμον καὶ [bd] ὄψιμον· 8 [v] μακροθυμήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς,

v Heb. vi. 15 reff. w Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39 only in Gospp. Epp., 1 Cor. xv. 23. 1 Thess. ii. 19. iii. 13 al. fr.† 2 Macc. viii. 12. xv. 21 only. x Matt. xxi. 33 &c. ||. John xv. 1. 2 Tim. ii. 6 only. Joel i. 11. y = Heb. xi. 10 reff. z = Acts xx. 24. 1 Pet. i. 19 al. Prov. iii. 15 al. a Matt. xviii. 26, 29. Luke xviii. 7. Sir. xviii. 11. xxxii. (xxxv.) 18. b Deut. xi. 14. Jer. v. 24. Joel ii. 23. c here only. Hos. vi. 4. d here only. Prov. xvi. 15.

7. for *αυτω*, *αυτον* KL c f g h k l Thl. rec aft 2nd *εως* ins *αν*, with [P]ℵ rel syr-mg [Antch$_1$] Œc-comm: om ABKL d j k l 36 sah Thl. rec ins *υετον* bef *πρωιμον*, with AKL[P]13 syrr Thl Œc; *καρπον* ℵ(ℵ[1] has *καρποντον*, ℵ[3] disapproving *τον*) 9 lat-ff_1 syr-mg copt Antch$_1$ Cassiod$_1$: om B m vulg sah arm. *προιμον* AB[1][P]ℵ. 8. aft *μακροθυμ.* ins *ουν* Lℵ [vulg-ed] (with fuld tol, not am demid) æth [Antch$_1$].

just man (these words are probably spoken generally, the singular being collective. **τὸν δίκαιον**, not merely *τὸν ἀθῷον*; it is his justice itself which provokes the enmity and cruelty of the *πλούσιοι*. It has been usual to refer these words to the condemnation and execution of Christ. So Œc., *ἀναντιῤῥήτως τό, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον, ἐπὶ τὸν χριστὸν ἀναφέρεται. τῇ μέντοι ἐπιφορᾷ, τῇ, οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν, ἐκοίνωσε τὸν λόγον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παθόντας. ἴσως δὲ καὶ προφητικῶς τὸ περὶ ἑαυτὸν ὑπεμφαίνει πάθος.* So Bede, at some length; Grot., al. But there is surely nothing in the context to indicate this, further than that such a particular case may be included in the general charge, as its most notorious example. I cannot see, with Huther, how the *present* **ἀντιτάσσεται** makes against this: for anyhow we must suppose a change of sense before the *present* can be introduced: and then it may as well be a description of Christ's patient endurance, or of His present long-suffering, as of the present meekness of the (generic) *δίκαιος*. But I prefer the latter, and with it the other reference throughout): **he** (the *δίκαιος*; Bentley more ingeniously than happily conjectured *ὁ κύριος*, as an emendation for *οὐκ*) **doth not resist you** (the behaviour of the just under your persecutions is ever that of meekness and submission. "**οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται** sine copula et pronomine ponderose additur." Schneckenb.). This last clause serves as a note of transition to what follows. So Herder remarks, as cited by Wiesinger: "And thus we have as it were standing before us the slain and unresisting righteous man, when lo the curtain falls: Be patient, brethren, wait!" See, on the whole sense, Amos ii. 6, 7; v. 12; and the description in Wisd. ii. 6—20.

7—11.] *Exhortation to suffering Christians to endure unto the coming of the Lord.* On the connexion, see above. 7.] **Be patient** (reff.) **therefore** (the *οὖν* (*ἰδὼν* 'matters being so') is a general reference to the prophetic strain of the previous passage: judgment on your oppressors being so near, and your own part, as the Lord's *δίκαιοι*, being that of unresistingness), **brethren** (contrast to *οἱ πλούσιοι*, last addressed), **until** (**ἕως** as a preposition, see Winer, § 54. 6. "Non tempus tantum sed rem quoque indicat, qua ἡ θλῖψις μακροθύμως toleranda tollitur." Schneckenb.) **the coming of the Lord** (i. e. here, beyond all reasonable question, of Christ. **ὁ κύριος**, it is true, usually in this Epistle is to be taken in the O. T. sense, as denoting the Father: but we have in ch. i. 1 and ii. 1 examples of St. James using it of our Saviour, and it is therefore better to keep so well known a phrase to its ordinary meaning, than with Theile and De W. (but only wahrscheinlich) to understand it, "Dei, qui Messia adventante invisibili modo præsens est"). *Encouragement by the example of the husbandman.* **Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, being patient over it** (with reference to it: quasi sitting over it and watching it: this local superposition is the root of all derived meanings of *ἐπί* with a dative), **till it** (better than "*he*," as Luth. and E. V.) **shall have received the early and latter (rain)** (see reff., and Winer, Realw. under Witterung. From the latter it appears that the **πρώϊμος** fell in Oct., Nov., and Dec., extending, with occasional snow, into Jan. (see reff. Deut., Jer.): and after fine spring weather in Feb., the **ὄψιμος** in March to the end of April (reff. and Jer. iii. 3 Heb. and E. V.). Œc. gives a curious interpretation of the early and latter rain: *πρώϊμος ὑετός, ἡ ἐν νεότητι μετὰ δακρύων μετάνοια· ὄψιμος, ἡ ἐν τῷ γήρᾳ.* As to the reading, it is much more probable that *ὑετόν* has been supplied than that it has been erased): 8.] **be ye also patient** (as well as, after the example of, the husbandman): **establish** (confirm, strengthen, both which are required for patience) **your**

e = Luke xxii. 32. Rom. i. 11. xvi. 25 al. Ps. cxi. 11. (1 Pet. v. 10. Ezek. vi. 2 al.)
f = 1 Pet. iv. 7 reff.
g = here only. (Heb. xiii. 17 reff.)
h Matt. vii. 1.
i ch. iv. 12 reff.
k Acts v. 23. xii. 6. see Matt. xxiv. 23. Rev. iii. 20.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

[e] στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ [w] παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου [f] ἤγγικεν. [9] μὴ [g] στενάζετε, ἀδελφοί, κατ' ἀλλήλων, [h] ἵνα μὴ [h] κριθῆτε· ἰδοὺ ὁ [i] κριτὴς [k] πρὸ τῶν [k] θυρῶν ἕστηκεν. [10] [l] ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε, ἀδελφοί, τῆς [m] κακοπαθείας καὶ τῆς [n] μακροθυμίας τοὺς προφήτας οἳ ἐλάλησαν τῷ [o] ὀνόματι κυρίου. [11] ἰδοὺ [p] μακαρίζομεν τοὺς [q] ὑπομείναντας. τὴν [r] ὑπομονὴν Ἰὼβ [s] ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ [t] τέλος κυρίου [u] ἴδετε,

l Heb. iv. 11 reff. m here only. Mal. i. 13. 2 Macc. ii. 26, 27 only. (-θεῖν, ver. 13.) n Heb. vi. 12 reff. o so Matt. vii. 22 (3ce). Mark ix. 38 v. r. Lev. xix. 12. p Luke i. 48 only. Gen. xxx. 13. q = Matt. x. 22. xxiv. 13 ‖ L. Rom. xii. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 12. 1 Pet. ii. 20. Job xiv. 14. r = ch. i. 3, 4 reff. s = Matt. xi. 2. Gal. i. 13 al. 3 Kings x. 1. t see Heb. vi. 8. u so Matt. x. 6. Gal. ii. 14.

9. aft *αδελφοι* ins *μου* A d 13. 36 Syr coptt [Antch$_1$]. rec *κατ' αλληλων* bef *αδελφοι*, with Lℵ rel syrr coptt [arm] Thl Œc: om *αδελφοι* K 23. 36. 64. 100-2: txt AB[P] a c d m 13 latt æth.—*κατα* ℵ. rec *κατακριθητε*, with Œc: txt ABKL[P]ℵ rel [Antch$_1$] Thl. rec om *ὁ*: ins ABKL[P]ℵ rel Thl Œc.

10. om *λαβετε* A 13 [æth]. rec aft *αδελφοι* ins *μου*, with KLℵ rel Syr coptt Thl Œc: om AB[P] a c h 13 latt syr arm Chr$_1$ Bede$_1$. rec *τ. κακοπ.* bef *αδελφοι*, with Œc: txt ABKL[P]ℵ rel latt syrr coptt Chr$_1$ Thl. *καλοκαγαθιας* ℵ. ins *εχετε* bef *τ. προφ.* Aℵ^3: *δεχετε* 13 [*sunt* æth]. ins *εν* bef *τω ονοματι* B[P] a h l^2 m, *in nomine* latt [arm].—*εν ονοματι* ℵ [Chr$_1$].

11. rec *υπομενοντας*, with KL rel: txt AB[P]ℵ a latt(*qui sustinuerunt*) syrr. rec *ειδετε*, with B^{1}Kℵ: txt AB^{2}L[P] j k m 13 Thl.

hearts, because the coming of the Lord is nigh (perf.: 'hath (already) drawn near, and is therefore at hand,' as the perfects ἕστηκα, ἔγνωκα, &c. Calvin says, "Colligendum robur ad durandum: colligi autem melius non potest, quam ex spe et quasi intuitu propinqui adventus Domini").

9.] *Exhortation to mutual forbearance.* "Quos ad manifestas et gravissimas improborum injurias fortiter ferendas incitarat, eos nunc hortatur, ut etiam in minoribus illis offensis quæ inter pios ipsos sæpe subnascuntur, vel condonandis vel dissimulandis promti sint. Contingit enim ut qui hostium et improborum maximas sæpe contumelias et injurias æquo animo tolerant, fratrum tamen offensas multo leniores non facile ferant." Horneius (in Huther). **Murmur not, brethren, against one another** (there is not any imprecation of Divine vengeance to be thought of, as Calvin, Theile, al.), **that ye be not judged** (seeing that murmuring against one another involves the violation of our Lord's μὴ κρίνετε (ref. Matt.), he finishes with the following clause there, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε: the passive verb here, as there, being to be taken in a condemnatory sense, or at all events as assuming the condemnatory issue): **behold, the Judge standeth before the door** (reff. The Judge, viz. the Lord. These last words are added with a view to both portions of the sentence preceding, not to the latter one only as Huther: μὴ στεν. involving in itself μὴ κρίνετε: the near approach of the Judge is a motive for suspending our own judgment, as well as for deterring us from incurring that speedy judgment on ourselves which we shall incur if we do not suspend it).

10, 11.] *Encouragement to patience in affliction by O. T. examples.* **Take, my brethren, as an example of affliction** (not, 'of enduring' or "suffering affliction," E. V.: the word is strictly objective, and is found parallel with ξυμφορά and the like: so in reff.: and Thucyd. vii. 77, ἐλπίδα χρὴ ἔχειν, μηδὲ καταμέμφεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἄγαν αὐτούς, μήτε ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς, μήτε ταῖς παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν νῦν κακοπαθείαις (spoken by Nicias to the suffering Athenian army in Sicily): so Isocr. p. 127 c, μηδὲ μικρὰν οἴεσθαι δεῖν ὑπενεγκεῖν κακοπάθειαν: which examples are decisive) **and of patience** (beware of the silly hendiadys, which indeed can have no place at all with the right meaning of κακοπάθεια) **the prophets** (so Matt. v. 12) **who spoke in the name** (or, **by the name.** We may consider τῷ ὀνόμ. as equivalent to ἐν τῷ ὀν., or we may explain it as De Wette 'by means of the name') **of the Lord** (God). 11.] *Another example,* in which a further point is gained. **Behold, we count happy them that have endured** (see Matt. v. 10. ὑπομείναντας *may* be a correction to suit the sense, and τέλος below, but it must be adopted as the most ancient reading, and it is connected with Matt. l. c., μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι, they who have been persecuted):

ὅτι [v] πολύσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ κύριος καὶ [w] οἰκτίρμων. 12 [x] πρὸ πάντων δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ [y] ὀμνύετε, μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ [z] ὅρκον· [a] ἤτω

v here only †. w Luke vi. 36 bis only. Exod. xxxiv. 6. (-μός, Heb. x. 28.) x 1 Pet. iv. 8. y constr., here only. Isa. lxv. 16. w. ἐν, & εἰς, Matt. v. 34, 35. z Heb. vi. 16, 17 reff. a 1 Cor. xvi. 22. Ps. ciii. 31. 1 Macc. x. 31.

om *ο κυριος* KL rel vulg-mss Thl : ins A(B)[P]ℵ latt syrr coptt [æth arm] Œc.—om *ο* B.
12. for 1st *δε*, *ουν* ℵ[1] [om K 1 106-80 arm]. *ορκ.* bef *τινα* A.

ye (have) heard of the endurance of Job; see also (not 'and have seen,' which Wiesinger renders even with the reading ἴδετε. The imperative is not as Huther auffallend, but natural enough, see ch. i. 6, 7) **the end of the Lord** ('the termination which the Lord (in O. T. sense) gave:' do not limit your attention to Job's sufferings, but look on to the end and see the mercy shewn him by God); **for** (better than "that," as Huther, al.: the sense being, 'Job's patience is known to you all: do not rest there, but look on to the end which God gave him: and it is well worth your while so to do, for you will find that He is' &c. And this has apparently occasioned the repetition by the Apostle of the word **ὁ κύριος**, which has been left out by those who imagined that **ὅτι** introduced merely the result of the inspection, and that therefore no new subject was needed) **the Lord is very pitiful** (**πολύσπλαγχνος**, a word no where else found: coined after the Heb. רַב־חֶסֶד (Wiesinger), which the LXX render πολυέλεος, Exod. xxxiv. 6 al., always joined with *μακρόθυμος*: see in Trommius. We have *εὔσπλαγχνος*, Eph. iv. 32; 1 Pet. iii. 8) **and merciful** (reff. This remembrance of God's pity and mercy would encourage them also to hope that whatever their sufferings, the *τέλος κυρίου* might prove similar in their own case).

12—20.] *Various exhortations and dehortations*, connected with the foregoing chiefly by the situation, sufferings, and duties of the readers. 12.] This dehortation from swearing is connected with what went before by the obvious peril that they, whose temptations were to impatience under suffering, might be betrayed by that impatience into hasty swearing and imprecations. That this suffering state of theirs is still in view, is evident from the **κακοπαθεῖ τις** which follows: that *it alone* is not in view is equally evident, from the **εὐθυμεῖ τίς** which also follows. So that we may safely say that the Apostle passes from their particular temptations under suffering to their general temptations in life. **But** (contrast of the spirit which would prompt that which he is about to forbid, with that recommended in the last verses) **above all things** (ref.: qu. d. 'So far is the practice alien from Christian meekness, that whatever you feel or say, let it not for a moment be given way to'), **my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath** (**ὅρκος** for '*formula jurandi*.' The construction of **ὄμνυμι** with an accus. of the thing sworn by is classical: that with *εἰς* or *ἐν*, as in ref. Matt., according to Hebraistic usage. Huther's note here is valuable and just: "It is to be noticed, that swearing *by the name of God* is not mentioned: for we must not imagine that this is included in the last member of the clause, the Apostle intending evidently by *μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον* to point only at similar formulæ, of which several are mentioned in ref. Matt. Had he intended to forbid swearing by the name of God, he would most certainly have mentioned it expressly: for not only is it in the law, in contradistinction to other oaths, commanded,—see Deut. vi. 13; x. 20: Ps. lxiii. 11,—but in the Prophets is announced as a token of the future turning of men to God: ref. Isa.: Jer. xii. 16; xxiii. 7, 8. The omission of notice of *this oath* shews that James in this warning has in view only the abuse, common among the Jews generally and among his readers, of introducing in the common every-day affairs of life, instead of the common yea and nay, such asseverations as those here mentioned: so that we are not justified in deducing from his words any prohibition of swearing in general, as has been attempted by many expositors of our Epistle, and especially by Œc., Bede, Erasm., Theile, De Wette, Neander, al. (on the other hand the following Commentators refer St. James's prohibition to light and trifling oaths: Calv., Est., Laurentius, Grot., Pott, Michaelis, Storr, Morus, Schneckenburger, Kern, Wiesinger, al.). The use of oaths *by heaven*, &c., arises on the one hand from forgetting that every oath, in its deeper significance, is a swearing *by God*, and on the other from a depreciation of simple truth in words: either way therefore from a lightness and frivolity which is in direct contrast to the earnest seriousness of a Christian spirit." See my note on Matt. l. c.): **but** (contrast to the habit of swearing) **let** (on the form **ἤτω**,

δε υμῶν τὸ [b] ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ [b] οὒ οὔ, ἵνα μὴ [c] ὑπὸ κρίσιν [c] πέσητε. 13 [d] κακοπαθεῖ τὶς ἐν ὑμῖν; προσευχέσθω· [e] εὐθυμεῖ τίς; [f] ψαλλέτω. 14 ἀσθενεῖ τὶς ἐν ὑμῖν; [g] προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς [h] πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν [i] ἐπ' αὐτὸν [kl] ἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν [km] ἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου, 15 καὶ ἡ [n] εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως [o] σώσει τὸν

...προσευξασθ. l.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k m o 13

b Matt. v. 37. see 2 Cor. i. 17 &c. c here only. ὥστε μηδ' ὑπὸ λόγον πίπτειν τὴν ἀδικίαν αὐτῶν, Polyb. iv. 15. 11. d 2 Tim. ii. 9. iv. 5 only. Jon. iv. 10 only. (-θεια, ver. 10.) e Acts xxvii. 22 only †. hypoth. indic., 1 Cor. vii. 18, 27. f Rom. xv. 9. 1 Cor. xiv. 15 bis. Eph. v. 19 only. Judg. v. 3 al. fr. g Matt. x. 1 al. fr. h = 1 Pet. v. 1 reff. i = Mark xv. 24. John xix. 24 (from Ps. xxi. 18). 1 Cor. vii. 36. k Mark vi. 13. Luke vii. 46. 2 Kings xiv. 2. l as above (k). Matt. vi. 17. Mark xvi. 1. Luke vii. 38, 46. John xi. 2. xii. 3 only. m Matt. xxv. 3 &c. Heb. i. 9 al. n = here only. (Acts xviii. 18. xxi. 23 only.) Prov xv. 29. o = Matt. ix. 21. Mark v. 23 al.

ins ο λογος bef υμων (*from Matt* v. 37) ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving) [8. 25. 33-marg vulg(not fuld harl) copt æth]. Steph ins εις bef υποκρισιν, with KL[P] rel arm Antch$_1$ Thl Œc: om ABℵ 13 latt syrr coptt æth [Damasc$_1$].

14. for 1st αυτον, αυτους ℵ[1] [26]. om 2nd αυτον B[P] a lat-ff$_1$ [Damasc$_1$]. rec ins του bef κυριου, with KL[P]ℵ rel [Damasc$_1$] Chr$_1$ Thl Œc: om A f 38. 67. 100 lectt-17-18 [arm].—om κυριου B.

[15. προσευχη P b o 27-9. 66[2]. 96. 142.]

see Winer, Gramm. § 14. 2. It is found *only*, in all Greek classical literature, in Plato, Rep. ii. p. 361 c) **your yea be yea, and (your) nay, nay** (it is hardly possible here to render 'But let yours be (your habit of conversation be) yea yea and nay nay,' on account of the *position* of the emphatic ὑμῶν: which in that case must have stood before the verb, ὑμῶν δὲ ἤτω, and even then might have been rendered the other way. As it is, the ὑμῶν τὸ ναί lies too close together to be disjoined as subject, leaving the other ναί for predicate. So that, in form at least, our precept here differs slightly from that in St. Matt. The fact represented by both would be the same: confidence in men's simple assertions and consequently absence of all need for asseveration): **that ye fall not under judgment** (i. e. condemnation: not as the meaning of κρίσις, but as the necessary contextual result. The words in fact nearly = ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε above. Notice, that there is here no exhortation to truthful speaking, as so many Commentators have assumed, e. g. Thl., Œc., Zwingle, Calv., Grot., Bengel, Schneckenb., Stier, al.: that is not in question at all). 13.] The connexion seems to be, Let not this light and frivolous spirit at any time appear among you; if suffering, or if rejoicing, express your feelings not by random and unjustifiable exclamations, but in a Christian and sober manner, as here prescribed. **Is any among you in trouble** (the classical usages are κακοπαθοῦντες τοῦ χωρίου τῇ ἀπορίᾳ, Thuc. iv. 29, of the Athenian soldiers besieging the Lacedæmonians in Sphacteria,—ib. i. 122, πόλεις τοσάσδε ὑπὸ μιᾶς κακοπαθεῖν, &c. The *suffering inflicted, not the state of him who suffers*, is called κακοπάθεια; see on ver. 10)? **let him pray. Is any in joy** (light of heart)? **let him sing praise** (lit. play on an instrument: but used in reff. Rom. and 1 Cor. and elsewhere of singing praise generally. The word '*Psalm*' is an evidence of this latter sense). 14.] **Is any sick among you** (here one case of κακοπάθεια is specified, and for it specific directions are given)? **let him summon to him** (send for) **the elders of the congregation** (to which he belongs: but not, *some one among those elders*, as Estius, Corn. a-Lap., and other Rom.-Cath. interpreters: cf. the Council of Trent, Sess. xiv. De Extr. Unct. can. 4 ("Si quis dixerit, presbyteros Ecclesiæ, quos beatus Jacobus adducendos esse ad infirmum inungendum hortatur, non esse sacerdotes ab Episcopo ordinatos, sed ætate seniores in quavis communitate, ob idque proprium Extremæ Unctionis ministrum non esse solum sacerdotem: anathema sit"), and Justiniani's vindication of the application of this passage to their sacrament of extreme unction: on which see below. The πρεσβύτεροι are not simply "ætate seniores in quavis communitate," but those who were officially πρεσβύτεροι, or ἐπίσκοποι, which in the apostolic times were identical: see notes on Acts xx. 17, 28: so that "sacerdotes ab Episcopo ordinatos" above, would, as applied to the text, be an anachronism), **and let them pray over him** (ἐπ' αὐτόν, either, 1. literally, as coming and standing over his bed: or, 2. figuratively, with reference to him, as if their intent, in praying, went out towards him. Either way, the signification of *motion* in ἐπί with an accus. must be taken into account, and we must not render '*for him*.' On the Pres-

[p] κάμνοντα, καὶ [q] ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος· κἂν [r] ἁμαρτίας ᾖ [rs] πεποιηκώς, [t] ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ. 16 [u] ἐξομολογεῖσθε

p Heb. xii. 3 (Rev. ii. 3 rec.) only. Job x. 1.
q = Mark i. 31. Matt. viii. 15. ix. 5, 6, 7 al.
r 1 Pet. ii. 22 reff.
s = 1 Cor. vi. 18.
t = & constr., Matt. xii. 31, 32.
u = Matt. iii. 6 ‖ Mk. Acts xix. 18 ‡.

byters praying, Bengel says, "qui dum orant, non multo minus est quam si tota oraret Ecclesia"), **anointing** (or, *when they have anointed*) **him with oil in the name of the Lord** (the ἐν τῷ ὀν. κυρ. belongs to ἀλείψαντες, not, as Gebser, to προσευξ., nor as Schneckenburger, to both. And thus joined, they shew that the anointing was not a mere human medium of cure, but had a sacramental character: cf. the same words, or ἐπὶ τῷ ὀν., εἰς τὸ ὄν., used of *baptism*, Matt. xxviii. 19: Acts ii. 38; x. 48; xix. 5: 1 Cor. i. 13, 15. **κυρίου** here is probably Christ, from analogy: His name being universally used as the vehicle of all miraculous power exercised by his followers). 15.] **And the prayer of faith** (gen. subj.: the prayer which faith offers) **shall save** (clearly here, considering that the forgiveness of sins is separately stated afterwards, σώσει can *only* be used of *corporeal healing*, not of the salvation of the soul. This has not always been recognized. The R.-Cath. interpreters, who pervert the whole passage to the defence of the practice of extreme unction, take σώσει of the salvation of the soul. Thus Corn. a-Lapide: "*Oratio fidei*, id est, sacramentum et forma sacramentalis extremæ unctionis, *salvabit infirmum*, hoc est, conferet ei gratiam qua salvetur anima." Some Commentators, as Lyra and Schneckenb., take both meanings. The Council of Trent prevaricates: "Ægroti animam alleviat et confirmat (unctio extrema), magnam in eo divinæ misericordiæ fiduciam excitando: qua infirmus sublevatus, et morbi incommoda ac labores levius fert, et tentationibus dæmonis calcaneo insidiantis facilius resistit: et sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi saluti animæ expedierit, consequitur") **the sick man** (κάμνω, *ægroto*, is classical, even in its absolute use: cf. Soph. Phil. 262: Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 16), **and the Lord** (most probably Christ, again: He who is Lord in the Christian Church) **shall raise him up** (from his bed of sickness: see reff. Here again our R.-Cath. friends are in sad perplexity. The vulg. led the way with its "*alleviabit.*" The interpretations may be seen in Corn. a-Lap., Justiniani, Estius, al. Cf. the Council of Trent above. A curious contrast is furnished by the short comm. of Œc.: τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἔτι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστρεφομένου οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐποίουν, ἀλείφοντες τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἐλαίῳ καὶ ἰώμενοι): **even if** (κἄν precedes a climax: see the sense below. So that the καί is not copulative, but the sentence is abruptly introduced) **he have committed** (he be *in a state of having committed*, i. e. abiding under the consequence of, some commission of sin; for so the *perf.* implies; and hereby the sin in question is presumed to have been the working cause of his present sickness. So Bede: "Multi propter peccata in anima facta, infirmitate vel etiam morte plectuntur corporis:" citing 1 Cor. xi. 30. On this necessary force of the perfect, see Winer, § 40. 4: and on the sense, cf. Matt. ix. 2, 5 f.: John v. 14) **sins, it shall be forgiven him** (supply as a subject, τὸ πεποιηκέναι, from the foregoing). Among all the daring perversions of Scripture by which the Church of Rome has defended her superstitions, there is none more patent than that of the present passage. Not without reason has the Council of Trent defended its misinterpretation with the anathema above cited: for indeed it needed that, and every other recommendation, to support it, and give it any kind of acceptance. The Apostle is treating of a matter totally distinct from the occasion, and the object, of extreme unction. He is enforcing the efficacy of the prayer of faith in afflictions, ver. 13. Of such efficacy, he adduces one special instance. In sickness, let the sick man inform the elders of the Church. Let them, representing the congregation of the faithful, pray over the sick man, accompanying that prayer with the symbolic and sacramental act of anointing with oil in the name of the Lord. Then, the prayer of faith (see Corn. a-Lap. above for the audacious interpretation) shall save (heal) the sick man, and the Lord shall bring him up out of his sickness; and even if it were occasioned by some sin, that sin shall be forgiven him. Such is the simple and undeniable sense of the Apostle, arguing for the efficacy of prayer: and such, as above seen, the perversion of that sense by the Church of Rome. Here, as in the rest of these cases, it is our comfort to know that there is a God of truth, whose judgment shall begin at His Church. Observe, the promises here made of recovery and forgiveness are unconditional, as in Mark xvi. 18 al. 16.] *A general injunction* arising out of a circumstance necessarily to be inferred in the preceding example. There, the sin would of necessity have been

οὖν ἀλλήλοις * τὰ [v] παραπτώματα, καὶ εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, ὅπως ἰαθῆτε. πολὺ [w] ἰσχύει [x] δέησις δικαίου [y] ἐνεργουμένη. 17 Ἡλίας ἄνθρωπος ἦν [z] ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν,

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k m o 13

v Matt. vi. 14, 15. xviii. 35. 2 Cor. v. 19. Eph. i. 7 al. Ezek. iii. 20.
w = Gal. v. 6. Heb. ix. 17.
x 1 Tim. ii. 1. Heb. v. 7 reff. only †. Wisd. vii. 3 only.
y = Gal. v. 6. Col. i. 29. 2 Thess. ii. 7 al.
z Acts xiv. 15

16. rec om *ουν*, with L rel lat-ff_1 æth [arm] Thl Œc: ins ABK[P]ℵ a c g 36 vulg syr coptt. * τὰς ἁμαρτίας AB[P]ℵ a c d 13 [$Ephr_1$]: *τα παραπτωματα* KL rel [$Damasc_1$-ed] Thl Œc. *προσευχεσθε* A B[(-*θαι* B[1]) $Ephr_1$].

confessed to the *πρεσβύτεροι*, before the prayer of faith could deal with it. And seeing the blessed consequences in that case,—'generally,' says the Apostle, in all similar cases, 'and one to another universally, pursue the same salutary practice of confessing your sins.' **Confess therefore to one another** (emphatically placed before *τὰ παραπτώματα*—'not only to the presbyters in the case supposed, but to one another generally') **your transgressions** (i. e. not merely, as Wolf, al., offences against your brethren; but also sins against God: cf. ref. Matt. vi.), **and pray for one another, that ye may be healed** (in case of sickness, as above. The context here forbids any wider meaning: and so rightly De Wette, Wiesinger, and Huther. So even Corn. a-Lap., "id est, ut sanemini, scilicet, ab infirmitate quæ vos detinet." On the other hand Justiniani, "recte Latinus interpres animæ sanitatem intellexit, hoc est, salutem sempiternam." And similarly Estius, Carpzov, Grot., al. Baumgarten, Schneckenburger, Kern, al., would join both). It might appear astonishing, were it not notorious, that on this passage among others is built the Romish doctrine of the necessity of confessing sins to a priest. As a specimen of *the way in which* it is deduced, I subjoin Corn. a-Lapide's exegesis: "'*Alterutrum*,' id est, homo homini, similis simili, frater fratri confitemini, puta sacerdoti, qui licet officio sit superior, natura tamen est par, infirmitate similis, obligatione confitendi æqualis." Cajetan, on the contrary, denies that "sacramental confession" is here spoken of: "nec hic est sermo de confessione sacramentali" [here, as in so many other cases, the much-vaunted unity of Roman interpreters embracing the most opposite opinions]. **The supplication of a righteous man** (i. e. of one who shews his faith by his works, see ch. ii. 24) **availeth much in its working** (i. e. worketh very effectually. Much doubt has arisen about the meaning and reference of **ἐνεργουμένη**. It is usually taken as in E. V., "the effectual fervent prayer,"—as an epithet to *δέησις*, setting forth its fervency. Œc. seems to take it passively, "helped forward by the sympathy of the person prayed for:" for he says, *ἐνεργεῖται ἡ τοῦ δικαίου εὐχή, ὅταν καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ οὗ εὔχεται συμπράττῃ διὰ κακώσεως πνευματικῆς τῷ εὐχομένῳ. ἂν γάρ, ἑτέρων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εὐχομένων, σπαταλαῖς ἡμεῖς σχολάζωμεν κ. ἀνέσεσι κ. ἐκδεδιῃτημένῳ βίῳ, ἐκλύομεν διὰ τούτου τὸ σύντονον τῆς εὐχῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀγωνιζομένου.* The following is from Huther's note: "Michaelis explains it 'preces agitante Spiritu sancto effusæ:' Carpzov, *δέησις διὰ πίστεως ἐνεργουμένη*: Gebser understands prayer in which the suppliant himself works for the accomplishment of his wish: similarly Calvin,—'Tunc vere in actu est oratio, quum succurrere contendimus iis, qui laborant.' Commonly, **ἐνεργουμένη** is assumed to be synonymous with *ἐνεργής* or *ἐνεργός* (*ἐκτενής*, Luke xxii. 44: Acts xii. 5), 'strenuus,' 'intentus,' 'earnest,' &c.: and this qualification of the prayer of the righteous man is attached to **πολὺ ἰσχύει** as its condition (so Wiesinger, and similarly Erasm., Beza, Gataker, Horneius, Grot., Wolf, Baumg., Hottinger, Schneckenb., Kern, Theile, al.). This interpretation however has not only, as Wiesinger confesses, N. T. usage against it, but can hardly be justified from the context, it being necessarily implied that the prayer of the righteous man is not a dead and formal one. Besides which, the force of the general sentence, *πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου*, suffers much from the appending of a condition under which alone the sentence could be true. Rightly therefore does Pott adhere to the *verbal* meaning of the participle **ἐνεργουμένη**, in periphrasing, *πολὺ ἰσχύει ἐνεργεῖν*, or *πολὺ ἰσχύει καὶ ἐνεργεῖ δέησις*: but both these periphrases are arbitrary: the first weakens the force of *ἰσχύει*, and the second makes the two ideas co-ordinate, which the Apostle never intended. At all events we must connect *ἐνεργουμένη* closely with *ἰσχύει*: not as above, but so that by it may be expressed that which is the field or element of the *πολὺ ἰσχύειν*: the prayer of the righteous can do much *in its working* (not, as De Wette, if it developes itself in act). That it *does work*, this is assumed: that, besides working, it *πολὺ ἰσχύει*, this is it which St. James puts forward, and confirms by the follow-

καὶ [a] προσευχῇ [ab] προσηύξατο [c] τοῦ μὴ [d] βρέξαι, καὶ οὐκ [d] ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐνιαυτοὺς τρεῖς καὶ μῆνας ἕξ· [18] καὶ πάλιν προσηύξατο, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς [ef] ὑετὸν [e] ἔδωκεν, καὶ ἡ γῆ [g] ἐβλάστησεν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς.

[19] Ἀδελφοί μου, ἐάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν [h] πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς [i] ἀληθείας καὶ [k] ἐπιστρέψῃ τὶς αὐτόν, [20] γινώσκετε ὅτι ὁ

a see Eph. vi. 18. b constr. inf. (w. τοῦ here only), Luke xxii. 40. c Matt. ii. 13. Acts xxi. 12. d here bis. Matt. v. 45. Luke vii. 38, 44. xvii. 29. Rev. xi. 6 only. (3 Kings xvii. 1.) Isa. v. 6. e 3 Kings xviii. 1. Acts xiv. 17. Job v. 10. f as above (e). Acts xxviii. 2. Heb. vi. 7. Rev. xi. 6 only. g trans., here only. Gen. i. 11. intr., Matt. xiii. 26. Mark iv. 27. Heb. ix. 4. h Heb. v. 2 reff. i ch. iii. 14. k trans., Luke i. 16, 17. Lam. v. 21.

18. *εδωκεν* bef *υετον* A 13. 73 latt Syr coptt: *εδωκεν τον υετον* ℵ.

19. rec om *μου*, with L rel Did, Œc: ins ABK[P]ℵ a b c d m o 36 [latt syrr coptt arm] Thl. ins *οδου της* bef *αληθειας* ℵ d j [5. 7. 8. 13. 22. 36. 40-marg. 65 Syr copt arm].

20. rec *γινωσκετω*, with AKL[P]ℵ rel latt: txt B c m syr æth. (13 def.)

ing example of Elias"). 17, 18.] *Example of this effectual prayer, in the case of Elias.* 17.] **Elias was a man of like passions with us** (this precedes, to obviate the objection that the greatness of Elias, so far out of our reach, neutralizes the example for us weak and ordinary men. There is no contrast to *δίκαιος* intended, as Gebser, but rather Elias is an example of a *δίκαιος*: nor again can **ὁμοιοπαθής** be taken to signify "involved in like sufferings," as Laurentius and Schneckenb.: see reff.), **and he prayed with prayer** (made it a special matter of prayer: not, "*prayed earnestly*," as E. V., Schneckenb., Wiesinger, al. This adoption of the Heb. idiom merely brings out more forcibly the idea of the verb) **that it might not rain** (the gen. of the intent: the purport and purpose of the prayer being mingled, as so commonly: cf. on the similar *προσεύχεσθαι ἵνα*, note, 1 Cor. xiv. 13. This fact is not even hinted at in the O. T. history in 1 Kings xvii. ff.; nor the following one, that he prayed for rain at the end of the drought: though this latter may perhaps be implied in 1 Kings xviii. 42 ff.), **and it rained not** (the use of **βρέχειν** for to rain is found first in prose, according to Lobeck, Phryn. p. 291, in Polyb. xvi. 12. 3: then in Arrian, Epict. i. 6. 30, and in LXX, N. T. and subsequent writers. Classically, it is poetical only. The impersonal use appears to be confined to later writers) **on the earth for three years and six months** (so also Luke iv. 25: and in the Jalkut Simeoni, on 1 Kings xvi., where we have, "Anno xiii. Achabi fames regnabat in Samaria per tres annos et dimidium anni." There is no real discrepancy here, as has been often assumed, with the account in 1 Kings: for as Benson has rightly observed, the words "in the third year" of 1 Kings xviii. 1 by no necessity refer to the duration of the famine, but most naturally date back to the removal of Elijah to Zarephath, ib. xvii. 8 ff.: cf. the same "many days" in ib. ver. 15, where indeed a variation is "for a full year." I cannot see how Huther can hold this to be an insufficient explanation, because we are bound to regard the drought as beginning immediately after Elijah's announcement 1 Kings xvii. 1: nor how it appears that that announcement must necessarily have been made at the end of the summer season during which it had not rained):

18.] **and again he prayed** (see above), **and the heavens gave rain** (reff.) **and the earth brought forth** (**βλαστέω** or **-άνω** is properly an intr. verb, but used transitively in the 1 aor., as some other verbs. So in Hippocrates (Palm and Rost's Lex.), Apoll. Rhod. i. 1131 (*οὖς ποτε νύμφη Ἀγχιάλη, Δικταῖον ἀνὰ σπέος, ἀμφοτέρῃσιν Δραξαμένη γαίης Οἰαξίδος ἐβλάστησε*), and later writers) **her fruit** ("quas ferre solet," Schneckenb.).

19, 20.] *The importance and blessing of reclaiming an erring brother.* This is very nearly connected with the foregoing; the duty of mutual advice and correction, with that of mutual confession and prayer. 19.] **Brethren, if any among you be seduced** (lit. passive; and there is no reason why the passive signification should not be kept, especially when we remember our Lord's warning, *βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ*) **from the truth** (not merely truth practical, of moral conduct, but that **ἀλήθεια** which is the subject of the *λόγος* whereby our regeneration took place, ch. i. 18—the doctrine of Christ, spiritual and practical), **and one convert him** (turn him back to the truth, reff.),

20.] **know** (or, with the rec. *γινωσκέτω*, *let him know*, viz. the last *τις*, *ὁ ἐπιστρέψας*—for his comfort, and for the

l = Rom. i. 27. 2 Pet. ii. 18. Jude 11. Jer. xxiii. 17.
m Heb. v. 7 reff.
n 1 Pet. iv. 8.
o Ezek. xxviii. 18.

[k] ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ [l] πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ [m] σώσει ψυχὴν [m] ἐκ θανάτου, καὶ [n] καλύψει [no] πλῆθος [o] ἁμαρτιῶν.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k m o 13

ΙΑΚΩΒΟΥ.

ins την bef ψυχην A 73. 81 [arm]. add αυτου A[P]ℵ 13. 36 vulg vind Cyr[$_1$-p] Did$_1$ Ambrst Cassiod. aft θανατου ins αυτου B [lat-ff$_2$ æth].

Subscription. τελος· του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου επιστολη καθολικη L: [ιακ. αποστ. επ. καθολ. P 68:] τελος h: om rel: ιακωβου επιστολη A 40. 69: επιστολη ιακωβου ℵ: txt B.

encouragement of others to do the like by this proclamation of the fact), **that he who converteth** (not, '*has converted*:' our English present, when connected with a future, exactly gives the aor. participle. The first action is necessarily antecedent to the second, which is all that the Greek requires) **a sinner from the error of his way** (thus is the person converted more generally expressed than before; not only, τὸν πλανηθέντα, but any ἁμαρτωλόν) **shall save a soul from death** (in eternity: the future shews that the σωτηρία spoken of is not contemporary with the ἐπιστρέψαι, but its ultimate result), **and shall cover a multitude of sins** (viz. by introducing the convert into that state of Christian faith, wherein all sins, past, present, and future, are forgiven and done away. See reff. and for the expression, Ps. xxxi. 1: Neh. iv. 5 LXX. The ἁμαρτιῶν, following ἁμαρτωλόν, necessarily binds the reference to the converted, not the converters. It is not τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ (as Syr., "hideth the multitude of his sins"), because the Apostle wishes to put in its most striking *abstract* light the good deed thus done. The objection (Whitby) that thus we should have a tautology,—the saving of his soul including the covering of his sins, is entirely obviated by this latter consideration: even without Wiesinger's reply, that "the words carry on further the σώσει ψυχήν, and state the ground of that salvation." The idea that they are the sins of the converter (Zacharias Ep. i. ad Bed., Erasmus, Whitby, Hammond, al.) is thus as abhorrent from the context, as it is generally repugnant to apostolic teaching: cf. on the whole, 1 Pet. iv. 8. "Commendat," says Calvin, "fratrum correctionem ab effectu, ut majore studio in eam intenti simus").

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Α.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k m o 13

I. [1] Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [a] ἐκλεκτοῖς [b] παρεπιδήμοις [c] διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας, [2] κατὰ [d] πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρός,

a ch. ii. 4 &c. Matt. xx. 16. Luke xviii. 7. Tit. i. 1. 2 John 1 al. Isa. xliii. 20.
b Heb. xi. 13 reff.
c John vii. 35. James i. 1 only. Ps. cxlvi. 2.
d Acts ii. 23 only †. Judith ix. 6. xi. 19 only.

TITLE. Steph πετρου καθολικη επιστολη πρωτη: elz πετρου του αποστολου επιστολη καθ. πρωτη: επ. καθ. α' του αγιου και πανευφημου αποστολου πετρου L: πετρου επιστολη α' ACℵ j k m o 13: [πετρου . . . P:] txt B. (After the title three lines are lost in C.)

CHAP. I. 1. aft εκλεκτοις ins και (but erased) ℵ[1] [syrr]. om ασιας ℵ[1]. om και βιθυνιας B[1].

CHAP. I. 1, 2.] ADDRESS AND GREETING: corresponding generally with those of St. Paul's Epistles, designating however himself more briefly, and his readers more at length. 1.] **Peter** (the Greek form of the name Cephas, a stone, given him by our Lord, see John i. 43: in 2 Pet. i. 1 it is "Symeon Peter") **an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect strangers** (see on παρεπιδήμοις, Heb. xi. 13 note. ἐκλεκτοῖς, chosen of God to His adopted family in Christ. The construction is irregularly carried on from ἐκλ. by κατὰ πρόγνωσιν κ.τ.λ. below, where see) **of the dispersion** (i. e. belonging to the *Jewish* dispersion, as in reff. This leading character of the readers of 1 Peter has been acknowledged generally: see testimonies in Prolegg. At the same time, as there argued (§ iii. 3 ff.), there is no reason to exclude Gentile Christians from among them, as forming part of the Israel of God. Indeed, such readers are presupposed in the Epistle itself: cf. ver. 14; ch. ii. 10; iv. 3) **of Pontus** (see Acts ii. 9, note), **Galatia** (see Prolegg. to Gal. § ii.), **Cappadocia** (Acts, ut supra), **Asia** (not quite as in Acts ii. 9; xvi. 6, where Phrygia is distinguished from it: here it must be included) **and Bithynia** (Acts xvi. 7, note: and on the whole geographical extent embraced by the terms, and inferences to be gathered from their order of sequence, see Prolegg. § iii. 6 ff., iv. 17). 2.] **according to** (i. e. *in pursuance of*. The local meaning of κατά with an accus., 'along (down) the direction of,' gives at once the derived meaning here. κατὰ πρόγ. κ.τ.λ. follows ἐκλεκτοῖς, the emphatic position of the predicative epithet having as it were left its sound yet ringing in the ear, so that this epexegesis of it, though unusual, does not occasion any difficulty. Œc., as also Cyr.-alex. de Recta Fide (Huther), joins κατὰ πρόγν. with ἀπόστολος: which can hardly be) **foreknowledge** (not merely "prævisio fidei," as Calov., but nearly synonymous with βουλή or προορισμός. It may be, and often is, this "prævisio" merely: see the word πρόγνωσις in Suicer, and Origen in Cramer's Catena: but can hardly be this here, where it is made distinctly to be the moving cause of election. See again on ver. 20, where the signification "fore-decreed" is necessary to the context. "The difference between προγιγνώσκειν and προορίζειν is this, that in the former idea, the fact of knowledge is especially put forward, seeing that all God's decrees rest on the ground of His omniscience." Huther. "Eligendos facit Deus, non invenit," is an important remark of Augustine. Cf. Hofmann's Schriftbeweis, i. 228 ff.) **of God the Father** (thus indicated, as

e 2 Thess. ii 13. f 1 Thess. iv. 3 &c. g & constr., Rom. i 5. xvi. 26. 2 Cor. x. 5. (Heb. v. 9 reff.) h Heb. xii. 24 (reff.) only. i gen., 2 Cor. xi. 26. j = Matt. xxiv. 12. 2 Pet. i. 2. Jude 2. Dan. iii. 31. k Mark xiv. 61. Luke i. 68. Rom. i. 25. ix. 5. 2 Cor. i. 3. xi. 31. Eph. i. 3 only. Gen. ix. 26. l Paul (Rom. xv. 6. Eph. i. 3 al.) only, exc. here and Rev. i. 6. see James i. 27. m Eph. ii. 4 al. Num. xiv. 19. n ver. 23 only †. o = John iv. 10. vi. 51. vii. 38. Acts vii. 38. Heb. x. 20. ch. ii. 4. p Luke xx. 35. Acts iv. 2. see Phil. iii. 11.

εν [ef] ἁγιασμῷ [e] πνεύματος, εἰς [g] ὑπακοὴν καὶ [h] ῥαντισμὸν [i] αἵματος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη [j] πληθυνθείη.

3 [k] Εὐλογητὸς ο [l] θεὸς καὶ [l] πατὴρ τοῦ [l] κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ [m] ἔλεος [n] ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα [o] ζῶσαν δι' [p] ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ

C πνευματος... ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k m o 13

3. [elz υμας, with 23. 38[1]: txt ABCKLPℵ rel.] δια ℵ a[2].

leading on to the great mystery of the Holy Trinity in the work of our salvation) **in** (not "*through*," as E. V.: the **κατά** betokens the origin, and enduring pattern after which,—**ἐν**, the conditional and abiding element in which, and **εἰς**, the result for which. So that ἐν is nót = εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἐν as De Wette) **sanctification** (reff.) **of the Spirit** (gen. subjective, or rather *efficient*, the Spirit being the worker of the sanctification: **πνεύματος**, not, as Beza, "vel spiritus sanctus, vel anima, quæ sanctificatur") **unto** (*result as regards us*—the fruit which we are to bring forth, and the state into which we are to be brought) **obedience** (absolutely, Christian obedience, the obedience of faith, as in ver. 14: see reff.: not to be taken with Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, which belongs closely to αἵματος) **and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ** (i. e. admission into and standing in that covenant, whose atoning medium is Christ's blood,—and mode of application, the sprinkling of that blood on the heart by faith. The allusion is to Exod. xxiv. 8, where the covenant was inaugurated by sprinkling the blood on the people. This, as Huther remarks, was the only occasion on which the blood was thus sprinkled on *persons:* for on the great day of atonement, only the sacred vessels were thus sprinkled. So also in Heb. ix. 13. But we need not confine the virtue of the sprinkling to *admission into* the covenant. Doubtless its *purifying power,* especially as connected with ὑπακοή, is also in the mind of the Apostle. And thus Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 305: maintaining that the Death of Christ is not only, *as looking back on the past,* a propitiation for sin, thereby removing the obstacle which stood in the way of God's gracious purpose towards man,—but also, *looking forward to the future,* a capacitating of us for the participation in God's salvation: just as Israel, sin having been atoned for by the sacrifice itself, was admitted into the actual state of reconciliation by the sprinkling on them of the sacrificial blood. The gen. **αἵματος** is that of the object, or material with which: cf. Heb. ix. 21, αἵματι ἐράντισεν. "By this description of the readers, an anticipation is given of the whole train of thought in the Epistle: the aim of which is to impress the blessed certainty of salvation, and with that, the obligations incurred by receiving God's gift." Harless): **grace and peace be multiplied unto you** (so, but more fully, in reff. 2 Pet. and Jude. "Pax a gratia distinguitur, tanquam fructus et effectus a sua causa." Gerhard. "Pax vestra multiplicetur" is quoted as a Rabbinical salutation by Wetstein and Schöttgen).

3—12.] The Apostle *begins*, much after the manner of St. Paul in the opening of his Epistles, *with giving thanks to God for the greatness of the blessings of salvation;* thus paving the way for the exhortations which are to follow. And herein, he directs his readers' look, first, *forward into the future* (vv. 3—9); then *backward into the past* (vv. 10—12). 3—5.] *Thanksgiving for the living hope into which the Christian has been begotten.* 3.] **Blessed be** (εὐλογητός is used in the N. T. of God only: and so almost always in the O. T.: while εὐλογημένος is applied to men. The shade of distinction is perhaps this: that εὐλογητός carries with it rather the imperative, 'Blessed be' &c.,—εὐλογημένος the indicative, 'Blessed is' &c. This is better than Van Hengel's distinction (on Rom. p. 140), that the verbal adjective gives "quod sibi constat,"—the participle, "quod aliunde pendet:" for thus we should not get the idea of praise in εὐλογητός) **the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ** (so verbatim ref. Eph., where see note), **who according to** (see on ver. 2, κατὰ πρόγνωσιν κ.τ.λ.) **his much mercy** (cf. πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει, ref. Eph.) **begat us again** (as in ref. and elsewhere in the N. T., where the idea, though not the word, occurs,—of the new birth from the state of nature to the state of grace,

χριστοῦ [p] ἐκ νεκρῶν, [4] εἰς [q] κληρονομίαν [r] ἄφθαρτον καὶ [s] ἀμίαντον καὶ [t] ἀμάραντον, [u] τετηρημένην ἐν [v] οὐρανοῖς εἰς

l και αμαραντον...

q = Eph. i. 14, 18. v. 5. Col. iii. 24. Heb. ix. 15. r Rom. i. 23. 1 Cor. ix. 25. xv. 52. 1 Tim. i. 17. ver. 23. ch iii. 4 only †. Wisd. xii. 1. xviii. 4 only. s Heb vii. 26 reff. t here only †. Wisd. vi 12 only. (-τινος, ch. v. 4.) u = John ii. 10. w. εἰς, John xii. 7. Acts xxv. 21. 2 Pet. ii. 4. v = Matt. v. 12. xix. 21. Phil. iii. 20. Col. i. 5.

4. transp *αμιαντον* and *αμαραντον* ℵ [Cyr$_1$ Gild]: om *και αμαρ.* o [Oros$_1$]. *τετηρημενον* ℵ[1]. *ουρανω* ℵ.

the work of God the Spirit (ver. 2), by means of the word (ver. 23), in virtue of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice and of union with Him (vv. 2, 18; ch. ii. 24; iii. 18)) **unto** (**εἰς**, either *telic*, unto as aim and end, = 'that we might have,' or *local*, unto = into; = 'so that we have.' The latter is here preferable, seeing that hope is not the aim but the condition of the Christian life) **a living hope** (**ζῶσαν**, as connected with ἀναγεννήσας; it is a life of hope, a life in which hope is the energizing principle. This is better than to understand it as contrasting our hope with that of the hypocrite, which shall perish: as Leighton, in some of his most beautiful language. **ἐλπίς** is not to be understood of the *object of hope*, but of hope properly so called, subjectively. This hope of the Christian "has life in itself, gives life, and looks for life as its object," De Wette) **through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead** (to what does **δι'** refer? Œc. says, καὶ πόθεν τὸ ζωὴν ἔχουσα; ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. And similarly, referring διά to ζῶσαν, Luth., Bengel, De W., al. But, while we retain distinctly the connexion of our *living* hope with the *life* of Him on whom it depends, it is much more natural to join this instrumental clause with the verb ἀναγεννήσας, as bringing in with it the whole clause, ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν, by which it is defined. The resurrection of Christ, bringing in life and the gift of the life-giving Spirit, is that which potentiates the new birth unto a living hope),

4.] **unto** (this **εἰς**, as the former one, depends on ἀναγεννήσας, and is coordinate to the other. It introduces the objective end to which our hope is directed. "Quamdiu peregrinamur, habemus spem vivam: finita peregrinatione, ζῶσα ἐλπὶς fit κληρονομία τῆς ἐπαγγελίας." Steinmeyer, in Wies.) **an inheritance** ("By **κληρονομία** (cf. ch. iii. 7, 9) is imported the whole fulness of blessings not seen, of which the Christian as a child of God (ἀναγενν. ver. 3) has expectation, cf. Gal. iv. 7. This inheritance is more closely defined, as σωτηρία (vv. 5, 9), as χάρις, χάρις ζωῆς (ver. 13; ch. iii. 7), as δόξα (ch. v. 1), as ἀμαράντινος τῆς δόξης στέφανος (ch. v. 4), or ἡ αἰώνιος τοῦ θεοῦ δόξα (ch. v. 10). The simplest expression for that, which the Apostle calls κληρονομία, is on the one side the χάρις ζωῆς with its δόξα, on the other the σωτηρία ψυχῶν. This **κληρονομία** is the full possession of that, which was promised to Abraham and all believers (Gen. xii. 3, see Gal. iii. 6 ff.), an inheritance, as much higher than that which fell to the children of Israel in the possession of Canaan, as the sonship of the regenerate, who have already received the ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πνεύματος διὰ τῆς πίστεως as a pledge of their κληρονομία, is higher than the sonship of Israel: cf. Gal. iii. 18, 29: 1 Cor. vi. 9: Eph. v. 5: Heb. ix. 15: and De Wette, h. l." Wiesinger) **incorruptible** (not liable to φθορά, decay. "We are here *inter peritura perituri*: the things are passing which we enjoy, and we are passing who enjoy them. . . . When death comes, that removes a man out of all his possessions to give place to another: therefore are these inheritances decaying and dying in relation to us, because we decay and die: and when a man dies, his inheritances, and honours, and all things here, are at an end in respect of him: yea we may say the world ends to him." Leighton), **undefiled** (Leighton quotes from Jerome, "Dives aut iniquus est, aut iniqui hæres." "All possessions here are defiled and stained with many defects and failings: still somewhat wanting, some damp on them, or crack in them: fair houses, but sad cares flying about the gilded and ceiled roofs: stately and soft beds and a full table, but a sickly body and queasy stomach. . . . All possessions are stained with sin, either in acquiring or using them, and therefore they are called mammon of unrighteousness, Luke xvi. 9") **and unfading** (in its beauty; which in all earthly things is passing and soon withered: see ver. 24. So that our inheritance is glorious in these three respects: it is in *substance*, incorruptible: in *purity*, undefiled: in *beauty*, unfading. "Amat Petrus synonyma cumulata: vv. 7, 8, 19; cap. v. 10." Bengel), **reserved** (= ἀποκειμένην, laid up, Col. i. 5) **in the heavens** ("ut sciamus eam esse extra periculum," Calv.: also reflecting back on the epithets above, because all that is *there* is incorruptible and undefiled and

ὑμᾶς τοὺς [w] ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ [x] φρουρουμένους [y] διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν [z] ἑτοίμην [a] ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ [b] ἐσχάτῳ. 6 ἐν ᾧ [c] ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, [d] ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ [e] δέον

ABCKL PℵabcdfghjklmO13

w 1 Cor. ii. 5. 2 Cor. vi. 7.
x 2 Cor. xi. 32. Gal. iii. 23. Phil. iv. 7 only +. Judith iii. 6.
y Rom. iii. 22. 2 Cor. v. 7 al. fr.
z = John vii. 6. w. inf., Luke xxii. 33. w. τοῦ, Acts xxiii. 15. Mic. vi. 8.
a = Rom. viii. 18. h. v. 1. Isa. lvi. 1.
b w. καιρ., here only. = John vi. 39 &c. see ver. 20.
c Matt. v. 12. Acts xvi. 34. ver. 8. ch. iv. 13. Rev. xix. 7. Ps. ii. 11.
d = Mark vi. 31. ch. v. 10. Rev. xvii. 10. Prov. xxiv. 33.
e Acts xix. 36 only. 1 Macc. xii. 11. see 1 Tim. v. 13.

rec ημας, with c [5. 38[1]. 42] harl copt Thl: txt ABCKL[P]ℵ rel latt syrr [arm] Jer Aug Gild Bede.

5. ετοιμως ℵ[1]. [ανακαλυφθηναι P.]

6. om εν ω C[2] [æth]. om εστιν Bℵ[1] c $Clem_1$ Thl_1-comm(ins_2): om ει δεον

unfading. The Greek interpreters make these words an argument against the millenarians: so Œc., εἰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἡ κληρονομία, μυθώδης ἡ χιλιοέτης ἀποκατάστασις. See also in Cramer's Catena) **for** (with a view to, see Rom. viii. 18) **you** (turning again to his readers from the general statement of ver. 3), **5.] who are being guarded** ("Quid juvat, salutem nobis in cœlo esse repositam, quum nos in mundo tanquam in turbulento mari jactemur? quid juvat, salutem nostram statui in tranquillo portu, quum inter mille naufragia fluctuemur? Prævenit apostolus ejusmodi objectiones," &c. Calvin. "Hæreditas servata est: hæredes custodiuntur: neque illa his, neque hi deerunt illi. Corroboratio insignis." Bengel. "Militare est vocabulum φρουρά: præsidium. Pii igitur dum sunt in periculis, sciant totidem eis divinitus parata esse præsidia: millia millium custodiunt eos." Aretius, in Huther) **in** (ἐν, of the power in which, and by virtue of which, the φρουρά is effectual: not, as Steinmeyer, al., "*in*," as in a φρουρά or fortress) **the power of God by** (the **δύναμις θεοῦ** was the efficient cause: now we come to the effective means) **faith** ("The causes of our preservation are two: 1. Supreme, the power of God; 2. Subordinate, faith. . . . Our faith lays hold upon this power, and this power strengthens faith, and so we are preserved." Leighton) **unto** (the end and limit of the φρουρεῖσθαι: cf. the very similar expression, in ref. Gal., ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. Calvin, Steiger, al. take this **εἰς** as co-ordinate with εἰς κληρ. above, and this clause as a second (third) pendant on ἀναγεννήσας: "Rem unam duobus modis exprimit," Calv. But it seems better, as in Gal. l. c., to attach εἰς to φρουρουμένους) **salvation** (**σωτηρία**, though in itself a merely negative idea, involves in itself, and came to mean in the N. T., the positive setting in bliss of the people of God: cf. ver. 9: James i. 21 al. fr.) **ready** (stronger than μέλλουσαν, Gal. iii. 23: Rom. viii. 18: ch. v. 1) **to be revealed** (see the two last cited places. The stress of the ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι is, as Wiesinger well remarks, not the nearness of the ἀποκάλυψις, but the fact of the salvation being *ready* to be revealed: not yet to be brought in and accomplished, but already complete, and only waiting God's time to be manifested. On the inf. aor. after ἑτοίμην, here giving the rapid completion of the act of ἀποκάλυψις as contrasted with the enduring φρουρεῖσθαι, see Winer, § 44. 7, *b*, *c*) **in the last time** (not, as Bengel, "in comparatione ad tempora V. T.," but absolutely, as in τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. It is otherwise in Jude 18, where see): **6—9.]** *Joy of the Christian at the realization of this end of his faith.* **6.]** It has been much disputed whether this verse (as also ver. 8, see there) is to be taken of *present* joy, or of *future*. In the latter case the present **ἀγαλλιᾶσθε** in both places must be a categorical present, used of a future time: as Thl., Œc. τὸ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ἀντὶ μέλλοντος εἴληπται. And this sense seems to be sanctioned by ver. 8, in which he could hardly predicate of his readers, that they at the present time rejoiced χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ. To avoid this, those who suppose the whole to allude to the time present, and the realization of future bliss by faith, imagine the present ἀγαλλιᾶσθε (not to be an imperative, as Aug., al., but) to have a slight hortatory force, reminding them of their duty in the matter. This however again will hardly suit the very strong qualifying terms above quoted from ver. 8. On the whole, after consideration, I prefer the former interpretation, and the quasi-future sense of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε in both places, with Syr., Œc. (alt.), Thl., Erasm., Luther, Huther, Wiesinger, against Calv., Estius, Grot., Calov., Steiger, De Wette, al. And this interpretation will be found confirmed, as we proceed, by many lesser accuracies and proprieties of rendering. **In which** (i. e. ἐν ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ: the **ἐν ᾧ** is temporal, ἐν bearing the same sense in the resumption as it did at the end of ver. 5, from which it

[e] ἐστίν, [f] λυπηθέντες ἐν [g] ποικίλοις [h] πειρασμοῖς, 7 ἵνα τὸ [i] δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως, [j] πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ [k] ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ πυρὸς δὲ [l] δοκιμαζομένου, [m] εὑρεθῇ [n] εἰς [no] ἔπαινον καὶ [p] δόξαν καὶ [p] τιμὴν [q] ἐν [qr] ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, 8 ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, [s] εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ

f Matt. xvii. 23. 2 Cor. ii. 2. 1 Thess. iv. 13 al. Gen. xlv. 5. g Heb. ii. 4 reff. h = Luke xxii. 28. Acts xx. 19. 1 Cor. x. 13. James i. 2, 12. Rev. iii. 10 al. Deut. iv. 34. i James i. 3 only. Ps. xi. 6. Prov. xxvii. 21 only. j Matt. xiii. 46. John xii. 3 (|| v. r.) only †. k = John vi. 27. Heb. i. 11 (from Ps. ci. 26). James i. 11. art. w. particip., ver. 21. Winer, § 20. 4. see Acts viii. 20 (Pet.). l = Luke xiv. 19. 1 Cor. iii. 13. Gal. vi. 4 al. Zech. xiii. 9. m = Rom. vii. 10. 1 Cor. iv. 2. 2 Cor. v. 3 al. n Eph. i. 6, 12, 14. Phil. i. 11. ch. ii. 14. o = Rom. ii. 29. p Rom. ii. 7, 10. q 2 Thess. i. 7. ver. 13. ch. iv. 13. r = as above (q) & 1 Cor. i. 7 only. (2 Cor. xii. 1, 7, al.) s chiefly John (i. 12. ii. 11 al. fr.). Acts x. 43 (Peter). Rom. x. 14 al.

εστιν Syr. λυπηθεντας Lℵ[1] d f j (k?) m: λυπηθηναι 105 vulg.

7. rec πολυ τιμιωτερον, with KL rel Clem Orig Thl Œc-txt: txt A B(sic: see table) C[P]ℵ b d j k m o [Euthal$_1$]. χρυσου B. rec transp δοξαν and τιμην, with KL[P] Syr Thl Œc: txt ABCℵ a c d h m 13. 36 vulg syr copt [arm] Orig$_1$. [—ins εις bef δοξαν KLP.]

8. rec ειδοτες, with AKL[P] rel copt Clem$_1$ [Cyr$_1$ Euthal$_1$] Thl Œc: txt BCℵ j o vulg syrr æth [arm] Polyc$_1$ Iren-int$_2$.

is resumed. Such is our Apostle's manner, to resume, in proceeding further, the thing or person just mentioned, in the same sense as before: cf. vv. 5, 8, 10. Or, **ἐν ᾧ** may mean, 'at which,' 'wherein,' as ch. iv. 4: the *καιρὸς ἔσχατος* being not the time, but the object of your joy. Those who regard **ἀγαλλιᾶσθε** as strictly present, understand *ἐν ᾧ* as in ch. iv. 4, but refer it to the whole preceding: so Calv., "Articulus, 'in quo,' refert totum illud complexum de spe salutis in cœlo repositæ") **ye rejoice** (ἀγαλλ. is a stronger word than *χαίρειν*, implying the external expression and exuberant triumph of joy. It is sometimes joined with *χαίρειν*, as in reff. Matt. and Rev.), **for a little time** (as in ch. v. 10 and other reff.) **at present** (**ἄρτι** would, on the hypothesis of **ἀγαλλιᾶσθε** being a proper present, be superfluous) **if it must be so** (= 'si res ita ferat,'—if it be God's will that it should be so: 'si' is hypothetical, not affirmative as Bengel. Cf. Œc. (alt.), *τουτέστιν, εἰ καὶ τοῦτο δεῖ· οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι θλίβονται*) **having been afflicted** (this past part., more than any thing, favours the quasi-future acceptation of **ἀγαλλιᾶσθε**: looking back from the time of which exultation, the grief is regarded as passed away and gone. It carries with it a slightly adversative sense —'though ye were troubled,' 'troubled as ye were,' or the like) **in** (not = *διά*, but the element and material of the *λύπη*) **manifold temptations** (**πειρασμοῖς**, as in ref. James, trials, arising from whatever cause; here, mainly from persecution, see ch. iv. 12 ff., on the *πύρωσις πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένη*. **ποικίλοις**: cf. James i. 2: "non unam tentationem ponit, sed plures; neque unum tantum genus, sed diversa." Calv.), 7.] **that** (end and aim of those temptations) **the proof** (see on ref. James) **of your faith** (= the fact of your faith being proved, and so, by an easy transition, the result of that proof, the purified and proved faith itself), **more precious than gold which perisheth** (**πολυτιμότερον** is in apposition with *δοκίμιον* above, forming part of the *subject* of **εὑρεθῇ**, not a predicate after it. No supply before 'gold,' such as "*of*," E. V., or '*that of*,' is legitimate. It is not '*the proof*' which is precious, though the literal construction at first sight seems to be this, but the faith itself: see above), **yet is** (usually, habitually) **proved by fire** (the **δέ** in this clause brings out this, that gold though perishable yet needs fire to try it— the inference lying in the background, how much more does your faith, which is being proved for eternity, not for mere temporary use, need a fiery trial?), **may be found** (finally and once for all, aor., as the result of the judicial trial at that day = 'evadat.' **εὑρ. εἰς**, see ref. Rom.) **unto** (having as its result: *εἰς* belongs to *εὑρεθῇ*, not (De W.) to the whole sentence) **praise and glory and honour** (*whose?* "Hic agitur de ipsorum electorum laude," Beza, rightly: and so most of the Commentators. Some have pressed the meanings of the separate words: **ἔπαινος** being the praise from the Judge, His *εὖγε δοῦλε ἀγαθέ*: **δόξα**, admission into His glory, ch. v. 1, 10: **τιμή**, the dignity and personal honour thence accruing, ch. iii. 7. But perhaps, as in Rom. ii. 7, we should rather regard them here as cumulative) **in** (i. e. 'at the day of:' the element, in time, in which it shall be manifested) **the revelation of Jesus Christ** (i. e. His return, who is now withdrawn from our sight, but shall then appear again: and with His *ἀποκάλυψις* shall come also the *ἀποκάλυψις τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ*, Rom. viii. 19: 1 John iii. 2):

ὑμῖν δὲ [p] διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἃ νῦν [q] ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν [r] εὐαγγελισαμένων [r] ὑμᾶς [s] πνεύματι ἁγίῳ [t] ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, εἰς ἃ [u] ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι [v] παρακύψαι.

13 Διὸ [wx] ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς [wy] ὀσφύας τῆς [z] διανοίας

ABCKL PℵabcdfghjKlmo 13

p transit., 2 Cor. iii. 3. viii. 19, 20. 2 Tim. i. 18. ch. iv. 10 only †. q John iv. 25. Acts xx. 20. 1 John i. 5 al. Isa. xl. 21. r constr., Luke iii. 16. Acts viii. 12. xiv. 15, 21. xvi. 10. Gal. i. 9. s dat., Acts vi. 10 (ᾧ). see 1 Cor. xiv. 15. t of the H. Spirit, here only. see Luke xxiv. 49. u = & constr., Matt. xiii. 17. Luke xxii. 15 al. Prov. xxiv. 1. v James i. 25 reff. w here only. Prov. xxxi. 17 only. x as above (w) only. y = Luke xii. 35. Eph. vi. 14. (Heb. vii. 5 reff.) Exod. xii 11. z = Matt. xxii. 37. Col. i. 21. 2 Pet. iii. 1. 1 Chron. xxix. 18.

rec ημιν, with K b d l o Syr copt [arm Cyr_2] Thl Œc: txt ABCL[P]ℵ rel vulg syr æth Vig Bede. rec ins εν bef πνευματι, with CKL[P]ℵ rel copt Thl Œc Vig_1: om AB 13 vulg Did_1 Cyr[-p_1] Hil Ambr Vict-vit Bede.

history, with the sole exception of Daniel, as before: β. that it would rather indicate a stop and discouragement of their search, than its legitimate result. Add to this, that the cases in which St. Peter himself, in the Acts, cites the prophecies, shew how he intended this ἀπεκαλύφθη to be taken: e. g. he quotes Joel, Acts ii. 17, speaking of the things prophesied by him as to take place ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις: he says of David, ib. ver. 31, προϊδὼν ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως: and ib. iii. 24, he says, καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας. From these examples it would appear, that the ἀπεκαλύφθη here is not said of any result or consequence of their ἐραυνῆσαι, but of the general revelation made to them: that it is co-ordinate with, not subordinate to ἐραυνῶντες. So in substance Wiesinger: the great stream of interpreters being the other way, or not touching the difficulty at all), **that** (not, '*because*,' as on interpretation (1) above it must be, and as Luther, al. take it: this clause does not contain the reason for the ἀπεκαλύφθη, but the content and purport of the ἀποκάλυψις) **not to themselves** (dat. commodi) **but to you they were ministering** (i. e. by announcing, foretelling: see reff.: Orig. on Ps. xlviii., vol. ii. p. 718, διακονεῖν τὸν λόγον: Jos. Antt. vi. 13. 6, of David's message to Nabal, ταῦτα τῶν πεμφθέντων διακονησάντων πρὸς τὸν Νάβαλον κ.τ.λ.) **the things** (in their previous announcement and foreshadowing) **which now have been declared** (aor., '*were declared*:' νῦν embracing the N. T. period: but we in English cannot join '*were*' with '*now*') **unto you by means of those who preached the gospel to you by** (dat. instrumental) **the Holy Spirit sent** (historic tense again, referring distinctly to the day of Pentecost) **from heaven** (herein consists the great difference between Prophet and Evangelist: the former was the organ of τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα χριστοῦ, the latter preached by the πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀποσταλὲν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ. Still, both are one in design, and in the contents of their testimony: cf. the τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος, and τὰ εἰς χριστὸν παθήματα. And both are here mentioned, to set before the readers their exceeding happiness in being the favoured objects of the ministration of salvation by Prophets and Apostles alike. "Ideo præcesserunt eorum vaticinia, quo certior esset fides nobis, qui nunc eadem vobis nuntiamus facta quæ prædixerant illi futura." Erasm. (paraph.)), **which things** (viz. the things announced to you: the αὐτά . . . ἅ: not, as many, the future glories promised to us: see below) **angels** (generic, as προφῆται above: see there) **desire to look into** (παρακύψαι, see reff., to stoop down and peer into. It enhances further still the excellence of the salvation revealed to us, that angels, for whom it is not designed as for us (Heb. ii. 16), long to pry into its mysteries. To the principalities and powers in heavenly places is made known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God, Eph. iii. 10. Hofmann remarks, Schriftb. i. 313, "Angels have only the contrast between good and evil, without the power of conversion from sin to righteousness. Being then witnesses of such conversion to God, they long to penetrate the knowledge of the means by which it is brought about. . . . They themselves are placed outside the scheme of salvation: therefore it is said that they desire to look into the facts of the apostolic preaching").

13—II. 10.] GENERAL EXHORTATIONS FOUNDED ON THE BLESSEDNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN STATE. 13.] *First exhortation—to* WATCHFULNESS *and* ENDURANCE OF HOPE. **Wherefore** (αἰτιολογικῶς ἀπὸ τῶν προτιμημένων ἡ παράκλησις· εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι οἱ προφῆται διηκόνησαν ἡμῖν τὰ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν, ταῦτα δὲ οὕτως ἦν θαυμαστά, ὡς, καὶ ἀγγέλοις ἐράσμια καταστῆναι, . . . ἐπάγει τὸ αἴτιον τούτων καί φησιν, ἐπεὶ οὖν τοιαῦτα τὰ δεδιηκονημένα ὑμῖν πᾶσι καὶ ἐράσμια καὶ τριπόθητα οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγγέλοις, διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἀμε-

ὑμῶν, [a] νήφοντες, [b] τελείως [c] ἐλπίσατε [c] ἐπὶ τὴν [d] φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν [e] ἐν [e] ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. [14] ὡς [f] τέκνα [g] ὑπακοῆς, μὴ [h] συνσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς [i] πρότερον

a 1 Thess. v. 6, 8. 2 Tim. iv. 5. ch. iv. 7. v. 8 only †. b here only †. Judith xi. 6. 2 Macc. xii. 42. c 1 Tim. v. 5. Ps. lxxvii. 22. dat., Rom. xv. 12. 1 Tim. iv. 10. vi. 17. Ps. xxi. 5. d = 2 Pet. i. 17, 18, 21. τὴν ἐκείνου ἑορτὴν πολλοῖς φέρειν συμφοράν, Herodian v. 6. e ver. 7 reff. f (see note.) g Heb. v. 9 reff. h Rom. xii. 2 only †. i = Heb. x. 32.

14. συσχηματιζομεναι B.

λῶς πρὸς αὐτὰ διατεθῆτε, ἀλλὰ συντείναντες ἑαυτοὺς κ. ἀνδρικῶς διατεθέντες. Œc. This connexion is better than that imagined by some Commentators, with vv. 5—9 generally; nor is the reason underlying διό, "because the Christian must through trial and proof reach glory" (De Wette), which rather lies in vv. 5—7, and is not again mentioned in the course of these exhortations) **gird up** (dynamic middle: the aor. conveying the sense of completeness and once-for-all-nature of the action) **the loins of your mind** (the figure is *one* throughout,—not *your loins*, viz. *those of your mind*, τὰς ὀσφύας ὑμῶν τῆς διανοίας. On **διάνοια**, see note on ref. 2 Pet. The exhortation seems to be taken from our Lord's command, Luke xii. 35, where, as here, the girding up is a preparation for the coming of the Lord. On the figure see Eph. vi. 14 ff., and Œc. above), **being sober** ("Mentis sobrietas et vigilantia requiritur, sicque metaphora in lumborum cinctura prius reposita ἐξηγητικῶς explicatur." Gerhard in Wiesinger. Calvin explains it well, "Non temperantiam solum in cibo et potu commendat, sed spiritualem potius sobrietatem, quum sensus omnes nostros contineamus, ne se hujus mundi illecebris inebrient." Observe **νήφοντες**, pres. part., indicating the continuing state in which the ἀναζώσασθαι and the ἐλπίσαι take place), **hope perfectly** (i. e. "without doubt or dejection, with full devotion of soul," De W.: even better Wahl, Lex., "ita, ut nihil desideretur." Erasm., Grot., Bengel take **τελείως** as merely temporal, "*in finem usque;*" and so E. V., "*hope to the end:*" but this clearly does not reach the full meaning. Syr., Œc., Jer., Benson, Semler, al. join τελείως with νήφοντες, which is of course possible, and better satisfies the rhythm of the sentence, in which on the other view νήφοντες stands rather feebly alone. But all things considered, I feel persuaded the majority of Commentators are right in making it an emphatic adjunct to the great word of exhortation, ἐλπίσατε) **for** (in the direction of: so ref. 1 Tim.) **the grace** (i. e. the great *gift* of grace, the crowning example of grace. Syr., Œc., al. read χαράν) **which is being brought** (E. V., "*is to be brought;*" not amiss, but not giving, what **φερομένην** expresses, the near impending of the event spoken of: q. d. 'which is even now bearing down on you') **to you in the revelation of Jesus Christ** (the meaning of St. Peter's own ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, as applied to the revelation of the Lord at His second advent, ver. 7, seems to fix the meaning of the above words as here given, and to preclude the rendering of Erasm. ("dum vobis patefit, seu manifestatur, Jesus Christus:" but doubtfully), Luther, Calov., Bengel, Steiger, al., who take the whole as referring to the present revelation of grace made by the gospel, in which Jesus Christ is revealed. The right meaning is given by Œc., Calv. (but taking ἐν for εἰς "usque ad"), Beza, Grot., Est., Semler, Pott, De W., Huther, Wiesinger).

14—21.] *Second Exhortation—to* OBEDIENCE, *and* HOLINESS, *and* REVERENCE. This exhortation is intimately connected with the former; but not therefore, as Wiesinger, to be regarded as one and the same. Each of these is evolved regularly out of the last (cf. again ver. 22), but each is an advance onward through the cycle of Christian graces and dispositions.

14.] **As** ("ὡς here, as in ch. ii. 2, 5; iii. 7, does not serve for comparison, but marks the essential quality of the subject: Lorinus says on ch. ii. 14 rightly, 'Constat hujusmodi particulas sæpe nihil minuere, sed rei veritatem magis exprimere.'" Huther) **children of obedience** (cf. τέκνα ὀργῆς, Eph. ii. 3; τέκνα φωτός, ib. v. 8; and esp. τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, ib. v. 6: τέκνα κατάρας, 2 Pet. ii. 14. "This mode of expression," says Winer, Gram. § 34. 3. *b*, Remark 2, "must be referred to the more vivid way of regarding things prevalent among the Orientals, which treats intimate connexion, derivation and dependence, even in spiritual matters, as the relation of a child or a son. 'Children of disobedience' are accordingly those, who belong to ἀπείθεια as a child to its mother, to whom disobedience is become a nature, a ruling disposition." Hence the student may learn to rise above all such silly and shallow interpretations as that τέκνα ὑπακοῆς is a Hebraism for τέκνα ὑπήκοα. The depths

ἐν τῇ [k] ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν [l] ἐπιθυμίαις, [15] ἀλλὰ [m] κατὰ τὸν [n] καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ [o] ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε, [16] [p] διότι γέγραπται [q] Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος. [17] καὶ εἰ πατέρα [r] ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν [s] ἀπροσωπολήμπτως

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

k Acts iii. 17. xvii. 30. Eph. iv. 18 only. Wisd. xiv. 22.
l = ch. ii. 11 reff.
m = Eph. iv. 24.
n Heb. ix. 15 reff.
o Gal. i. 13. Eph. iv. 22. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Heb. xiii. 7. James iii. 13. ver. 18. ch. ii. 12. iii. 1, 2, 16. 2 Pet. ii. 7. iii. 11 †. Tobit iv. 14 AB (om. ℵ). 2 Macc. v. 8 Ed-vat. (not AB) only. (art. omd., Eph. ii. 21. Col. iv. 12.)
p = ver. 24.
q Levit. xi. 44. xix. 2. xx. 7, 26.
r = Acts ii. 21 (from Joel ii. 32). ix. 14. Rom. x. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 22 al.
s here only †. Clem. ad Cor. § 1, p. 208.

16. for διοτι, διο [C]ℵ. aft γεγραπται ins οτι B m [syrr æth]. rec (for εσεσθε) γενεσθε, with K[P] rel, γινεσθε L b^2 h j k m Thl Œc [*estote* am(and harl tol) spec Syr coptt arm]: txt ABCℵ a d 13. 36 [vulg-ed syr æth] Clem Cyr[-p_3] (Opt_1).
for οτι, διοτι ℵ [$Clem_1$]. rec aft αγιος ins ειμι, with CKL[A^2P] rel [vss] Thl Œc: om A^1Bℵ $Clem_1$ Cyr[-p_1].

of the sacred tongue were given us to descend into, not to bridge over) **not conforming yourselves** (thus only, by expressing a middle sense, can we bring out the present participle as combined with the subjective prohibitory particle: and so E. V., well: "*not fashioning yourselves according to.*" [But it would have been better to keep the same English for the word as is given in] ref., where the expression, and tense, are similar. The word **συνσχηματίζεσθαι** belongs to later Greek. The participial construction is variously explained: Wiesinger refers it back to ἀναζωσάμενοι and νήφοντες above; Bengel *supplies* γενήθητε; De Wette connects it with γενήθητε following, ἀλλά being inserted in negligence of the strict construction; Huther regards it as belonging not to γενήθητε, but to κατὰ τὸν καλέσ. ὑμ. ἅγιον below (?). De Wette's view is in the closest analogy with the construction in ver. 22, ἡγνικότες . . . . ἀγαπήσατε: and perhaps therefore to be preferred: but Wiesinger's is very obvious and natural) **to your lusts (which were) formerly in your ignorance** (**ἄγνοια**, as in reff., ignorance of things divine, even to the extent of heathenish alienation from God, which latter is most probably here pointed at. Cf. Rom. i. 18 ff. This ignorance marks not only the period, but also the ground and element of these lusts prevailing in fashioning the life. As to the construction in ταῖς | πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν | ἐπιθυμίαις,—πρότερον-ἐν-τῇ-ἀγν.-ὑμῶν, which would more naturally stand as predicate (ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ταῖς πρότ.-ἐν-τῇ-ἀγν.-ὑμ.), forms an adjectival epithet),

15.] **nay rather** (owing to the broken construction, **ἀλλά** is not, strictly speaking, the negation of μὴ συνσχημ., but of whatever we supply to complete it; and thus is stronger than merely 'but.' So Œc., ἀλλὰ νῦν γοῦν, λέγει, τῷ καλέσαντι συσχηματιζόμενοι, ἁγίῳ ὄντι κ.τ.λ.) **after the pattern of** (the prep. still carries on the idea of conformity of σχῆμα) **that Holy One** (**ἅγιον** is a substantive, not an adjectival predicate, as Œc. above, E. V., and De Wette) **who called you, be ye yourselves also** (**γενήθητε**, aor. imperat., setting forth the completeness with which this holiness is to be put on. But the passive sense of ἐγενήθην must not be every where pressed: see notes on 1 Thess. i. 5: Heb. iv. 3. The attempt to assign an agent wherever ἐγενήθην is used, quite breaks down in some passages, e. g. 2 Cor. iii. 7; vii. 14) **holy in all** (manner of, every instance of: not πάσῃ τῇ nor τῇ πάσῃ: nor need we suppose, as De W., an irregular construction such as it is almost impossible to avoid recognizing in Eph. ii. 21) **behaviour** (conversation, in the old sense of turning and walking about in life: "Nulla sit pars vitæ quæ non hunc bonum sanctitatis odorem redoleat." Calv.):

16.] **because it is written** (**διότι** gives the reason not only for the designation of God as the Holy One, but for the whole exhortation which precedes—for the duty of assimilation to Him in His Holiness), **Ye shall be holy because I am holy** (see Matt. v. 48: Eph. v. 1: 1 John iii. 3).

17.] *Further exhortation*, in consideration of our close relation of children to God our Judge, *to reverence and godly fear*. **And if** ("*Si* non dubitantis est, sed supponentis rem notam. Est enim omnium renatorum communis oratio, Pater noster qui es in cœlis." Estius. The **εἰ** introduces an hypothesis with an understood background of fact: If, (as is the case) &c.) **ye call upon as father** (**πατέρα**, not, as E. V. "*the Father*," but used predicatively and prefixed for emphasis) **Him who judgeth impartially** (see Acts x. 34: James ii. 1 reff. The pres. part. gives the attribute or office: "Him, who is the Judge," see ref. So that there is not even an apparent inconsistency with the declaration that the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, John v. 22: for this last fact of itself implies that the Father *is the Judge*, the 'fons judicii:' as Didymus says here,

[t] κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου [u] ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς [v] παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον [w] ἀναστράφητε, [18] εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ [x] φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, [y] ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς [z] ματαίας ὑμῶν [a] ἀναστροφῆς [b] πατροπαραδότου, [19] ἀλλὰ [c] τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς [de] ἀμνοῦ [ef] ἀμώμου καὶ [g] ἀσπίλου χριστοῦ,

t pres. as ch. ii. 23. u = Acts iii. 16. Rom. vii. 5. 1 Cor. iii. 13. Heb. vi. 10. Rev. xxii. 12. Ps. xxvii. 4. v Acts xiii. 17 only. Ezra viii. 35. (-κεῖν, Heb. xi. 9.) w = Heb. xiii. 18 reff. x Rom. i. 23. 1 Cor. ix. 25. xv. 53, 54. ver. 23 only †. Wisd. ix. 15 al². 2 Macc. vii. 16. y Luke xxiv. 21. Tit. ii. 14 (w. ἀπό) only. w. ἐκ, Ps. cxxix. 8. z James i. 26 reff. a ver. 15 reff. b here only †. c = Acts xx. 24. James v. 7. 2 Pet. i. 4 al. Prov. iii. 15. viii. 11. d John i. 29, 36. Acts viii. 32 (from Isa. liii. 7) only. e Num. vi. 14. f Heb. ix. 14 reff. g James i. 27 reff.

17. κρινουντα C. αναστρεφομενοι ℵ[1] (Tischdf$_{expr}$).
18. φθαρτου αργυριου ℵ[1]. πατροπαρ. bef αναστρ. C a m arm Thl.
19. ins τω bef τιμιω C m [Cyr$_1$].

"judicante Filio Pater est qui judicat") **according to the work of each man** (ἔργον: "Unius hominis unum est opus, bonum malumve." Bengel. Cf. James i. 4: Gal. vi. 4. ἑκάστου, be he Jew or Gentile, high or low, rich or poor: thus by setting God's just judgment above all alike, His Majesty, as inculcating godly fear, is enhanced), **behave** (see on ἀναστροφή above) **during the time of your sojourning** (on παροικέω, see note, Heb. xi. 9. The Christian, who calls God his Father, is in exile, tarrying in a strange country, while here on earth) **in fear** (ἐν φόβῳ stands first as emphatic. How, it is asked, is this, seeing that "there is no fear in love: for perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment" (1 John iv. 18)? Œc. answers, that the fear here recommended is not the φόβος καταρκτικός, leading to repentance, but the φόβος τελειωτικός, which accompanies the Christian through his whole course. And Leighton beautifully says, "This fear is not cowardice: it doth not debase, but elevates the mind: for it drowns all lower fears, and begets true fortitude and courage to encounter all dangers for the sake of a good conscience and the obeying of God. The righteous is as bold as a lion, Prov. xxviii. 1. He dares do any thing, but offend God: and to dare to do that, is the greatest folly, and weakness, and baseness, in the world. From this fear have sprung all the generous resolutions, and patient sufferings of the saints and martyrs of God: because they durst not sin against Him, therefore they durst be imprisoned, and impoverished and tortured and die for Him. Thus the prophet sets carnal and godly fear as opposite, and the one expelling the other, Isa. viii. 12, 13. And our Saviour, Luke xii. 4, 'Fear not them which kill the body, but fear Him' &c. Fear not, but fear: and therefore fear, that you may not fear"), 18] **knowing** (being aware: this argument enhances the duty of godly fear by the consideration of the inestimable price at which they were redeemed. This consideration is urged through vv. 18—21) **that not** (emphatic) **with corruptible things** (φθαρτοῖς subst.; not, as Luther, agreeing with ἀργυρ. ἢ χρυσίῳ), **silver or gold** (notice ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, not ἀργύρῳ ἢ χρυσῷ. The diminutive forms stand generally (not always, cf. Palm and Rost in χρυσίον) for the coined or wrought metal: and such a sense would be applicable here), **were ye redeemed** (bought out of, by the payment of a λύτρον, presently to be specified: see reff., and cf. ἀγοράζεσθαι, 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; ἐξαγοράζεσθαι, Gal. iii. 13) **out of your vain conversation** (ματαίας ἀναστρ., "vana vivendi ratio, quæ, ubi tempus præteriit, nil reliqui fructus habet." Beng.) **delivered to you from your fathers** ("*unus* Pater imitandus ver. 17: idem antitheton, Matt. xxiii. 9." Bengel. This again makes it probable that the persons here more especially addressed are Gentile Christians. The Apostle, himself a Jew, would hardly speak of the vain ungodly lives of Jews as πατροπαράδοτα, without more explanation. Benson, in loc., imagines that there is an allusion to the Jewish practice of paying down money as a ransom for life, Exod. xxi. 30; xxx. 11—16: Num. iii. 44—51; xviii. 15: but there does not seem any ground for this view here: the words following on ἐλυτρώθητε do not give countenance to it, but rather favour the view that it is the *buying out of captivity* which is in the Apostle's mind: see below),— 19.] **but with precious** (τιμίῳ is not, as Huther, in opposition to φθαρτοῖς; nor does it signify "*imperishable*," but simply and generally '*precious*,' '*of worth*') **blood, as of a lamb blameless and spotless** (see Exod. xii. 5: Levit. xxii. 20), **(even the blood) of Christ** (this I believe to be the more natural construction. The other, adopted by E. V., De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger, and many Commentators, "*but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb*"

20 [h] προεγνωσμένου μὲν [i] πρὸ [i] καταβολῆς [i] κόσμου, [k] φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ᾽ [l] ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι᾽ ὑμᾶς 21 τοὺς [m] δι᾽ αὐτοῦ [n] πιστοὺς [o] εἰς θεόν, τὸν [p] ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν [p] ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι [o] εἰς θεόν. 22 Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν [q] ἡγνικότες

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

h = Rom. viii. 29. xi. 2 (Acts xxvi. 5. 2 Pet. iii. 17) only †. Wisd. vi. 13. viii. 8. xviii. 6 only.
i John xvii. 24. Eph. i. 4 only. (ἀπό, Heb. iv. 3 reff.)
k Heb. ix. 26 reff. l Heb. i. 1 reff. m Acts iii. 16. n constr., here only. see Acts xvi. 15.
o = Acts xx. 21. xxiv. 15. xxvi. 18. p Heb. xi. 19 reff. q James iv. 8 reff.

20. προεγνωσμενου C[1] : ανεγνωσμενου ℵ[1]. rec εσχατων, with KL[P] rel vulg sah [æth arm Did$_1$] Thl Œc : txt ABCℵ d 13. 36 syrr copt Cyr[-p$_1$]. του χρονου ℵ[1]. ημας A k.

21. rec (for πιστους) πιστευοντας, with CKL[P]ℵ rel [syrr] Thl Œc : πιστευσαντας 13 : txt AB vulg Vocat. εγειροντα ℵ[1].

&c., is of course legitimate; and in that case τιμίῳ being prefixed for emphasis, is explained by the ὡς ἀμνοῦ clause inserted between it and χριστοῦ. We have a somewhat similar arrangement in Heb. xii. 27, δηλοῖ τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετάθεσιν, ὡς πεποιημένων. But I prefer the other, as bringing forward the τιμίῳ αἵματι in contrast to the φθαρτοῖς, ἀργ. ἢ χρυσ. and then explaining the τιμίῳ by a climax finding its highest point in χριστοῦ. The question, with what particular lamb Christ is here compared, will be found discussed in the main on John i. 29. Our reply here however will be somewhat modified by the consideration, that the figure of buying out of the ματαία ἀναστροφή seems to contain an allusion to the bringing up out of Egypt, and the προεγνωσμένου following, to the taking up of the paschal lamb beforehand, cf. Exod. xii. 3, 6. And thus I believe Wiesinger and Hofmann are right in maintaining here the reference to the paschal lamb. "As Israel's redemption from Egypt required the blood of the paschal lamb, so the redemption of those brought out of heathendom required the blood of Christ, the predestination of whom from eternity is compared with the taking up of the lamb on the tenth day of the month." Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 326. See, for a further discussion of this point, Wiesinger's note here: and Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 194 ff.): **20.**] The preciousness and completeness of this redemption is further enhanced by *God's foreordination* of it, and His *bringing it to glorious completion* in His due time. **Who** (viz. χριστός, as shewn by the αὐτόν and αὐτῷ below) **hath been foreordained indeed** (see on ver. 2) **before the foundation of the world** (see reff. The same thought is foremost in the Apostle's speech in Acts ii. 23, iii. 18), **but manifested** (brought out of the κρυπτόν of God's purposes into the φανερόν of Incarnation and historical world-fact. The same word occurs in ch. v. 4 of the yet future manifestation of Christ at His second coming) **at the end of the times** (cf. ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, Heb. i. 1, and note there: and for this substantive sense of ἐσχάτου, Acts i. 8; xiii. 47. This φανέρωσις of Christ, as Wiesinger remarks, marks this as the end of the times, and this last time shall only endure so long, as this φανέρωσις requires) **for your sakes** (an additional and weighty intensification of their obligation) **21.**] **who are through Him** (surely not only, as Wies., through His manifestation; but through Him personally, made to you all that He is made as the medium of your faith in God: the resurrection and glory being included. In fact τὸν ἐγείραντα κ.τ.λ. is an epexegesis of δι᾽ αὐτοῦ) **believers on God** (a similar specification is found at ver. 4, εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς κ.τ.λ.) **who raised Him from the dead, and gave Him glory** ("That we are redeemed from our vain conversation, is owing to the blood of Christ: but that we have faith and hope in God, is brought about by God having raised Christ from the dead, and given Him glory." Hofm. Schriftb. ii. 1, p. 383. Wies. remarks that the δόξαι of ver. 11 are here separately specified), **so that your faith and hope are** (not, as Syr., Vulg., Œc., Luth., Calv., Beza, Est., al., and E. V., "that your faith and hope *might be*;" nor, as Aretius (in Huth.), "so that your faith and hope *ought to be*:" but simply announcing a matter of fact. Your faith rests on Christ's resurrection—it was God who raised Him: your hope, on Christ's glorification: it is God who has given Him that glory. Closely accordant with this is St. Peter's first public speech in the Acts, ii. 22 ff., where all that has happened to Christ is referred to God as the doer of it) **on** (resting on and in) **God.**

22—25.] *Third exhortation, to* LOVE OF ONE ANOTHER, *from the consideration of their new birth by the word of God.*

22.] **Having purified** (i. e. 'seeing that ye have purified:' the part. carries with it

εν τῇ [r] ὑπακοῇ τῆς [s] ἀληθείας εἰς [t] φιλαδελφίαν [u] ἀνυπόκριτον, [v] ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε [w] ἐκτενῶς, 23 [x] ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ [y] σπορᾶς [z] φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ [a] ἀφθάρτου, διὰ λόγου [b] ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος. 24 [c] διότι

r ver. 14. s Rom. ii. 8. Gal. v. 7. t Rom. xii. 10. 1 Thess. iv. 9. ch. ii. 17. iii. 8. 2 Pet. i. 7 bis only †. u James iii. 17 reff. v = Rom. vi. 17. Mark xii. 30, 33 al. w Acts xii. 5 only. Joel i. 14. Jon. iii. 8. Judith iv. 12 only. (see Luke xxii. 44. Acts xxvi. 7. ch. iv. 8.) x ver. 3 only †. y here only. 4 Kings xix. 29. 1 Macc. x. 30 only. z ver. 18. a ver. 4 reff. b ver. 3 reff. c ver. 16.

22. rec aft *αληθειας* ins *δια πνευματος*, with KL[P] rel spec Thl Œc Gild Vig: om ABCℵ 13 vulg syrr copt arm[-usc Clem$_1$]. rec ins *καθαρας* bef *καρδιας*, with CKL [P]ℵ[1] rel tol(and harl) [syrr copt arm Antch$_2$] Thl Œc: om AB vulg Gild.—*καρδ. αληθινης* ℵ[3].

23. for *σπορας*, *φθορας* ACℵ. rec aft *μενοντος* ins *εις τον αιωνα*, with KL[P] rel vulg Syr Thl Œc: om ABCℵ 13 fuld(and demid [harl]) syr copt arm Did$_1$ Cyr$_4$ Jer$_1$.

an inferential force as to the exhortation, and besides, assumes that as a fact to which it covertly exhorts. "Luther has rendered it, not exactly, but according to the sense: machet keusch . . . und . . ." Huther. **ἁγνίζειν**, of *moral* purification, as in ref.) **your souls** (the **ψυχαί**, as the centres of personality, though here described as purified *by the persons* themselves, yet are not so except by a process in which the whole person is employed: the habit of obedience) **in** (the course of: the region, in which the purification takes place) **your obedience of** ('*to*,' so that **τῆς ἀλ.** is gen. objective. It might be, obedience brought about by the truth, gen. subjective: but not so simply. 'The truth' is that of the Gospel of Christ in its largest sense, not merely as Calv., "regula, quam nobis Dominus in evangelio præscribit:" and *ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀληθείας* nearly = *ὑπ. (τῆς) πίστεως*, Rom. i. 5 and elsewhere. Compare St. Peter's own saying, Acts xv. 9, *τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*) **the truth** (see above), **unto** ('*with a view to*,' '*in the direction of*,' it might be with or without intention: the legitimate tendency of that purification, which ought to have been going on in your souls, was toward) **unfeigned** (reff.) **brotherly love** (love of Christians towards one another: see reff.), **love one another from the heart earnestly** (**καρδία** is the seat of the affections: let the love come straight and pure from thence, not short of it, from any secondary purpose as its origin. **ἐκτενῶς** is proscribed by Phrynichus, p. 311, where see Lobeck's note. But the adj. is not, as sometimes stated, a word of later Greek: we have *ἐκτενὴς φίλος* in Æsch. Suppl. 990. '*Intente*' exactly gives the sense: with the energies on the stretch):

23.] *Ground of the exhortation*, carried up further than the act of *ἡγνικέναι* above, to the state of the new life of which that was an act; even to the beginning of that new life in their regeneration by the divine word. And the begetting cause of this new birth being God's living and imperishable word, from that fact come in new considerations, enforcing that pure love which belongs not to a transitory and shifting but to an eternal and abiding state. **Being born again, not of** (out of, as origin) **corruptible seed** (**σπορά**, not in its strict and proper sense, '*sowing*' (ref. 4 Kings), but in its looser one of *seed*. And the seed spoken of is not, as Huther, that of plants; but the *semen humanum*, as the sequel shews), **but incorruptible, by means of** (not *ἐκ* this time. The word of God is not the begetting principle itself, but only that by which the principle works: as it were the coccus or grain which is the involucrum and vehicle of the mysterious germinating power. We are not regenerated *ἐκ* but *διὰ λόγου*. But on the other hand, the word itself is no mere perishing vehicle; no mere sacramental symbol, lost in the using: but it lives by and with the divine principle of life which it conveys and expands, and abides for ever. The **ἐκ** of origination rests in God Himself, the Father, who begat us of his own will: the **διά** of instrumentality moves on and abides for ever) **the** (the definite art. is necessary in English, for the very reason for which it is omitted in Greek: viz. to prevent the **λόγου** from becoming concrete, and keep it to its widest general and abstract reference) **word of God, living and abiding** (**ζῶντος** is thrown forward, as an emphatic predicate, before *θεοῦ*. That the two participles belong to *λόγου*, not to *θεοῦ*, is decisively shewn by the sequel, where the abiding nature, not of God, but of the word of God, is set forth. Many, however, have taken them with *θεοῦ*; so vulg. ("per verbum Dei vivi"), (not Œc. as commonly cited, for he says, *on this verse*, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα δὲ μένειν αὐτὸ διαβεβαιοῦται*), Beza (who however prints "per verbum Dei vivum et permanentis,"

d Matt. xxiv. 22. John xvii. 2 al. Isa. xl. 6.
e James i. 10, 11 (reff.).
f = Rom. x. 8. Heb. vi. 5 reff.
g Heb. vii. 24 reff.
h pass., = ch. iv. 6. Luke xvi. 16. Gal. i. 11 only‡. (Heb. iv. 2 al.)

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

[d] πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς [e] χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς [e] ἄνθος [e] χόρτου· [e] ἐξηράνθη ὁ [e] χόρτος, καὶ τὸ [e] ἄνθος [αὐτοῦ] [e] ἐξέπεσεν· [25] τὸ δὲ [f] ῥῆμα κυρίου [g] μένει [g] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ [f] ῥῆμα τὸ [hi] εὐαγγελισθὲν [i] εἰς ὑμᾶς. II. [1] [k] Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν [k] κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ [l] ὑποκρίσεις καὶ [m] φθόνους καὶ πάσας [n] καταλαλιάς,

i 2 Cor. x. 16. see 1 Thess. ii. 9. Heb. ii. 3. k = James i. 21 (reff.). l Matt. xxiii. 28. Mark xii. 15. Luke xii. 1. Gal. ii. 13. 1 Tim. iv. 2 only †. 2 Macc. vi. 25 only. m Matt. xxvii. 18 ‖ Mk. Rom. i. 29. Gal. v. 21. Phil. i. 15. 1 Tim. vi. 4. Tit. iii. 3. James iv. 5 only †. Wisd. vi. 23 (25). 1 Macc. vii. 16 only. n 2 Cor. xii. 20 only †. Wisd. i. 11 only. (-λεῖν, ver. 12.)

24. om 1st *ως* Aℵ[3] [*ωσει* ℵ[1]] a 13. 36 am[1](with harl) syrr [æth] (Orig$_1$) Thl Zeno. ins *η* bef *δοξα* ℵ[1]. rec (for *αυτης*) *ανθρωπου*, with [KLP] rel Chr$_2$ Œc: *αυτου* ℵ[1]: txt ABCℵ[3] a 13. 36 vulg syrr copt æth Orig$_1$ Did$_1$ Zeno Bede. om *αυτου* ABℵ a c 13 am[and fuld] syrr arm Orig$_1$ Did$_1$ Œc Bede$_1$: ins CKL[P] rel [vulg] (and demid harl tol) copt æth.

25. om *το ρημα το* A.

Chap. II. 1. *υποκρισιν* B Syr copt Aug [Clem$_1$ Orig-int$_1$ Gild], *-σεις* or *-σειν* ℵ[3]. *φονους* B. *πασαν καταλαλιαν* ℵ[1] [copt]: om *πασας* A Syr æth Clem$_1$ [Orig-int] Aug Gild.

sic), Calv. (altern., preferring this), Aretius, Grot. (expressly, alleging for it Dan. vi. 26, Theod., ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν θεὸς ζῶν καὶ μένων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας), al.).

24.] **Because** (Scripture proof that the word of God lives and abides. "Locum Jes. xl. 6 f. citat ad probationem utriusque membri, hoc est ut constet, quam fluxa et misera sit prima hominis nativitas, et quanta regenerationis gratia." Calv.) **all flesh** (= man in his life of σῶμα and ψυχή only: "homo ex vetere generatione," as Bengel) **is as** (ὡς is neither in Heb. nor in LXX) **grass, and all glory of it** ("quicquid ex carne veluti flos ex gramine suo efflorescit," Wies.) **as flower of grass. The grass was dried up** (the aor.; the fact being related as in a tale; so in James i. 11. In more idiomatic English, we should say "*hath dried up*"), **and the flower (thereof) fell** (*is fallen*, see above) **away**:

25.] **but the word** (the change from λόγος to ῥῆμα may be on account of the citation. Yet it is not easy to see why it would have been more difficult to change ῥῆμα to λόγος than τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν to κυρίου. ῥῆμα is rather the word uttered, the '*dictum*:' λόγος, the word, uttered or unuttered, single or manifold, concrete or abstract) **of the Lord** (LXX, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν: changed here probably on account of the application which follows, as De W.) **remaineth for ever. And** (the δέ applies what has gone before: the contrast being between the general truth and the particular identification) **this** (*predicate*, logically considered, *not subject*, as Wies., al.: "The word which was &c. is this very ῥῆμα here spoken of") **is the word which was** (Angl. has been) **preached to you** (in the declaration of the gospel. **εἰς ὑμᾶς**, not merely the dative commodi ὑμῖν, but as addressed to you and diffused among you: see reff. The logical inference to be drawn is, 'and consequently the word preached to you is imperishable and eternal, and demands of you that you earnestly and intently follow up that new life which by it has been implanted in you.' Hence the connexion of ch. ii. 1—3).

Chap. II. 1—10.] *Exhortations to nourish and perfect this new life, under the image, a. of newborn babes* (1—3), *β. of God's spiritual temple and priesthood* (4—10). **1.**] **Laying aside** (aor., 'once for all:' 'having laid aside') **therefore** (on the connexion, see above, ch. i. ult.) **all** (manner of) **malice** (κακία here *proper*; "nocendi cupiditas," as Hemming (in Huther): not as Aretius, ib., the genus, of which the following are species. This cannot be well, on account of πάντα δόλον below, which shews that clause to be parallel, not subordinate, to this) **and all guile** (cf. ver. 22; ch. iii. 10: John i. 48; and ἄδολον below) **and hypocrisies** (closely connected with δόλους, and therefore not requiring πάσας, which is supplied from πάντα preceding. **δόλος** is the abiding disposition, ὑποκρίσεις are the acts of personation and deception which are some of its manifestations) **and envies** (again embraced under δόλον, but not perhaps so closely connected with it. The guileless disposition knows not envy), **and all slanderings** (ref. 2 Cor. The verb, but not the subst., is found in classical Greek. Aug., cited by Gerhard, says, "Malitia malo delectatur alieno: invidia bono cruciatur alieno: dolus duplicat cor: adulatio duplicat linguam: detrectatio vulnerat famam"), **2.**] **as newborn**

[2] ὡς [o] ἀρτιγέννητα [p] βρέφη τὸ [q] λογικὸν [r] ἄδολον [s] γάλα [t] ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα [u] ἐν αὐτῷ [v] αὐξηθῆτε [w] εἰς σωτηρίαν, [3] [x] εἴπερ [y] ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι [z] χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος. [4] πρὸς ὃν [a] προσερχόμενοι λίθον [b] ζῶντα, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν

o here only †. Lucian, in Wetst. p Luke i. 41, 44 al[3]. Acts vii. 19. 2 Tim. iii. 15 only †. Sir. xix. 11. 1 Macc. i. 61. 2 Macc. vi. 10 only. q Rom. xii. 1 only †. Eus. H. E. i. 1. r here only †. (-ως, Wisd. vii. 13.) s 1 Cor. iii. 2. ix. 7. Heb. v. 12, 13 only. Gen. xviii. 8. t & constr., 2 Cor. ix. 14. Phil. i. 8. ii. 26. (Rom. i. 11. 2 Cor. v. 2. 1 Thess. iii. 6. 2 Tim. i. 4. James iv. 5.) Ps. cxviii. 173. u = ch. i. 22 al. fr. v transit., 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7. 2 Cor. ix. 10. Gen. xvii. 20. pass. (mid.) 2 Cor. x. 15. Col. i. 6, 10. Exod. i. 7. w so Eph. ii. 21. iv. 15. x Rom. viii. 9. 1 Cor. xv. 15. 2 Thess. i. 6. y constr. (w. ὅτι), here only. Psa. xxxiii. 8. Prov. xxxi. 18. (Heb. ii. 9 reff.) z = l. c. Matt. xi. 30. Luke (v. 39) vi. 35. Rom. ii. 4. (1 Cor. xv. 33.) Eph. iv. 32 only. a = Heb. iv. 16 (note). constr., here only. 1 Kings xiv. 36 al. b = ch. i. 3 reff. Psa. cxvii. 22. Matt. xxi. 42.

2. *αρτιγεννητα* A [Cyr$_2$]. ins *και* bef *αδολον* a d g 13 am(with tol) syrr arm Orig[-int$_1$(om$_5$) Cyr$_1$] Aug. rec om *εις σωτηριαν*, with L c d f k l Thl-comm Œc: ins ABCK[P]ℵ rel [syrr copt æth arm] Clem$_1$ Cyr[-p] [Orig-int] Aug Ruf.
3. for *ειπερ*, *ει* ABℵ[1] Syr Clem$_1$: *ειsπερ* (sic) 13. for *χρηστος*, *χριστος* or *χs* KL d f m 13 Clem$_1$.
4. for *υπο*, *απο* C: *υπ'* B.

babes (so the Rabbis, of their neophytes: see Wetst. h. l.), **long after** (ἐπι- gives, not intensity, but direction) **the** (the art. confines the reference to the gospel alone) **spiritual** (I thus render λογικόν, for want of a better and more distinctive word. Its sense is as in ref. Rom., to distinguish the γάλα spoken of from mere σαρκικὸν γάλα, and to shew that it is spoken figuratively and spiritually: "Lac illud animi, non corporis, lac mente hauriendum." Our English is too poor in psychological distinctions to be able to express it by any appropriate adjective: "*reasonable*" (vulg.) is decidedly wrong, as E. V. in Rom.; and "*of the word*," as E. V., here after Beza, is just as bad) **guileless** (not 'unadulterated,' in contrast to less pure human teachings (cf. δολοῦν τὸν λόγον, 2 Cor. iv. 2): but, in contrast to δόλος above, 'that is without guile,' has no by-ends, no one purpose but to nourish and benefit the soul) **milk** (not here in contrast, as in 1 Cor. iii. 2 and Heb. v. 12, 13, to strong meat: but simply in reference to its nourishing qualities), **that on it** (as τεθραμμένος ἐν, 'fed on,' see Winer, § 48. *a* (3). d, note [3, p. 485, Moulton's edn.]) **ye may grow** (properly passive: be nourished up) **unto salvation** (the growth is the measure of the fulness of that—not only rescue from destruction, but—positive blessedness, which is implied in σωτηρία; see on the word above, ch. i. 5): **3.**] **if, that is** (wenn anders of the German. The περ conditions the εἰ, see reff. and notes there: and Æsch. Ag. 28, εἴπερ Ἰλίου πόλις ἑάλωκεν, ὡς ὁ φρυκτὸς ἀγγέλλων πρέπει [if so be expresses the same, viz. that the necessary condition of the above exhortation is assumed as having place in the readers]), **ye tasted** (have tasted. The infant once put to the breast desires it again: the Apostle appeals to this their first taste as an incentive to subsequent ones) **that** (the formula, from the well-known and beautiful Ps. xxxiv.) **the Lord** ("quod subjicitur: ad quem accedentes, non simpliciter ad Deum refertur, sed ipsum designat qualis patefactus est in persona Christi." Calv.) **is good** (reff. Perhaps the simplest meaning of χρηστός, as applied to meats and drinks, is here intended: as vulg., "*dulcis*:" see Palm and Rost, χρηστός, 1. a). **4, 5.**] *Exhortation to come to Christ the chosen stone, and be built up into a spiritual temple unto God.*

4.] **To whom** (i. e. τὸν κύριον) **approaching** (pres., representing the daily habit of the Christian life, not something to be done once for all. προσέρχεσθαι is elsewhere in the N. T. always with a dat. Its signification here is, the approach made by faith, when the Christian closely realizes the presence and seeks the communion of his Lord), **a** (or, "*the*:" the omission of the art. seems to be very frequent in this Epistle, where yet a definite reference is undeniable) **stone** ("Petrus a petra Christo sic denominatus metaphora petræ delectatur, ac suo exemplo docet omnes debere esse petros, h. e., vivos lapides supra Christum fide ædificatos." Gerhard, in Wies. The allusion is to Ps. cxviii. 22 and Isa. xxviii. 16. Obs. that no ὡς must be supplied before λίθον, as is done in E. V. al.: Christ *is* the stone: we do not come to Him *as* we come to a stone) **living** (ζῶντα points not only to the figure being realized in a higher department of being than its natural one, but also to the fact of the Lord being alive from the dead. It would be unnecessary, were not the idea broached by Steiger, to protest against any allusion being intended to "*saxum vivum*" (Æn. i. 171: Ov. Met. xiv. 714) as distinguished from broken stones), **by men indeed rejected** (in Ps. l. c. ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες), **but in the sight**

[c] ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον [d] παρὰ δὲ θεῷ [e] ἐκλεκτόν, [e] ἔντιμον, 5 καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι [f] ζῶντες [g] οἰκοδομεῖσθε [h] οἶκος [i] πνευματικός, [k] εἰς [l] ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, [m] ἀνενέγκαι [i] πνευματικὰς θυσίας [n] εὐπροσδέκτους θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

c here bis. Matt. xxi. 42 ‖, from Psa. cxvii. 22. Luke ix. 22 ‖ Mk. xvii. 25. Heb. xii. 17 only. Jer. vi. 30.
d = James i. 17 reff. e see ver. 6. f = Rom. vi. 11. 2 Cor. vi. 9. Gal. ii. 19. g Matt. &c., as above, from l. c. = 1 Thess. v. 11. see 1 Cor. iii. 9. Eph. ii. 21 al. h see Heb. iii. 6 reff. i = 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. Eph. i. 3. [v. 19.] Col. i. 9. iii. 16. k = 1 Thess. v. 11. Eph. ii 22. l ver. 9 only. Exod. xix. 6 only. (see Luke i. 8, 9.) m = Heb. vii. 27 reff. n Rom. xv. 16, 31. 2 Cor. vi. 2. viii. 12 only †.

5. for λιθοι ζωντες, λιθος οντες ℵ[1]. εποικοδομεισθε A[2]Cℵ b d o 36 vulg Cyr[-p_4] $Procop_1$ Bede. for πνευματικος, πνευματος ℵ[1]. rec om εις, with KL[P] rel vulg syr Clem $Orig_1$ Thl Œc Bede: ins ABCℵ 36 tol copt æth arm $Orig_2$[-int_1] Eus_1 $Procop_1$ Hil_1 [Ambr]. ανενεγκας ℵ[1] [ενεγκαι 13]. om πνευματικας ℵ [Syr-ms]. rec ins τω bef θεω, with KL[P]ℵ[3] rel $Clem_1$ $Orig_1$ Thl Œc: om ABCℵ[1] arm. (13 def.)

of God (with God. "Deo judice, coram Deo") **chosen** (not merely "eximius," but selected, chosen out), **had in honour** (see below on ver. 6), **5.] be ye also as living** (see above) **stones built up** (it is disputed whether **οἰκοδομεῖσθε** is indicative or imperative. Much is to be said both ways. Wiesinger, who is the ablest recent advocate for the indicative, maintains that the passage is epexegetical of the preceding *ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε*, shewing how love to the word, seeking in the word the Lord Himself and His goodness, of itself leads to the completion set forth in ver. 5. But I cannot help feeling that this view of epexegesis of *ἵνα ἐν αὐτ. αὐξ.* is much weakened by the fact that *πρὸς ὃν* must be referred to *κύριος*, which is already separated from *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* by *εἴπερ ἐγεύσασθε κ.τ.λ.* And other weightier reasons are behind. On the indicative view, the pres. part. *προσερχόμενοι* could hardly have been used, but it would surely have been *προσελθόντες*. This is felt by Luther, who renders it zu welchem ihr gekommen seyd. Again, the connexion with the foregoing by a participle, proceeding on to an imperative, exactly corresponds to the former hortatory sentences, ch. i. 13, 14, 22, and ver. 1. Finally, the long procession of mere predications, on this view, would be tame and almost tautological, in comparison with the powerful gathering up with the *οὖν*, ver. 7, of the high and holy state on which the preceding exhortation depends, as contrasted with that of the unbelieving. I therefore decide for the imperative, against Syr. (Etheridge: "you also as living stones are builded"), Estius, Grot., Beng., al., and Wiesinger, and with Œc., Syr. (as commonly quoted), Beza, Aret., Benson, Steiger, De Wette, Huther) **a spiritual house** (**οἶκος** = *ναός*, 1 Cor. iii. 16: Eph. ii. 21: as before, the stones are called *living*, and the house *spiritual*, not merely to signify that they are not dead stones, and the house not a material one, but on account of the life which Christians derive from Christ, the living Stone, and of the service which they render in virtue of being a body dwelt in by the Holy Spirit) **for** (see var. readd.) **an holy priesthood** (abstract, office of priesthood, including in itself the individual priests: see ref. Exod. Being God's spiritual temple, they form an holy priesthood to Him, approaching and serving before Him in virtue of that Living and Holy One, whose mystic Body they are, and in whom the Father is well pleased. And they need no other by whom to approach God: being all priests, they require not, nor admit of, any distinct body of men among themselves specially called priests, nearer to God than themselves. No where is this more clearly declared by inference, than here) **to offer up** (**ἀναφέρειν**, not occurring in St. Paul, nor in the classics, but (reff.) in Heb. and St. James, is the regular LXX word for offering up sacrifice. The aor. is here used, because no habitual offering, as in rite or festival, is meant, but the one, once-for-all, devotion of the body, as in Rom. xii. 1, to God as His. On the infin. of the purpose, see Winer, § 44. 1) **spiritual sacrifices** (cf. especially Heb. xiii. 15, 16. Spiritual, because as the temple, as the priests, as the God, so the offering. It is this, rather than any distinction from the O. T. sacrifices, that is pointed at in **πνευματικάς**) **acceptable** (reff.) **to God through Jesus Christ** (these last words may be joined, either, 1. with *εὐπροσδέκτους*, or, 2. with *ἀνενέγκαι*. This latter has for it the analogy of Heb. xiii. 15, *δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν κ.τ.λ.*, and is preferred by Grot., Aret., De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger: and I think reasonably. The introduction of **διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ** as a mere appendage of *εὐπροσδέκτους* would not satisfy the weighty character of the words, nay would seem to put them in the wrong place, seeing that not merely the acceptability, but the very existence, and possibility of offering, of those sacrifices depends on the mediation of the great High Priest).

6 [o] διότι [p] περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ [q] Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον [r] ἀκρογωνιαῖον, [s] ἐκλεκτόν, [t] ἔντιμον, καὶ ὁ [u] πιστεύων [u] ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ [v] καταισχυνθῇ. 7 [w] ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ [x] τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· [y] ἀπειθοῦσιν δέ, [z] λίθος ὃν [a] ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη [b] εἰς [c] κεφαλὴν [d] γωνίας, καὶ [e] λίθος [f] προσκόμματος καὶ [g] πέτρα [gh] σκανδάλου, 8 οἳ

o = ch. i. 16, 24. p = Acts xxiii. 25 (Luke v. 9) only‡. 1 Macc. xv. 2 al. see ref. to Jos. in note. q Isa. xxviii. 16. r Eph. ii. 20 only. l. c. only. s ver. 4. (Matt. xx. 16 al. fr.) = Luke xxiii. 35. l. c. t ver. 4. Luke vii. 2. xiv. 8. Phil. ii. 29 only. l. c. 1 Kings xxvi. 21. u Luke xxiv. 25. Rom. ix. 33 & x. 11 (from l. c. Aℵ). 1 Tim. i. 16. v = Rom. as above, and v. 5. 1 Cor. i. 27 al. w dat. commodi, 2 Cor. v. 13. Rom. xiv. 6 al. Winer, § 31. 4. *b*. x = John iv. 44. Rom. ii. 7. Col. ii. 23 al. y = Acts xiv. 2. Rom. x. 21 (from Isa. lxv. 2). xi. 30. ver. 8. ch. iii. 1, 20. iv. 17. Deut. i. 26. z Psa. cxvii. 22. a ver. 4 reff. b Matt. xix. 5. xxi. 42 ‖ (from l. c.) al. c = Matt. xxi. 42 ‖, and Acts iv. 11 (from l. c.) only. d as above (c). Matt. vi. 5. Acts xxvi. 26. Rev. vii. 1. xx. 8 only. e Isa. viii. 14. Rom. ix. 32, 33. f Rom. as above, & xiv. 13, 20. 1 Cor. viii. 9 only. Isa. xxix. 21. g Rom. ix. 33 from l. c. only. h = Matt. xviii. 7 al. Ps. cv. 31.

6. rec (for *διοτι*) *διο και*, with (13?) Œc: *διο* b 19. 68: txt ABCKL[P]ℵ rel vulg syrr copt Thl Aug Bede. (13 illegible?) rec ins *τη* bef *γραφη*, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: *ἡ* (for *εν*) C [a d h] vulg lat-ff: txt ABℵ k 13. *εκλεκτον* bef *ακρογων*. B m [(Syr) copt arm Cyr$_1$]. *αυτον* ℵ[1] [d].

7. *ημιν* ℵ[1], but *υ* is written over appy by origl scribe. for *απειθουσιν*, *απιστουσιν* BCℵ a. (13 def.) rec *λιθον* [1st] (*to conform to* LXX *and Matt, where there is no var read*), with C[2](appy) KL[P]ℵ[1] rel Thl: txt AB C[1](appy) ℵ[3] c Œc. (13 def.) *πετραν* ℵ.

8. for *οι*, *οσοι* C[1] a m 36. (13 def.) aft *οι* ins *και* ℵ[3].

6.] *The exhortation* of the previous verses is *substantiated* in its form and its assertions *by O. T. prophecy*. **Because** (q. d. the aforesaid is so, on the ground of Scripture) **it is contained** (reff.: and for the impersonal sense, Jos. Antt. xi. 4. 7, *καθὼς ἐν αὐτῇ* (*τῇ ἐπιστολῇ*) *περιέχει*. Hence *περιοχή*, the contents or argument of a book or portion of a book, in later Greek) **in Scripture** (**γραφῇ**, in its technical sense, anarthrous: not so found in the Gospels, but Rom. i. 2; xvi. 26: 2 Pet. i. 20), **Behold, I place in Zion a chief corner-stone, chosen, had in honour** (the citation is a free one: *τίθημι ἐν Σιών* representing *ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών*, —the epithet *πολυτελῆ* being omitted, and *ἐκλεκτόν* and *ἀκρογωνιαῖον* transposed): **and he that believeth on Him** (or, '*it*:' *ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ* is not in the LXX-B., but is found in Aℵ) **shall not be ashamed** (it is remarkable, that St. Paul in citing the same prophecy, Rom. ix. 33, has in common with St. Peter the two divergences from the LXX, the *τίθημι ἐν Σιών*, and the insertion (?) of *ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ*. On *ἀκρογωνιαῖον*, see ref. Eph. note. Here, whatever may be the case there, can hardly be any idea of the 'lapis summangularis' joining the two walls, Jewish and Gentile, together, as some (e. g. Œc.) have thought). 7, 8.] *Appropriation of the honour* implied in the last clause *to believers*: and per contra, *to unbelievers*, of *another and opposite effect of the exaltation of this corner-stone*. 7.] **To you** (dat. commodi) **then** (inference from the *ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.*) **is the honour** (the **τιμή** belonging to the Stone itself (*ἔντιμον* above), with which you are united in the building: the honour implied in the *οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ* said of those who believe on Him. There can be, I think, no doubt that these two commonly divergent accounts given of the word *τιμή* ought to be combined in one. That the result of the *οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ* is what the Apostle means to state, is evident by the *οὖν* and *τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*: that the form in which this is stated is *ὑμῖν ἡ τιμή*, is evidently owing to the occurrence of *ἔντιμον* above. It is as plainly altogether beside the purpose, with Erasm., Luth., Calv., Aret., Bengel, al., to understand 'Christ,' or 'the Stone,' as the subject, and render as E. V., "He is precious," making *ἡ τιμή* predicate instead of subject) **who believe**: **but to the disobedient** (not, the *unbelieving*: see Heb. iii. 18, note. Unbelief is the *root* of *ἀπείθεια*: but it is the manner of Scripture, to follow it out into disobedience, its invariable effect, when spoken of in contrast to *πίστις*. The dat. is not one of reference, but incommodi. Then what follows is in the form of another quotation, or rather combination of quotations: the first from Ps. cxviii. 22), **the stone which the builders rejected, this has become for a** (has been made into a) **head corner-stone** (this is true with regard to believers also: but to them it is grace and glory, to these it is terror and destruction), **and a stone of stumbling and rock of offence** (second quotation from Isa. viii. 14. Here again, St. Paul in Rom. ix. 33 has taken the

[l] προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ [y] ἀπειθοῦντες, [k] εἰς ὃ καὶ [k] ἐτέθησαν. 9 ὑμεῖς δὲ [l] γένος [lm] ἐκλεκτόν, [no] βασίλειον [np] ἱεράτευμα, [q] ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς [r] περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς [s] ἀρετὰς [t] ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ [u] ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς [v] καλέσαντος

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

l Matt. iv. 6 || L. (from Ps. xc. 12). vii. 27. John xi. 9, 10. Rom. ix. 32. xiv. 21 only. Prov. iii. 23.
k Acts xiii. 47, from Isa. xlix. 6 Aℵ. 1 Thess. v. 9. 1 Tim. i. 12.
l Isa. xliii. 20. m ch. i. 6 reff. n Exod. xix. 6.
o = here (Luke vii. 25) only. p ver. 5 only. l. c. only. see note. q of the Jews, Luke vii. 5. xxiii. 2. John xi. 48—52. xviii. 35 al. r Eph. i. 14. 1 Thess. v. 9. 2 Thess. ii. 14. Heb. x. 39 only. 2 Chron. xiv. 13. Mal. iii. 17 only. (Isa. xliii. 21.) s = 2 Pet. i. 3 (5 bis. Phil. iv. 8) only. Isa. xliii. 21. xlii. 8, 12. lxiii. 7. t here only. = Ps. ix. 14. — διαγγ., Isa. xlii. 12. διηγεῖσθαι, xliii. 21.)
u so Psa. cvi. 14. v 1 Cor. i. 9. Col. iii. 15. 2 Thess. ii. 14. 1 Tim. vi. 12. ver. 21. ch. v. 10.

απιστουντες B [vulg].

same words, differing from the LXX, but agreeing with the Hebrew. This stumbling is not mere mental offence, which, e. g. they take at the preaching of the Cross; but the "stumbling upon the dark mountains" of Jer. xiii. 16, see Prov. iv. 19: Dan. xi. 19: the eternal disgrace and ruin which forms the contrast to τιμή above. Cf. on πέτρα σκανδάλου Matt. xvi. 23, note [the very expression carries a reminiscence of Peter's own days of unbelief, when he was an offence,—he, Πέτρος,—to his Lord]), **8.] who stumble, being disobedient to the word** (τῷ λόγῳ belongs to ἀπειθοῦντες, not as E. V. after vulg., Erasm., Luth., Beza, Estius, al., to προσκόπτουσιν, which is doubly objectionable, in, 1. making ἀπειθοῦντες a mere tautology from ἀπειθοῦσιν before: 2. giving a place not prominent enough to τῷ λόγῳ, whereas on the other rendering it takes its proper place, as being the means of growth to the Christian, and rejected by the disobedient: 3. confining the sense of 'stumbling' (see above) to a mere subjective one: 4. opposing the analogy of ch. iii. 1 and iv. 17. Cf. Wolf, in loc.: "*Qui impingunt*, nempe, in lapidem illum angularem, verbo non credentes (obedientes?): quo ipso et offensio ipsa et ejus causa indicatur"), **for which** (thing, fact, viz. the προσκόπτειν, τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦσιν, their whole moral course of delinquency and the πρόσκομμα at the end of it) **they were also** (καί, besides that they reach it, there is another consideration) **appointed** (set where they are, or were; viz. by Him who τίθησιν, above, the stone of stumbling. This exposition is certain, notwithstanding the protests of Œc., Did., al. Nor can I see how Bengel can escape, with his διττολογία, "*Positi sunt* respondet τῷ *pono* ver. 6; sed cum differentia. Nam Deus Christum et electos active dicitur *ponere*; infideles dicuntur *poni*, passive." What inference would he deduce from this? Would he take themselves as the agents, as Œc., Did., "Ad non credendum a semetipsis sunt positi," thus passing over καί, and making the clause a vapid tautology? Or would he say with Aretius, "Non Deus certe, sed Satan tales posuit," thus making in the world's moral arrangement, Satan a coordinate power with God?). **9, 10.]** *Contrast*, in a glorious *description of the office, privilege, and function, of the enlightened and adopted people of God*.

9.] But ye (emphatic) **are a chosen generation** (not, as De Wette, "*the* chosen generation;" though this is implied, it is not in the words, nor does it correspond with the indefinite predicates which follow. On the expression, cf. ref. Isa., τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν. γένος betokens a common origin and unity of related life: but perhaps Wiesinger goes too far in pressing the idea here), **a kingly priesthood** (ἱεράτευμα as above, see note. The expression is from the LXX of Exod. xix. 6. Cf. Rev. i. 6, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ, and v. 10. In the N. T. church these two elements, the kingship and the priesthood, are united in every individual believer, as in our great Head, Jesus Christ, who alone unites them in the O. T. church; the two coexisting, but never, except in the case of Melchisedek His foretype, united in the same Person), **an holy nation** (also from Exod. xix. 6, LXX; God's declaration at Sinai respecting Israel), **a people for acquisition** (i. e. peculiarly God's own, as interpreted by what follows in the place of Isaiah referred to, as well as here. There it stands, λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετάς μου διηγεῖσθαι. See, on the word, ref. 1 Thess. note. In the place of Exodus which was before quoted, ch. xix. 5, we read ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν. See also Deut. vii. 6. Œc. says, περιποίησιν ἡμᾶς καλεῖ διὰ τὸ περιποιήσασθαι ἡμᾶς τὸν θεόν, as in Acts xx. 28, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου), **that ye may tell out** (ἐξαγγ. not = ἀναγγ. The prep. gives the sense of publishing *forth*) **the virtues** (i. e. gracious dealings, excellent and glorious attributes: see Isa. above, and in reff. Philo repeatedly uses ἀρεταί in this sense: e. g. De Mut. Nom. § 34, vol. i. p. 606, πολλὴ δὲ ἄγνοια νομίζειν τὰς θεοῦ ἀρετὰς τὰς ἀρρεπεῖς καὶ παγιωτάτας χω-

[v] εἰς τὸ [w] θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς· 10 οἵ [x] ποτὲ [y] οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ [z] λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ [a] ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ [a] ἐλεηθέντες.

11 [b] Ἀγαπητοί, [c] παρακαλῶ ὡς [de] παροίκους καὶ [ef] παρεπιδήμους [g] ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν [h] σαρκικῶν [i] ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵ-

w Matt. xxi. 42 ‖ Mk., from Ps. cxvii. 23. John ix. 30. Rev. xv. 1, 3 only. x = Philem. 11. ch. iii. 5 al. y Hosea ii. 23. (see Rom. x. 19, from Deut. xxxii. 21.) z Heb. iv. 9 reff. a l. c. A. pass., Matt. v. 7. Rom. xi. 30, 31. 1 Cor. vii. 25. 2 Cor. iv. 1. 1 Tim. i. 3, 16 only. b Heb. vi. 9 reff. c = Heb. xiii. 19 al. fr. d Acts vii. 6, 29. Eph. ii. 19 only. Gen. xv. 13. (-κεῖν, Heb. xi. 9 reff.) e Gen. xxiii. 4. f Heb. xi. 13 reff. g w. gen., Acts xv. 29. 1 Tim. iv. 3. Jer. vii. 14 compl. w. ἀπό, Acts xv. 30. 1 Thess. iv. 3. v. 22. h Rom. xv. 27. 1 Cor. iii. 3. ix. 11. 2 Cor. i. 12. x. 4 only. 2 Chron. xxxii. 8 compl. i = Rom. xiii. 14. Gal. v. 16. Eph. ii. 3. ch. i. 14. iv. 2, 3. 2 Pet. ii. 18. 1 John ii. 16.

11. απεχεσθε ACL[P] c[2] f h j[1] o syrr copt æth Did_1 Cyr_1 [$Cypr_1$] Zeno Leo. add απο C[1] 27 Did_1.

ῥῆσαι ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου δύνασθαι . . . . ἀκράτους μὲν γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρετάς: see other passages in Loesner) **of Him** (God: the Father) **who called you out of darkness** ("tenebræ ignorantiæ, errorum, peccatorum, miseriæ, adeoque totum diaboli regnum," Gerh.) **to** (not exactly "*into:*" **εἰς** with *καλέσαντος* gives more the aim of the call, than its local result: to, i. e. to attain unto and be partakers of: to walk in and by) **His wonderful light** (this expression here can hardly mean the light of our Christian life only; but must import that light of God's own Presence and Being, after which our walking in light is to be fashioned: the light to which St. John alludes, when he says, *ἐὰν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν, ὡς* **αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί.** Had not this been intended, surely neither **εἰς** nor **αὐτοῦ** would have been used. "It is wonderful," says De Wette, "just as to one coming out of long darkness the light of day would be wonderful." The figure of the corner-stone has not quite passed away from the Apostle's mind; in the end of the prophecy concerning which we read, Ps. cxvii. 23 (Matt. xxi. 42), *παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστιν* **θαυμαστὴ** *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν*): **10.**] **who** (contrast between their former and present states) **were once no people** (the Apostle is again citing, or rather clothing that which he has to write in, O. T. words. In Hosea ii. 23 A, we read *ἐλεήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠλεημένην, καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ οὐ λαῷ μου λαός μου εἶ σύ*), **but (are) now the people of God** (these words, as Wies. maintains, apply most properly to Gentile Christians, although spoken in the prophecy of Jews. St. Paul thus uses them, Rom. ix. 25; and it is not impossible that that passage may have been in St. Peter's mind), **who were unpitied** (of God: the **οὐκ** here and above, not merely negatives, but contraries: not "who had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy," as E. V., indicating a mere change of time in order of progress, but who were unpitied, objects of aversion and wrath), **but now compassionated** (the aor. part. has a fine and delicate force which cannot be given in a version: q. d. who were men who (have received no pity), but now men who (received pity), viz. when God called you by Christ).

11—IV. 6.] *Exhortations to walk christianly and worthily towards and among those without who speak and act in a hostile manner.* Hitherto we have seen them exhorted to walk worthily of their calling as distinguished from their own former walk: now the Apostle exhorts them to glorify God before an ungodly and persecuting world. **11. 12.**] Ver. 11, negative, exhorts to *abstinence from fleshly lusts:* ver. 12, positive, to *cause the unconverted Gentiles around, by their fair Christian walk, to glorify God.*

11.] **Beloved** (as this word is only found once again in this Epistle, ch. iv. 12, we may apply to it Wiesinger's remark, "The seldomer our Apostle uses this endearing term, the weightier it is where it does occur as the opening of a hortatory discourse"), **I exhort you as sojourners** (see ref. Eph. and note) **and strangers** (see on ch. i. 1. This primary and literal meaning of the word is probably the uppermost one here, seeing that the Apostle is speaking of behaviour among the Gentiles. Still, from the more general reference of this first exhortation, the other and wider reference, "quia filii Dei, ubicunque terrarum agant, mundi sunt hospites" (Calv.), must not be left out of sight. These words, **παροίκ. κ. παρεπιδ.**, belong, not to **παρακαλῶ**, as Huther, al., but to *ἀπέχεσθαι*. They form the ground why the readers should abstain, not why the Writer should exhort. In *νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν*, 2 Thess. iii. 15, we have the other case) **to abstain** (or, with the reading *-σθε*, **abstain**) **from the carnal lusts** (= *αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός*, reff. Eph. and 2 Pet.; *αἱ κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι*, Titus ii. 12. Here, it is, from the context, the walking and acting in the indulgence of these lusts which the Apostle is forbidding.

τινες [k] στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, [12] τὴν [l] ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν [m] ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα [n] ἐν ᾧ [o] καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς [p] κακοποιῶν, ἐκ τῶν [q] καλῶν [q] ἔργων [r] ἐποπτεύοντες [s] δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ [t] ἐπισκοπῆς. [13] [u] Ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ [v] ἀνθρωπίνῃ [w] κτίσει

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

k = here only. see James iv. 1 (also Luke iii. 14. 1 Cor. ix. 7. 2 Cor. x. 3. 1 Tim. i. 18. 2 Tim. ii. 4). Isa. xxix. 7. l ch. i. 15 reff. m = ver. 16. ch. iv. 8. Heb. vii. 24. Acts ii. 44. n = Rom. ii. 1. xiv. 22. o James iv. 11 (reff.). ch. iii. 16 only. p here bis. (John xviii. 30 rec.) ch. (iii. 16 rec.) iv. 15 only. Prov. xii. 4. xxiv. 19 only. (-ποιεῖν, ch. iii. 17.) q Heb. x. 24 reff. r ch. iii. 2 only †. Ps. ix. 34 (14) Symm. Demosth. 168. 13. Polyb. v. 69. 6 al. s = Matt. v. 16. ix. 8 al. t = Luke xix. 44 (Acts i. 20. 1 Tim. iii. 1) only. Job x. 12. Isa. x. 3. Jer. vi. 15. u Heb. xii. 9 reff. v Acts xvii. 25. Rom. vi. 19. 1 Cor. ii. 13. iv. 3. x. 13. James iii. 7 only. Num. v. 6. w see note & Mark xvi. 15. Col. i. 23 al.

12. for 1st *υμων*, *υμιν* ℵ. *εχοντες καλην* bef *εν τοις εθνεσιν* KL[P] rel [Syr copt] Clem$_1$ Œc Polyc-int Cypr$_2$: om *εχοντες* B : txt ACℵ (a) m [13] 36 [vulg æth Clem$_1$ Thl]. rec *εποπτευσαντες*, with AKL[P] rel [Clem$_1$] : txt BCℵ a j m 36 [vulg syrr] Thl Œc [Cypr$_2$]. *δοξασουτρεμουσιν* (*see 2 Pet* ii. 10) ℵ[1].

13. rec aft *υποταγ.* ins *ουν*, with KL[P] rel vulg[-ed] syr Thl Œc Bede : om ABCℵ m 13 [am(and fuld demid tol) coptt æth arm] Did$_1$ Cassiod$_1$. *κτισει* bef *ανθρωπ* C m syr coptt [Eus$_1$] Did$_1$: om *ανθρωπ.* ℵ[1].

See them enumerated in Gal. v. 19—21), **the which** (**αἵτινες**, not = *αἱ*, but gathers up into a class the *ἐπιθυμίαι* and asserts it of all of them that they &c.: thus rendering a reason, 'quippe quæ.' With *αἱ*, it might have been taken, "from *those* fleshly lusts, *which*" &c.) **war** (ref. James and Rom. vii. 23. "Non modo impediunt, sed oppugnant: grande verbum." Bengel) **against the soul** (*ψυχή*, the man's personal immortal part, as opposed to his body, his *μέλη* in which the *ἐπιθυμίαι στρατεύονται*, is held in suspension between influences from above and influences from beneath: drawn up and saved, or drawn down and ruined. And among its adversaries are these fleshly lusts, warring against it to its ruin): 12.] *Positive result of this abstinence*, and its important fruit: **having** (we have the same disjunction of the construction in Eph. iv. 1, 2, *παρακαλῶ . . ὑμᾶς . . . ἀνεχόμενοι*. It serves to give vividness to the description, taking the participle out from under the *παρακαλῶ*, and depicting, as it were, the condition recommended, as actually existing. It is so eminently, though not under exactly the same circumstances as to construction, in the beautiful procession of participles and adjectives in Rom. xii. 9—19) **your behaviour among the Gentiles comely** (as over against the *ματαία ἀναστροφή* of the Gentiles, ch. i. 18. Cf. ch. iii. 16), **that** (aim of the preceding) **in the matter in which** (so *ἐν ᾧ* in reff.: not, '*while*,' for that would not apply to *δοξάσωσιν* below: both could not be going on *together*: nor "*whereas*," E. V., "pro eo quod," Beza, for which sense of *ἐν ᾧ* there is no precedent. The sense is, 'that that conduct, which was to them an occasion of speaking against you as evil-doers, may by your good works become to them an occasion of glorifying God.' And '*that, in which*,' will be in fact your whole Christian life) **they speak against you as evil-doers** (often the Christians would be compelled to diverge from heathen customs and even to break human laws, and thus would incur the imputation of malefactors), **they may, on the ground of your good works, being spectators of them** (contrast to the ignorance assumed in the *ἀγνωσία τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων* below, ver. 15. On the word, see reff.: and cf. *ἐπόπτης*, an eye-witness, 2 Pet. i. 16), **glorify God in (the) day of visitation** (i. e., the day when God visits,—*ἐπισκέπτεται*, Luke i. 68, 78: Acts xv. 14,—mankind with His offers of mercy and grace: cf. also ref. Luke, where our Lord says of Jerusalem, *οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου*. The word has been variously understood: the Fathers generally (cf. Suicer in voc.), Lyra, Erasm., Beza, De Wette, al. explain it as above: Œc., Wolf, Bengel, al. think that the day of *inquisition before earthly magistrates* is meant (*ἡμέραν δὲ ἐπισκοπῆς τὴν κατὰ κόσμον ἐξέτασιν καλεῖ· ἐξετάσεως γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τοῦ βίου ἡμῶν γενομένης, εἶτα πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον τῆς ὑπολήψεως τῶν πραγμάτων εὑρισκομένων αὐτοί τε πρὸς οἷς αἰσχύνονται ἐπανορθοῦνται, καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάζεται*. Œc.). Bede, al. understand it of the day of judgment. But the former sense is far preferable on account of usage, and for its fitness in the context). 13—17.] *Exhortation to subjection to secular rule.*

13.] **Be subjected** (aor. pass. with a quasi-middle sense, given by the aorist coupled with the fact of the command: be in a condition of having been subjected: on the medial signification of aorists passive in N. T., see on ch. v. 6) **to every human institution** ("quod creat et condit homo,"

διὰ τὸν κύριον· εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς [x] ὑπερέχοντι [14] εἴτε [y] ἡγεμόσιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις εἰς [z] ἐκδίκησιν [p] κακοποιῶν, [a] ἔπαινον δὲ [b] ἀγαθοποιῶν. [15] ὅτι [c] οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ [d] θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, [e] ἀγαθοποιοῦντας [f] φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν [g] ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων [h] ἀγνωσίαν· [16] ὡς ἐλεύθεροι,

x = Rom. xiii. 1 (Phil. ii. 3. iii. 8. iv. 7) only. Gen. xli. 40.
y = Matt. x. 18. Mark xiii. 9 ‖ L. elsw. of Rom. govr., exc. Matt. ii. 6. Epp., here only. Gen. xxxvi. 15, &c.
z Heb. x. 30 reff.
a ch. i. 7 reff.
b here only †. Sir. xlii. 14 only, but in bad sense. (-ποιΐα, ch. iv. 19.)
c = Matt. i. 18.
d Rom. xii. 2. Heb. x. 36.
e = ver. 20. ch. iii. 6, 17. 3 John 11. (Num. x. 32 al.) Tobit xii. 13 B (not Aℵ).
f Matt. xxii. 12, 34. Mark i. 25 ‖ L. iv. 39. (1 Cor. viii. 9 v. r.) 1 Tim. v. 18 only. Deut. xxv. 4 only.
g Luke xi. 40. Rom. ii. 20 al. Ps. xciii. 8.
h 1 Cor. xv. 34 only. Job xxxv. 16. Wisd. xiii. 1 only.

14. rec aft εκδικησιν ins μεν, with C(appy) [P] rel syr-w-ast [Damasc$_1$] Thl Œc: om ABKLℵ d g k l m 13 vulg spec [Syr copt arm Antch$_1$].

15. αγαθοποιουντες C: -ποιειν 13. add υμας C b m o Thl [syrr]; και 13. φιμοιν ℵ[1].

Luth. Such, and not "*every human creature*," as Syr., Erasm., Estius, Pott, De Wette, is the meaning. The latter would stultify what follows: for it is not to the king as a man, but to the king as a human institution, that we are to be subject. And so Œc., κτίσιν ἀνθρωπίνην τὰς ἀρχὰς λέγει τὰς χειροτονητὰς ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων, ἢ καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς βασιλεῖς, καθότι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἐτάχθησαν ἤτοι ἐτέθησαν. It is no objection to this, that all powers are ordained of God: for that consideration does not come into notice in these words, but in those which follow, διὰ τ. κύριον. *Here,* it is the *lower side* of such institutions, the fact of their being ordained and upheld by men, that is brought into sight) **for the Lord's sake** (i. e. Christ's: **κύριος** with St. Peter, except in O.T. citations, is always our Lord. And here there is additional reason, for that He, the Head of all principality and power, is yet in us his members subject to them, until the day when all shall be put under His feet): **whether to king** (general,—but, from the nature of the case as regarded those to whom the Epistle is addressed, here the Roman Emperor) **as supereminent** ("qui ita imperat, ut ab aliis hominibus ipsi non imperetur," Gerh.), 14.] **or to governors** ("ἡγεμόνες præsides provinciarum, qui a Cæsare mittebantur in provincias," Gerh.) **as to men sent** (*in the habit of being sent,*—sent from time to time: the pres. part. describes the genus: the particular ἡγεμόνες would be described as πεμφθέντες) **through him** (*the king,* not κυρίου, as some, and Calvin very positively, "qui pronomen ad regem referunt multum falluntur." But there can be little doubt that he is wrong. For first the analogy of the clauses, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι . . . ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις, shews that the grounds of obedience in each case, all being alike διὰ κύριον, belong to the actually existing rights of power in that case. The king is supreme, in his own right: governors rule by delegation from the king, '*mittuntur*' δι' αὐτοῦ. Then, the right understanding of διὰ κύριον, as applying to all, forbids this view. For thus we should obey the king as ὑπερέχων, no mention of the Lord being made, whereas rulers are to be obeyed as sent by the Lord. Finally, the prep. **διά**, as distinguished from ὑπό, designates rather the subordinate than the original sender. A governor could surely not be said to be sent **διὰ** κυρίου) **for** (to bring about) **vengeance on** (as in ref.: **ἐκδίκησις**, being a 'vox media,' has another meaning, that of "avenging of," in Luke xviii. 7, 8. Œc., taking it in this latter meaning, gives a convenient limitation to the duty, which was the furthest possible from the mind of the Apostle: ἔδειξε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πέτρος τίσι καὶ ποίοις ἄρχουσιν ὑποτάσσεσθαι δεῖ, ὅτι τοῖς τὸ δίκαιον ἐκδικοῦσιν) **evil-doers, and praise of well-doers.** 15.] **For** (ground of ὑποτάγητε; correlative with, but not going so far as, the purpose announced in ver. 12) **so** (after this manner, in this direction and wise: viz. as follows, ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν κ.τ.λ.) **is** ('*se trouve,*' κεῖται) **the will** (thing willed, concrete result of the will) **of God, that doing good** (the anarthrous participle carries the reason with it: by doing good: "*with well-doing,*" E.V.) **ye** (necessarily understood) **put to silence the ignorance** ("Locutio quam usurpat, 'obstruere ignorantiam,' quamvis per novitatem dura sit, sensum tamen non obscurat." Calv. On the word **φιμόω**, see reff.; and Palm and Rost's Lex. **ἀγνωσία**, see the instructive parallel, ref. 1 Cor., is not simply ignorance of this or that fact, but a state of lack of knowledge or understanding, habitual ignorance. This state is here introduced as speaking, "having (as Wiesinger) ever its mouth open rather than its eyes," ready to cry out upon any mere appearance of things as misunderstood by it) **of the foolish men** (above

καὶ πάσχοντες [e] ὑπομενεῖτε, [v] τοῦτο γὰρ [w] χάρις παρὰ θεῷ. 21 [g] εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ [g] ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν [h] ὑπολιμπάνων [i] ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα [k] ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς [l] ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ, 22 ὃς [m] ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ [m] ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ [n] εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, 23 ὃς [o] λοιδορούμενος οὐκ [p] ἀντελοιδόρει, πασχων οὐκ [q] ἠπείλει,

ABCKL P ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

g ver. 9 reff. h here only †. i here only †. 2 Macc. ii. 28 only. Polyc. ad Phil. § 8, p. 1012. Clem. ad Cor. § 33, p. 275. k Mark xvi. 20. 1 Tim. v. 10, 24 only. Job xxxi. 7. l Rom. iv. 12. 2 Cor. xii. 18 only ‡. Sir. xxi. 6. m = John viii. 34. 2 Cor. xi. 7. James v. 15. 1 John iii. 4, 8, 9 only. 3 Kings xvi. 19. (Isa. liii. 9.) n = Matt. i. 18. Luke xvii. 18. Acts viii. 40. Rom. vii. 10. Rev. xiv. 5. o pass., 1 Cor. iv. 12 only ‡. act., John ix. 28. Acts xxiii. 4. Deut. xxxiii. 8. (-ρία, ch. iii. 9. -ρος, 1 Cor. vi. 10.) p here only †. q Acts iv. 17 only. Gen. xxvii. 42. (-λή, Eph. vi. 9.)

om 2nd υπομεινετε C : υπομενετε m o vulg spec [Anton$_2$]. rec om 2nd γαρ, with BCKL[P]ℵ rel vulg spec [syrr coptt æth arm Damasc-ms]: ins A k 13 Thl Œc Tert$_1$. ins τω bef θεω A a c d h k m 36 Thl.

21. om και A vulg-mss syr [(sah)]. ins ο bef χριστος ℵ o. for επαθεν, απεθανεν ℵ [Syr arm Damasc$_1$ Ambr$_2$ Fulg Quæst]. for υπερ, περι A. Steph ημων ημιν, with d Syr copt [Damasc$_1$] Aug$_1$: ημων υμιν KL[P] a f h j l o 13. 36 [vulg-ed] fuld[1] Thl Tert$_1$ Cypr$_1$: txt ABCℵ rel am(with demid fuld[2] harl tol) syr sah æth [Damasc-ms] Œc Ambr.

23. for αντελοιδ., ελοιδορει ℵ[1] [*maledicebat* vulg Did-int$_1$].

but if well-doing and suffering (for it) (these last words are amply justified by the logical connexion of the participles, see above) **ye shall endure it (it is glory)** (with the reading **τοῦτο γάρ** below, it becomes necessary to supply, mentally at least, some such words): **for this is thankworthy** (see above) **with** (in the estimation of: see Luke ii. 52) **God.**

21.] **For** (proof that undeserved suffering is *χάρις παρὰ θεῷ*, by the instance of Christ's sufferings, which were our example) **to this** (state, viz. the endurance of wrongful sufferings) **ye were called: because** (ground of the assertion *εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε*) **Christ also** (the **καί** applies to the **ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**, the words **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** carrying with them the *ἀγαθοποιῶν*, as explained below, ver. 24) **suffered for you, leaving behind for you** (emphatic repetition from the former *ὑμῶν*. Tischendorf's reasoning, edn. 7, that *ἡμῶν, ὑμῖν* was probably the original reading, and has given rise to *ἡμῶν ἡμῖν* and *ὑμῶν ὑμῖν*, may be met by the above consideration in favour of the more ancient reading. [In edn. 8 Tischdf. reads as in text.] **ὑπολιμπάνω** is a late form of *ὑπολείπω*. Themist. Orat. x. p. 139 D, is the only place quoted for this sense: Dion. Hal. i. 23 uses the 2 aor. in an intransitive sense, of streams failing,—*τὰ δ' ὑπελίμπανε θέρους, τὰ δ' εἰς τέλος ἀπεσβέννυτο.* On the pres. part. here, Bengel remarks, "in abitu ad Patrem." It gives the abiding intent of the single fact **ἔπαθεν**: and might be rendered 'ut relinqueret') **a copy** (**ὑπογραμμός**, a pattern to write or paint by: technically, *ὑπογραμμοὶ παιδικοί* were formulæ given by writing-masters to their pupils, containing all the letters of the alphabet. Clem. Strom. v. 8. 50, p. 675 P., who gives examples of them) **that ye should follow upon** (**ἐπακολουθέω**, follow close upon, the **ἐπί** denoting close application to: it is a word commonly used of following behind another) **His footsteps** (so in reff.):

22.] *Further expansion of this example of Christ*, making it plain that He *ἀγαθοποιῶν καὶ πάσχων ὑπέμεινεν*:—**who never did** (the aor. gives the force, as distinguished from the imperf. *ἐποίει*, of "never in a single instance") **sin** (the words are almost a citation from Isa. liii. 9, A[ℵ[3a]], *ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ*) **nor yet** (climax: not only did He never sin in act, but not even . . .) **was guile ever found** ("non deprehendebatur fraudulenta locutus," Wiesinger: cf. Winer, § 65. 8, on this sense of *εὑρίσκομαι*) **in His mouth:**

23.] **who when reviled, reviled not again** (a proof of his *ὑπομονή*. Isa. liii. 7 is before the Apostle), **when suffering threatened not** (both these, imperfects, denoting constant habit. The order is again that of climax: from *λοιδορούμενος* to *πάσχων*, from *οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει* to *οὐκ ἠπείλει*): **but** (see on this particular use of **δέ** as a stronger contrast than **ἀλλά**, on Heb. ii. 6. It is nearly our 'yea, rather:' removing the thing previously negatived altogether out of our field of view, and substituting something totally different for it) **delivered (them)** (see below) **up** (what? Most Commentators supply *ἑαυτόν* [so E. V.], or 'causam suam,' both of which seem out of place and hardly justified by the usage of the verb. Rather would I supply an object out of the *λοιδορούμενος* and *πάσχων* foregoing, either, with Huther and Wiesinger,

[r] παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ [s] κρίνοντι [t] δικαίως, 24 ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς [u] ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ [v] ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς [w] ἁμαρτίαις [x] ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ [w] δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, [y] οὗ τῷ [z] μώλωπι [y] [αὐτοῦ] ἰάθητε· 25 ἦτε γὰρ ὡς [z] πρόβατα [z] πλανώμενοι, ἀλλ' [a] ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν [b] ποι-

r see Matt. v. 25. s ch. i. 17. t Luke xxiii. 41. 1 Cor. xv. 34. 1 Thess. ii. 10. Tit. ii. 12 only. Deut. i 16. Sir. xxxii. (xxxv.) 17 (22) BN[3a]. u = Heb. ix. 28 only. (see ver. 5.) Isa. liii. (11) 12. v = Acts v. 30. x. 39. Gal. iii. 3, from Deut. xxi. 23. w dat., Rom vi. 2, 11. Gal. ii. 19. x here only †. Herod. ii. 85. Thucyd. ii. 34. y constr., Matt. iii. 12. Acts xv. 17, from Amos ix. 12. Rev. iii. 8 al. z here only. Isa. liii. 5, 6. a = here only. (see John xii. 40.) Isa. xlv. 22. Joel ii. 12. b Heb. xiii. 20 reff.

for δε, τε C.
24. υμων B. om εν ℵ[1]. aft αμαρτιαις ins υμων A æth. συνζησωμεν C. om 2nd αυτου ABCK rel : ins L[P]ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving) b[2] f g h j k l Thl Œc.
25. om ητε γαρ B. rec πλανωμενα, with CKL[P] rel Thl Œc : txt ABℵ. αλλα B. επεστρεψατε C [a (c)] : επιστραφητε [P]ℵ.

"His reproaches and sufferings," or, which seems to me better, "those who inflicted them :" perhaps not without reference to "Father, forgive them : for they know not what they do") **to Him that judgeth** (pres., whose office it is to judge) **righteously** (i. e. the Father: designated in ref. as ὁ ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνων. Calv. says well, "Qui sibi ad expetendam vindictam indulgent, non judicis officium Deo concedunt, sed quodam modo facere volunt suum carnificem"). **24.] who Himself** (now the ἀγαθοποιῶν reaches its height. He was not only negatively innocent, ver. 22, but suffered in the pursuance of the noblest purpose of love, and that love *towards us:* by which fact His example is further brought home and endeared to us) **bore our sins** (but in the pregnant sense of "bore to sacrifice," "carried and offered up:" see notes on James ii. 21, Ἀβραὰμ . . . . ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ . . . ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον : see Levit. xiv. 20; Heb. vii. 27. It is a word belonging to *sacrifice*, and not to be dissociated from it. In Isa. .iii. 12, αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνένεγκεν, (Heb. ix. 28,) we have the sense of bearing on Himself more prominent: and by that passage our rendering here must be regulated: always remembering that the other sense lies behind) **in His (own)** (this is almost required by the repetition of αὐτοῦ after αὐτός, when it might have been well omitted, if no emphasis had been intended) **body on the tree** (constr. prægn., "took them to the tree and offered them up on it;" as the above sense of ἀνήνεγκεν necessitates. Cf. Vitringa in Huther: "Vix uno verbo ἔμφασις vocis ἀναφέρειν exprimi potest. Nota *ferre* et *offerre*. Primo dicere voluit Petrus, Christum portasse peccata nostra, in quantum illa ipsi erant imposita. Secundo, ita tulisse peccata nostra, ut ea secum obtulerit in altari. Respicit ad animantes, quibus peccata primo imponebantur, quique deinceps peccatis onusti offerebantur. Sed in quam aram ξύλον ait Petrus, lignum, h. e., crucem"); **tha** (purpose of that great and crowning suffering of the Lord) **having died** (not, as some Commentators, "having past away," being removed to a distance ("longefacti a peccatis," Grot.), but literally, "having died:" so Herod. ii. 85, 136, μηδ' ἄλλον μηδένα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἀπογενόμενον θάψαι : v. 4, vi. 58, and other examples in Raphel and Wetstein) **to our sins** (reff.), **we should live to righteousness** (the same contrast is found, but with another image, of being freed from, and become servants to, in Rom. vi. 18. In ib. ver. 11, where the same figure of death and life is used, it is νεκροὺς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ), **by whose stripe ye were healed** (μώλωψ, the weal left by a stripe. From Isa. liii. 5, τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. "Paradoxon apostolicum : vibice sanati estis. Est autem μώλωψ, vibex, frequens in corpore servili, Sir. xxiii. 10." Bengel).

25.] For (justification of the last assertion by another allusion to Isa. liii.) **ye were straying like sheep** (so in ref. Isa., πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν): **but ye have returned** (not, "have been converted:" the 2 aor. pass. ἐπεστράφην occurs often in a middle sense, and it is impossible to press the passive: cf. Matt. (ix. 22) x. 13; Mark v. 30. Wiesinger's reason for doing so, that this word corresponds to ἰάθητε, is hardly tenable: it may with just as much plausibility be alleged that it corresponds to ἦτε πλανώμενοι) **now unto the Shepherd** (cf. ch. v. 4, and the prophecies in Isa. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24, also John x. 11) **and Bishop** (there may be a reference to Ezek. xxxiv. 11, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκζητήσω τὰ πρόβατά μου καὶ ἐπισκέψομαι αὐτά (not to ref. Job, as some): but the most likely account of the expression is, that the Apostle transfers the well-known name of the elders of the churches, ἐπίσκοποι, to the great Head of the Church, of whom they were all the servants and representatives. On

c Acts xx. 28. Phil. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 2. Tit. i. 7 only. Job xx. 29.
d Heb. xii. 9 reff.
e 2nd pers., Luke vi. 41. 1 Thess. ii. 14.
f ch. ii. 7. constr., ch. iv. 17. i. 17. only †. (reff.)

μένα καὶ [c] ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. III. [1] Ὁμοίως, [αἱ] γυναῖκες, [d] ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς [e] ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα καὶ εἴ τινες [f] ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν [g] ἀναστροφῆς [h] ἄνευ [i] λόγου [k] κερδηθήσονται, [2] [l] ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ [m] ἁγνὴν [g] ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν· [3] ὧν

ABCKL P ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

g ch. i. 15 reff. h Matt. x. 29. ch. iv. 9 only. Amos iii. 5. i = 1 Cor. k = Matt. xviii. 15. 1 Cor. ix. 19 &c. † ind. fut., Rev. iii. 9 reff. l ch. ii. 12 m = Tit. ii. 5. 2 Cor. xi. 2. Prov. xix. 3.

Chap. III. 1. om αι ABℵ[1]: ins CKL[P]ℵ[3] rel Thl Œc. ει bef και CK b m o: om και B a copt arm Ps-Ath[-int$_1$] Fulg: txt AL[P]ℵ rel vulg Clem$_1$ Aug Bede.—οιτινες, omg ει, a c. rec κερδηθησωνται, with a b[1] j o [Damasc-ed]: txt A B(sic, see table) CKL[P]ℵ rel 36(sic) Clem$_1$ [Damasc-ms] Thl Œc.

2. εποπτευοντες ℵ[1] a.

the name and office, see notes, Acts xx. 17, 28; Phil. i. 1) **of your souls** (so in ch. i. 9, 22, and in ver. 11).

Chap. III. 1—7.] *Exhortations in regard to the married state:* and (1—6) *to wives:* (7) *to husbands.* 1.] **In like manner** (i. e. after the same general principle, enounced in ch. ii. 13, as the *οἰκέται* in *their* relation) **wives** (γυν., as *οἱ οἰκέται*, ch. ii. 18, *οἱ ἄνδρες*, ver. 7, is vocative. This is decisively shewn by ὑμῶν below, as in ver. 7. By the context γυναῖκες is shewn to be *wives*) [**by being**] **in subjection to** (the participle, as in ch. ii. 18: carrying on the general πάντας τιμήσατε) **your own husbands** (ἰδίοις gives point to the obligation, but is without any distinctive emphasis: see the parallel place, Eph. v. 22, and note), **that even if** (καὶ εἰ puts into climax the hypothesis: *εἰ καί*, only that which follows the *καί*, i. e. the fact assumed: see for the full elucidation of this, 1 Cor. vii. 21 note, and Winer, § 53. 7, Hermann on Viger, p. 832, Klotz, Devar. ii. 519 f., Hartung i. p. 139; the views of Hermann and Klotz differing slightly from the above and Hartung, but coming to the same in the end. In this place, as De Wette remarks, καὶ εἰ assumes as possible, the apparently exceptional case which may seem to justify the wives' disobedience: *εἰ καί* would concede that the fact was so and direct notice to the fact itself) **any** (husbands) **are disobedient to the word** (in a state of unbelieving disobedience; most probably, though this is not directly nor necessarily assumed, heathens), **they shall be won** (see reff.: converted to faith and obedience: made a gain for Christian love, and for Christ Himself. Cf. Leighton: "A soul converted is gained to itself, gained to the pastor, or friend, or wife, or husband who sought it, and gained to Jesus Christ: added to His treasury, who thought not His own precious blood too dear to lay out for this gain." On ἵνα with an indic. fut., see Winer, § 41. *b*. 1. b: and cf. reff.) **without word** (without the wives preaching to them, or exhorting them, but simply by your Christian behaviour. The grammarians call this way of speaking, in which a word (λόγου) is intentionally used in two different senses in the same sentence, *antanaclasis*. The other rendering, '*without the word*,' is not indeed, as Wiesinger, precluded by the absence of the article, for λόγου, *indefinite*, might just as well, with the exclusive preposition ἄνευ, refer to the Gospel,—but on account of the general improbability of such a saying, seeing that faith is grounded on hearing, and hearing on the word of God. Besides which, the wives' conversation, being a shewing forth of obedience to the word, could not be said to produce its effect ἄνευ (τοῦ) λόγου. Œc. proposes a curious alternative rendering: ἄνευ λόγου, ἤτοι σχολάζοντος παντὸς λόγου καὶ πάσης ἀντιλογίας ἢ (then follows the interpretation as given above, but very well put) ὡς τῆς διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐπιδείξεως κυριωτέρας οὔσης τῆς διὰ τῶν λόγων περιεργίας. ἄφωνον γὰρ ἔργον κρεῖσσον ἀπράκτου λόγου) **by means of the behaviour of their wives,**

2.] **when they behold** (lit. "having beheld:" the time of the ἐποπτεύσαι is slightly antecedent to that of κερδηθήσονται, but not enough to justify the use of the past. part. in English. On the verb, see ref.) **your chaste behaviour** (ἁγνήν, in the largest sense, not with its proper reference only: modest and pure) **coupled with fear** (so the E. V., admirably: conducted, led, maintained, in a spirit of reverence to your husbands, cf. Eph. v. 33, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα. The connexion of words is τὴν ἐν φόβῳ | ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφήν, not, as Huther, τὴν | ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν | ἀναστροφήν). 3.] **Of whom** (the wives; you, who are addressed) **let** (**the adornment**) **be** (much better so, supplying the word from κόσμος expressed below, than either, 1. as E. V. al. taking

ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ⁿ ἔξωθεν ᵒ ἐμπλοκῆς ᵖ τριχῶν καὶ ᵠ περιθέσεως ʳ χρυσίων ἢ ˢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων ᵗ κόσμος, 4 ἀλλ' ὁ ᵘ κρυπτὸς τῆς ᵛ καρδίας ʷ ἄνθρωπος ˣ ἐν τῷ ʸ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ ᶻ πραέος καὶ ᵃ ἡσυχίου ᵇ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ᶜ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ᵈ πολυτελές. 5 οὕτως γάρ ᵉ ποτὲ καὶ αἱ ἅγιαι γυναῖκες αἱ ᶠ ἐλπίζουσαι ᶠ εἰς θεὸν ᵍ ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς, ʰ ὑποτασσόμεναι

n = 2 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Tim. iii. 7. Rev. xi. 2. o here only †. (see Exod. xxxv. 22. Isa. iii. 18, 20.) p Epp., here only. Matt. x. 30 al. q here only †. (-τίθεναι, 1 Cor. xii. 23.) r Acts iii. 6. xx. 33. 1 Tim. ii. 9 al. s here only. Job xli. 4 (5) only. t = here only. 2 Kings i. 24. u = Rom. ii. 29. 1 Cor. xiv. 25. v see ch. i. 22. Rom. ii. 15, 29. 1 Cor. iv. 5 al. w so Rom. vii. 22. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Eph. iii. 16. x = Luke iv. 14. Rom. ii. 29. 1 Cor. iv. 21. y ch. i. 4 reff. constr., Rom. viii. 3. Phil. iv. 5. Winer, § 34. 2. τὸ πιστὸν τῆς πολιτείας, Thuc. i. 68. τὸ τ. θεῶν εὐμενές, Demosth. p. 20 A. z Matt. v. 5. xi. 29. xxi. 5 (from Zech. ix. 9) only. Ps. xxxvi. 11. a 1 Tim. ii. 2 only. Isa. lxvi. 2 only. b = 1 Cor. iv. 21. Gal. vi. 1. c subjective, Luke xvi. 15. 1 Tim. ii. 3. v. 4 al. fr. Ps. cxiv. 9. d Mark xiv. 3. 1 Tim. ii. 9 only. Prov. i. 13 al. e ch. ii. 10. f 2 Cor. i. 10. John v. 45 only. Ps. cxliv. 15. Isa. ii. 5 bis, see ch. i. 13 reff. g Matt. xii. 44 || L. 1 Tim. ii. 9. Rev. xxi. 2 al. Ezek. xvi. 11 reff. h ver. 1.

3. om τριχων Carm Clem₁. ins η bef περιθεσεως C vulg spec Syr Ps-Ath[-int₁] Cypr.

4. om τω ℵ¹ [εν τω φθαρτω A¹]. om και ℵ¹. ησυχιους (sic) ℵ. πραεως BKLℵ c f m 13 [Damasc-ms₁]. transp πρ. and ησυχ. B vulg spec copt Ps-Ath₁ Aug Ambr.

5. εκοσμουν εαυτας bef αι ελπιζουσαι επι τον θεον ℵ. rec (for εις) επι, with KL[P]ℵ rel Œc: txt ABC a c d 13. 36 Damasc₁ Thl. rec ins τον bef θεον, with ℵ rel 36 Œc: om ABCKL[P] b d m o 13 Damasc₁ Thl.

the word κόσμος expressed below as the subject, and supplying it after ἔξωθεν, which however comes to the same in sense, or, 2. as Huther, taking ὧν ἔστω as complete in itself, "let whose business be;" which is against not only probable construction, but the analogy of 1 Tim. v. 9, which see) not the outward adornment (ὁ ἔξωθεν κόσμος belong together, the intermediate words merely serving to define the κόσμος as that most usually adopted by women) of braiding of hair (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 9, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν, and Ellicott's note there) and putting round (the head, as diadems, or the arm, as bracelets, or the leg, as anklets, or the finger, as rings, or generally, hanging the body round with) of golden ornaments (χρυσίον, see ch. i. 7, 18, and note at the latter place) or of putting on of dresses ("the sex which began first our engagement to the necessity of clothing, having still a peculiar propensity to be curious in that, to improve the necessity to an advantage." Leighton. The three verbal substantives, as Bengel, "innuunt operam comendi multa tempora absumentem"): **4.**] but (rather let their adornment be) the hidden man of the heart (= ὁ ἔσω[θεν] ἄνθρωπος, see reff. Here, as Wies. well argues, it is not, as in ref. Rom., merely the inner man as distinguished from the outer man, which unbelievers have as well as believers: and that for this reason, that the κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος is not here that which is *to be adorned*, but is itself the adornment: and consequently is of necessity the regenerate life itself in its freshness and beauty. And this is designated as being τῆς καρδίας, a gen. of apposition,—consisting in the heart, changed, and lovely with Christian affections and graces), in (standing in, as its condition and element. No art. is needed before ἐν, because this clause is further descriptive, not of ἄνθρωπος, but of κόσμος) the incorruptible (ornament) (τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ, a concrete adj. used by preference over the abstract noun, apparently as contrasted with the concretes just mentioned) of the meek and quiet spirit ("mansuetus, qui non turbat: tranquillus, qui turbas aliorum fert placide. Ad illud refer ver. 5 fin.: ad hoc, ver. 6 fin." Bengel) which (viz. the meek and quiet spirit: not, as Grot. al., the whole preceding, ἀλλ' . . . πνεύματος, nor, as Bengel and Steiger, τὸ ἄφθαρτον. The art. before πραέος marks the antecedent to the ὅ) is in the sight of God ("qui interna, non externa spectat," Bengel) of great price (reff.: the word used for costly ointment and raiment). **5.**] For (enforcing of the same by example) in this manner (i. e. with the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit) formerly also (as well as you, if you obey) the holy women (ἅγιαι, as in Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21; Eph. iii. 5; women of blessed note in the sacred history as servants of God), who hoped (ἐλπίζουσαι, part. of the imperfect, according to Winer, § 45. 1: but is it not rather the indefinite pres. part. defining the quality or office, as ὁ σπείρων, ὁ πειράζων?) in God (i. e. whose hope was directed towards, and rested in, God. Bengel remarks, "vera sanctitas, spes in Deum: est hoc epitheton pars subjecti"), adorned themselves, being in subjection to their own husbands (this clause describes the state in which the adornment was put on, to which it belonged: being thus in subjection, they were adorned with the meek

τοῖς [h] ἰδίοις [h] ἀνδράσιν, [6] ὡς Σάῤῥα [l] ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, [k] κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα, ἧς ἐγενήθητε [l] τέκνα [m] ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν [n] πτόησιν. [7] Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως [o] συνοικοῦντες κατὰ [p] γνῶσιν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

i = Heb. xi. 8 reff.—aor., as Gal. iv. 8. 1 Cor. ix. 20. k Gen. xviii. 12. l Gal. iv. 31. m ch. ii. 15 reff. n here only. Prov. iii. 25. 1 Macc. iii. 25 Ed-vat. [πτοῃ (?), ABℵ] only. (-εῖσθαι, Luke xxi. 9.) o here only. = Sir. xxv. 8, 16. p = 2 Pet. i. 5, 6.

6. υπηκουεν B(sic: see table) m vulg spec Syr æth[?] Aug$_2$ Fulg.
7. om οι B. for συνοικουντες κατα γνωσιν, συνομιλουντες ℵ[1]. rec συγκλη-

and quiet spirit which belongs to it): **6.]** **As** (e. g.) **Sarah obeyed** (aor. It refers to her whole course of obedience considered as a completed whole: cf. reff., and John xvii. 4) **Abraham calling him lord** (ref.: ὁ δὲ κύριός μου πρεσβύτερος): **of whom ye have become** (i. e. by your implanting through faith into the family of faithful Abraham. The aor. properly refers back to the precise time when they were so made; but cannot be so expressed in English) **children, if** (the connexion of the following participles is variously taken. The worst way is with Bengel, Ernesti, al. to suppose them in apposition with ὑποτασσόμεναι above, ὡς . . . τέκνα being in a parenthesis: for there is nothing in either of the participles which finds any historical justification in the history of the holy women. Didymus, al., understand them of the manner in which ye are to become Sarah's children: Harless, Wies., al., of the sign by which your having so become is to be known: but it is perhaps better to take them as the condition on which: and so most Commentators and virtually the E. V. "as long as," rendering literally the *dum* of Beza) **ye do good, and are not afraid of any sudden fear** (to what do these words allude? As in reff., they appear to be a citation from Prov.: where it is said to him that obeys the counsels of wisdom, οὐ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν ἐπελθοῦσαν, οὐδὲ ὁρμὰς ἀσεβῶν ἐπερχομένας. This passage, the coincidence with which can hardly be fortuitous, seems to point to the objective rather than the subjective sense of πτόησις, so that φοβεῖσθαι πτόησιν is not = φοβεῖσθαι φόβον, but πτόησις is some external cause of terror. And such a meaning would suit very well with the context, in which as in ver. 14, the Apostle is often encouraging his readers to bear affliction and persecution cheerfully. So that we may interpret πτόησιν with Est., "quod dum facitis, non est quod metuatis quidquam mali: velut, ne maritis vestris displiceatis, si minus corruptæ inceditis: aut ne serviliter vos tractent, si faciles ad obsequium vos præbeatis; ut solet sexus muliebris vanis pavoribus esse obnoxius. Sed et si forte nacti estis maritos iniquiores, silentio potius ac patientia, quam multis verbis studete eorum animos lenire." Cf. Luke xxi. 9; xxiv. 37. Huther quotes from Stephanus an extraordinary explanation, "jubentur mulieres officium facere etiam cum nullus eas metus constringit, i. e. sponte et ultro." And Œc., interpreting ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι of doing good deeds of benevolence, understands this of the wives not being afraid of the account which their (unbelieving) husbands would require of them: ἐλεήμονας αὐτὰς εἶναι παραινεῖ, μηδὲν ὑποβλεπομένας τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλογισμόν. See Winer, § 32. 2. *b*, who however interprets πτόησιν subjectively). With regard to the much-disputed question whether by the preceding injunction all ornament of dress is forbidden, or only the making such ornament *the adorning*, it may safely be left to the Christian wisdom of believing women, to be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is, in this as in other similar matters. Within the limits of propriety and decorum, the common usage is the rule. There is sin in singularity, both as ministering to pride in ourselves, and as giving offence to others and discommending our holy religion. As Leighton well says, "There may be in some an affected pride in the meanness of apparel; and in others, under either neat or rich attire, a very humble unaffected mind . . . . 'Magnus qui fictilibus utitur tanquam argento; nec ille minor qui argento tanquam fictilibus,' says Seneca: Great is he who enjoys his earthenware as if it were plate, and not less great is the man to whom all his plate is no more than earthenware." **7.]** ***Duty of husbands to their wives.*** **Ye husbands in like manner** (ὁμοίως, not as Est., Grot., Steiger, al., '*vicissim*,' but referring back to the πάντας τιμήσατε ch. ii. 17: cf. τιμήν below. This has not been seen, owing to inattention to the aor. there: even Huther, who interprets ὁμοίως rightly, that there is a certain τιμή due to the wife, as to the husband and the master before, does not connect the idea with the general precept under which all these are ranged) **dwelling** (συνοικεῖν is referred by the older expositors (e. g. Jerome contra Jov. i. 7, vol. ii. p. 248, Aug. in Ps. cxlvi., vol. iv. pt. ii.,

[q] σκεύει τῷ [r] γυναικείῳ, [s] ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ [t] συγκληρονόμοις [u] χάριτος [v] ζωῆς, [w] εἰς τὸ μὴ [x] ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.

8 [y] Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες [z] ὁμόφρονες, [a] συμπαθεῖς, [b] φιλ-

q (see note.) Rom. ix. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 21. 1 Thess. iv. 4. r here only. Esth. ii. 11. Tobit ii. 11. s here only. Deut. iv. 19 only. w. τιμ., Jos. Antt. i. 7. 1. t Rom. viii. 17. Eph. iii. 6. Heb. xi. 9 only †. (-μεῖν, Sir. xxii. 23.) u = ch. i. 13. v = James i. 12 reff. w = Heb. ii. 17 reff. x Acts xxiv. 4. Rom. xv. 22. Gal. v. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 18 only †. Dan. ix. 26 Theod-Ald. only. y = here only. Xen. Cyrop. i. 4. 1. z here only (see Rom. xii. 16) †. ἐννέα κοῦρας ὁμόφρονας, Hes. Theogon. 60. ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες, Theognis 81. a here only †. Jos. Antt. xix. 7. 3. (-θεῖν, Heb. iv. 15. x. 34.) b here only †. 2 Macc. xv. 14 only. (-φία, ch. i. 22.)

ρονομοι, with ACKL[P] rel syr Jer$_1$: -μους ℵ[1]: txt Bℵ[3] m o [18] vulg spec Syr [copt (appy)] æth arm Thl Œc Aug Ambr Cassiod. ins ποικιλης bef χαριτος (see ch iv. 10) AC[2]ℵ a c Jer. rec εκκοπτεσθαι, with C[2]KL rel Thl$_2$, *ut non intercidantur* syr: txt AB[P] d j k l, ενκ. ℵ c, *ut ne impediantur* vulg spec [Ambr Aug] Jer. (C[1] uncert.) ταις προσευχαις B, *impingatis in orationibus vestris* Syr [(copt)].

8. (B has φιλαδελφοι, not φυλ., see table.)

al.) to the 'tori conjugalis consuetudo:' but for this there seems no reason, as the word is often used of the whole conjugal life: so Kypke here, "*connubio juncti vivant:* ad totum respicit vitæ consortium, in quo justo copulati matrimonio vitam transigunt. Est hæc frequentior vocis notio, quæ apud Græcos antiquiores, ni fallor, sola occurrit. Demosth. in Neæram, p. 534, scopum τοῦ συνοικεῖν esse dicit, ut liberi gignantur legitimi et ingenui, et ab hoc distinguit τὸ ἑταίρας καὶ παλλακὰς ἔχειν") **according to knowledge** (in an intelligent and reasonable manner, well aware of the ἀσθένεια spoken of below: see reff.) **with the feminine as with the weaker vessel** (γυναικείῳ is an adj. not a subst. as Wahl: see reff. For σκεῦος, instrument, applied to the wife, see ref. 1 Thess. Here the man is a σκεῦος also; both being God's instruments in His beneficent work of the multiplication of mankind. The higher use of the word as a vessel of grace, or of wrath, does not preclude the lower one which is most obvious here, where the married relation is the subject of consideration. On ἀσθενεστέρῳ, Bengel says, "comparativus: etiam vir habet infirmitatem:" and so Steiger: but this is plainly not so: the word 'weaker' being used as comparing with something which is stronger, viz. the man. Some, as Luth., Calv., Beza, Est., Grot., Hamm., E. V., join these words, ὡς ἀσθενεστ. κ.τ.λ., with ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν. But this mars the parallelism and the sense. For the Apostle prescribes two things: 1. consideration for the wife, as of the weaker sex: 2. honour for the wife, as a fellow-heir of the grace of life. Œc. carries on the same idea, of not exacting too rigid accounts, as on ver. 6: τουτέστιν, αἴσθησιν λαμβάνοντες τῆς τοῦ θήλεος κουφότητος καὶ τοῦ εὐπαραφόρου ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ εἰς μικροψυχίαν εὐολίσθου, μακρόθυμοι γίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς, μὴ λόγον ἀπαιτοῦντες πικρῶς τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῶν εἰς ταμιείαν παρακατατεθέντων. But for this there does not seem any reason), **giving** (ἀπονέμειν, to apportion, see reff.) **honour as to those who are also** (besides being your wives) **fellow-inheritors** (with you) **of the grace of life** (i. e. God's gracious gift of life eternal: ch. i. 4, 13 suffice to clear the meaning, the former explaining κληρον., the latter, χάριν. So that χάρις ζωῆς must not be weakened into χάρις ζῶσα with Erasm., nor into χάρις ζωοποιοῦσα with Grot. The reading συγκληρονόμοι, which it is now proved that B has not [Tischdf. however, though he assigns the *s* to B[1](appy), does not think it quite free from doubt], seems to have arisen from the mistaken joining of ὡς ἀσθ. κ.τ.λ. with ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν: see var. readd.): **in order that your prayers be not hindered** (ἐγκόπτειν, ἐμποδίζειν, διακωλύειν, Hesych. The hindrance meant seems to be, that which would be occasioned by the man not giving his wife proper honour as a fellow-heir of the grace of life; in which case the peculiar promise of advantage in social united prayer would be lost: cf. Matt. xviii. 19. According to this view, the united prayers of man and wife are meant. And so most of the Commentators. Cf. Schol.-Matth., ὁ γὰρ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν θόρυβος τῶν κατὰ θεὸν ἔργων ἐμπόδιον: and Lyra, "Cum vir et uxor non sunt bene concordes, minus possunt orationi vacare, et eorum orationes sunt minus exaudibiles." De Wette understands it of losing the confidence requisite for (mutual?) prayer; Wiesinger, of the prayers of the husband alone. If ἐκκόπτεσθαι be read, it must be "be not cut off," see Rom. xi. 22, 24; 2 Cor. xi. 12).

8, 9.] *General summary exhortations to mutual forbearance and love.* 8.] **Finally** (τὸ τέλος, adverbial accusative, as μακράν, μάτην, ἀκμήν, τὴν ἀρχήν, John viii. 25, δωρεάν, &c. See Winer, § 32. 6. Œc. gives the connexion well: τί χρὴ ἰδιολο-

ἀδελφοι, [c] εὔσπλαγχνοι, [d] ταπεινόφρονες, 9 μὴ [e] ἀποδιδόντες [e] κακὸν ἀντὶ [e] κακοῦ ἢ [f] λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ [f] λοιδορίας, [g] τοὐναντίον δὲ [h] εὐλογοῦντες, ὅτι [i] εἰς τοῦτο [i] ἐκλήθητε ἵνα [k] εὐλογίαν [l] κληρονομήσητε. 10 [m] ὁ γὰρ [n] θέλων [o] ζωὴν [p] ἀγαπᾷν καὶ [q] ἰδεῖν [r] ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς [s] παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν [s] ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ [t] χείλη [u] τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι [v] δόλον,

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

c Eph. iv. 32 only †. d here only. Prov. xxix. 23. [Plut. Mor. p. 336 e.] e = Rom. xii. 17. 1 Thess. v. 15. f here bis. 1 Tim. v. 14 only. Prov. x. 18. (-ρεῖν, ch. ii. 23.) g 2 Cor. ii. 7. Gal. ii. 7 only †. 3 Macc. iii. 22. h = Luke vi. 28. Rom. xii. 14 al. i ch. ii. 9 reff. k = Heb. vi. 7 reff. l Heb. i. 4 reff. m Psa. xxxiii. 12—16 freely. n = Gal. iv. 21. vi. 12. 1 Tim. i. 7. 2 Tim. iii. 12. James ii. 20. o = James iv. 14 reff. p = 2 Tim. iv. 8. Ps. l. c. and xxxix. 14. q = John iii. 3. Luke ii. 26. xvii. 22. Heb. xi. 5. r see Eccles. xii. 1. s act., here only. constr., w. ἀπό, here only. Ps. xxxvi. 8. gen., ch. iv. 1. (w. particip., Heb. x. 2 reff.) t = Heb. xiii. 15 reff. u constr., Luke iv. 42. xxiv. 16. Acts x. 47 al. v ch. ii. 1, 22 al.

rec (for ταπεινοφρονες) φιλοφρονες, with K[P] rel: φιλοφ. ταπεινοφ. L vulg-ed(and some mss) Thl Œc: txt ABCℵ a c d g j 13 am(with demid [fuld]) syrr [arm] copt Clem$_1$ Antch$_1$.

9. rec ins ειδοτες bef οτι, with L[P] rel syr-mg Thl Œc: om ABCKℵ 13 vulg [spec] syrr copt [æth arm] Antch$_2$ Damasc$_1$.

10. ημερας bef ιδειν C a c h [vulg-ed]. rec aft γλωσσαν ins αυτου, with KL[P]ℵ rel vulg syrr copt [æth arm Thl Œc]: om ABC 13 [Anton$_1$]. ins τα bef χειλη C[1]. rec aft χειλη ins αυτου, with L[P] rel [vulg Syr copt æth arm Thl Œc]: om ABCKℵ a 13 fuld syr.

γεῖσθαι; ἁπλῶς πᾶσι φημί· τοῦτο γὰρ τέλος καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο πᾶσιν ὁ σκοπὸς ἀφορᾷ τῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο νόμος πᾶσιν ἀγάπης), all (being) (the adjectival construction still carried on [from ch. ii. 17]) of one mind (reff.), sympathizing (συμπάθεια ὁ πρὸς τοὺς κακῶς πάσχοντας ὡς καὶ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ἔλεος, Œc. But the meaning is not confined to cases of sorrow: the χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων is also included), loving the brethren, compassionate (in classical Greek, *of strong courage*, lit. "of strong bowels," as in Hippocr. p. 89 c (Huther); here, and in ref., as Bengel, "misericordes erga afflictos"), humble-minded (the word forms a note of transition to the next verse: humility being essential both to true gentleness of love and to true patience under injuries); 9.] not giving back [to others] evil for evil, or reproach for reproach ("non malum pro malo in factis injuriosis, nec maledictum pro maledicto in verbis contentiosis." Lyra), nay rather (the δέ sharpens the contrast more than ἀλλά: see above, on ch. ii. 23) on the contrary, blessing (scil., the evil doer or speaker. The word *blessing*, in E. V., is liable to be, and generally is, mistaken for the substantive εὐλογίαν): because to this end (viz. that which follows with ἵνα, as in ch. iv. 6: not as Œc., Grot., Calv., Steiger, De Wette, al., that which has gone before, which would leave a very lame connexion of the sentence: see below) ye were called (by God), that ye might inherit blessing ("qui cœleste regnum aliquando hereditare debent, illi sunt benedicti ac filii benedictionis, non solum passive sed etiam active, benedictionem spiritualem a Deo per fidem recipientes et vicissim aliis ex caritate benedicentes." Gerhard. And this is obviously the right connexion; for, as Wies. remarks, it is not in order to inherit a blessing that we must bless; but because our portion is, blessing: and the reasoning is much as in Eph. iv. 32, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν). 10.] For (*the above exhortations are impressed by a citation* from Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii. LXX) 13—17. That the citation cannot, as De Wette maintains, apply directly to the last written words, is plain, by the verb κληρονομήσητε, necessarily referring to the future life, whereas the blessings promised in the Psalm as necessarily refer to the present. So that we must connect the citation mainly with the εὐλογοῦντες, and if we take in the intermediate clause, it must be only secondarily, as connecting, generally, blessing with blessing) he who desireth to love life (the citation is curiously divergent from the LXX, and very difficult to understand. The LXX have, τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζωήν, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθάς; Here all is plain: whereas θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾷν is hardly intelligible. Commentators have endeavoured to make it so by introducing some foreign idea into one or other of the verbs: thus the 'glossa interlinearis,' De Wette, al., "qui vult ostendere, se dilectionem habere:" Bengel and Steiger, "qui vult ita vivere, ut ipsum non tædeat vitæ." Huther, understanding ζωή of the future life, "He that will love life," seeing that the love of life, in this sense, is dependent on a certain moral relation of man and is impossible without love. But if we are to take the words as they stand, and not rather regard them as another way

[11] [y] ἐκκλινάτω δὲ [y] ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν, [z] ζητησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ [a] διωξάτω αὐτήν. [12] ὅτι [b] ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου [b] ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ [c] ὦτα αὐτοῦ [d] εἰς [e] δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ [f] ποιοῦντας [f] κακά. [13] καὶ τίς ὁ [g] κακώσων ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ [h] ζηλωταὶ γένησθε; [14] ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ [i] πάσχοιτε διὰ [k] δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι.

y = (intr.) Rom. xvi. 17. Ps. xxxvi. 27. (Rom. iii. 12 [from Ps. xiii. 3] only.) z = Matt. vi. 33. Col. iii. 1. 1 Macc. ii. 29. a = Rom. ix. 30. 2 Tim. ii. 22. Heb. xii. 14 al. b = w. gen., Deut. xi. 12. acc., but in bad sense, Amos ix. 8. c James v. 4. d see Matt. v. 35. e Heb. v. 7 reff. f John xviii. 30. g Acts vii. 6 (from Gen. xv. 13), 19. xii. 1. xiv. 2. xviii. 10 only. Exod. v. 22. Isa. l. 9. h = Acts (i. 13) xxi. 20. Tit. ii. 14 al.‡ 2 Macc. iv. 2. i opt. elsw. only in parenth., as 1 Cor. xv. 37. ver. 17. k = Matt. v. 10.

11. rec om δε, with C[2]KL[P]ℵ rel vulg(with am[1] [demid]) Syr copt [arm Anton$_1$] Thl Œc: ins ABC[1] a c m am[2](and [fuld] harl tol) syr [(æth)].

12. rec ins οι bef οφθαλμοι, with C[3] c j 36 Œc: om ABC[1]KL[P]ℵ rel [arm] Thl. ins την bef δεησιν C.

13. (B has ει, not εαν as Muralto; see table.) rec (for ζηλωται) μιμηται, with KL[P] rel Œc: txt ABCℵ a c d 13 vulg [syrr copt æth arm] (Clem$_1$) Damasc$_1$ Thl. γενοισθε B; γενεσθαι ℵ[1].

14. for αλλ' ει, ει δε Aℵ[3] 13: αλλα ει ℵ[1] [αλλα και ει P]. aft μακαριοι ins εσται

of expressing the same as in the Psalm, it may well be, "He that loves life and wishes to continue to do so") **and to see** (reff.) **good days, let him refrain** (the LXX proceed in the 2nd person, παῦσον . . . . σου. The word itself, like the English one "refrain," implies a natural tendency towards that from which the abstention is to take place) **his tongue** ("primum notat, quæ linguæ vitia cavenda sint, nempe ne contumeliosi ac petulantes simus: deinde ne fraudulenti ac duplices. Hinc ad facta descendit, ne quem lædamus, vel ne cui inferamus damnum." Calv.) **from evil, and lips, that they never speak** (aor. referring to single occasions, or, better perhaps, to the whole life considered as one fact) **deceit** (i. e. speak one thing and mean another):

11.] **moreover** (the δέ brings up a new particular, belonging to a different sphere of conduct) **let him turn away from** (in act, that is: see reff.) **evil, and do good: let him seek peace, and pursue it** (because it is not always to be found, and when not immediately found, may require diligent pursuit: cf. ref. Heb. and St. Paul's εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. Rom. xii. 18. The 'glossa interlinearis' is good: "inquirat pacem ut rem absconditam, et persequatur eam ut rem fugitivam"). 12.] *The citation continued, and a reason given for the foregoing conditions of prosperity.* **Because the eyes of the Lord** (Jehovah) **are** (directed, in a favourable sense,—for good) **upon righteous men** ("inde vitam habent et dies bonos," Bengel), **and His ears** (inclined) **unto their supplication: but the face of the Lord is** (directed, in an unfavourable sense,—for wrath) **upon men doing evil things.**

13—IV. 6.] *Exhortation to right behaviour towards the world in persecutions which come upon them for righteousness' sake* (13—17): and that *by the example of Christ* (18—22), *whose suffering in the flesh, and* by consequence *whose purity and freedom from sin they are to imitate* (iv. 1—6). 13.] **And** (connected with what preceded: seeing that God takes such care for the righteous, and that the result of that care will be a life worthy to be loved, and good days. Beza, Bengel, al., would make the καί only a 'formula interrogandi.' But the other is to me much more probable: and indeed, as De W. well says, even in cases where καί appears merely to introduce a question, it in reality always connects) **who is he that shall harm you** (not, as Wies., if I understand him, "that will have any mind to harm you" (nicht in dem Sinne . . . . . . daß Niemand ihnen etwas anhaben kann . . . . sondern in dem Sinne, daß ihnen Niemand Uebles wird thun wollen): many will have this: but your μακαριότης will be such as to turn off all their malice and make even suffering itself to be happiness) **if ye be** (by having become: aor.: but we cannot express this in English otherwise than by expressing its result, ye *be*) **emulous** [i. e. as in E. V. **followers**: the Rheims version has **emulators**, which if it were sufficiently English would be better] **of that which is good** (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is first, for emphasis: "if it be that which is good, of which you are zealous?" Thus the contrast between κακώσων and τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is stronger. The adj. has been taken by some as masc.: but probably only on account of the apparent difficulty of μιμηταί (rec.) being joined with it. This latter reading has most likely come in from 3 John 11, μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθόν)? 14.] **Nay if even** (see

m Mark iv. 41. Luke ii. 9. Jonah i. 10. Isa. viii. 12, 13.
n indef. pron., John viii. 44. Rom. ii. 26. Luke xxiii. 51. Winer, § 22. 3. 3.
o l. c. = Matt. ii. 3. xiv. 26. John xiv. 1. Esth. iii. 15. p Col. iii. 24. q = Matt. vi. 9. Exod. xx. 8. Isa. xxix. 23. Sir. xxxiii. 4. r = ver. 4 reff. s Tit. iii. 1. t = Acts xxii. 1. (xxvi. 2.) Phil. i. 7, 16. constr., 1 Cor. ix. 3. absol., 2 Cor. vii. 11. 2 Tim. iv. 16 only †. Wisd. vi. 10 only. u Heb. xiii. 17 reff. v = Heb. iv. 16 reff. w James i. 21 reff. x Heb. (ix. 9) x. 22 reff.

ABCKL PℵN a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

τὸν δὲ m φόβον n αὐτῶν μὴ m φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ o ταραχθῆτε, 15 p κύριον δὲ τὸν p χριστὸν q ἁγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς r καρδίαις ὑμῶν. s ἕτοιμοι [δὲ] ἀεὶ s πρὸς t ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς u λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος ἀλλὰ v μετὰ w πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου, 16 x συνείδησιν ἔχοντες x ἀγαθήν,

ℵ [arm]. om μηδε ταραχθητε BL.

15. rec (for χριστον) θεον, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: om [τ. χρ.] æth Promiss: txt ABCℵ a c 13 vulg syrr coptt arm $Clem_1$. om 2nd δε BCℵ a b c o 13. 36 vulg [spec] copt arm $Orig_2$ Bede. απαιτουντι Aℵ[3] [Damasc-ms]. rec om αλλα, with KL[P] rel [spec] Syr Œc: ins ABCℵ a c 13 vulg syr copt arm $Clem_1$ $Damasc_1$ Thl.

on εἰ καί, above, ver. 1) **ye chance to suffer** ("levius verbum quam κακοῦσθαι." Beng. In fact the πάθημα need not be a κακόν, but may be an ἀγαθόν, and is, in the case supposed. The opt. after εἰ usually takes place when "illa quæ ponitur conditio, non revocatur ad veritatem, sed fingitur tantummodo cogitatione." Klotz, Devar. ii. p. 491) **on account of righteousness** (Wies. quotes Augustine's "martyrem facit non pœna sed causa." δικαιοσ., that right and holy living to which you devote yourselves and which gives offence to the ungodly world. διὰ δικ. = ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης in our Lord's saying Matt. v. 10, and ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, ib. ver. 11), **blessed are ye** ("ne hoc quidem vitam beatam vobis aufert, immo potius auget." Beng.). **But** ("docet quomodo suscipienda sint adversa, ne beatitas imminuatur." Beng. The words are almost verbatim from Isa. viii. 12, 13) **be not afraid with their terror** (not, "afraid of," as E. V. φόβον is, as in l. c., subjective, and φοβηθῆναι φόβον merely as χαίρειν χαράν and the like. The command amounts to this, "be not affected in heart by the fear which they strive to inspire into you") **nor be troubled** ("sicut summum malorum quæ lex minatur est cor pavidum et formidine plenum, Lev. xxvi. 36, Deut. xxviii. 65, ita maximum bonorum quæ Christus nobis promeruit inque Evangelio offert, est cor de gratia Dei certum ac proinde in omnibus adversis et periculis tranquillum." Gerh.):

15.] **nay rather** (the sharply adversative δέ, see above on ch. ii. 23) **sanctify** (reff.) **in your hearts** (in the O. T. passage it is added, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος. "This addition is not made here, but ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ὑμῶν, to bring out that the ἁγιάσατε must be perfected in the inner parts of a man and so keep him from all false fear. As if he would say, Care only for this, that your heart may be a temple of Christ, in which becoming honour may be given to Him as Lord; then will nothing further disturb you: you have in Him all that you can need." Wiesinger) **Christ as Lord** (κύριον is emphatically placed forward as predicate; and the expression τὸν κύριον τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτόν (LXX-F., not A) changed in a Christian sense into κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστόν): [**but** (so far from being afraid of men, be ever ready to give them a gentle and reverent answer when they enquire of your hope)], (**being**) (the same adjectival sentences as before) **ready always for** (ἑτοιμ. πρός, ref. [i. e. to give]) **an answer** (an apologetic justification, in the primitive Christian sense. This was most commonly given before official persons and on trial, but in the present case is expressly extended to every person and occasion) **to every man** (παντί, dat. aft. ἀπολογίαν, as in ref. 1 Cor.) **that asketh of you a reason** (a reasonable account) **concerning the hope [that is] in you** (ἐλπίς, not as Calvin = πίστις ("spes hic per synecdochen pro fide capitur"), but as Luth.: "in persecutione oportet nos habere spem: si ratio spei exigitur, oportet nos habere verbum." And Bengel: "spes christianorum sæpe commovit alios ad percontandum"), **but** (ἀλλά makes a contrast to the ἑτοιμότης—ready, but not over ready: see Luther, below) **with meekness** (see above on ver. 4) **and fear** (another antanaclasis, after μὴ φοβηθῆτε φόβον above. This fear is not the fear of God exclusively, nor that of men, but the aspect of the mind as regards both: proper respect for man, and humble reverence of God. The case supposed would generally occur when some one invested with authority asked a reason: and the complexion of the answer to be given is taken from that circumstance. On the injunction, Luther says, speaking from his own experience at Worms and elsewhere, "Then must ye not answer with proud words and bring out the matter with a defiance and with violence as if ye would tear up trees, but with such fear and lowliness as if ye

ἵνα [y] ἐν ᾧ [yz] καταλαλεῖσθε [a] καταισχυνθῶσιν οἱ [b] ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν χριστῷ [c] ἀναστροφήν. 17 [d] κρεῖττον γὰρ [e] ἀγαθοποιοῦντας εἰ [f] θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ πάσχειν ἢ [g] κακοποιοῦντας, 18 ὅτι καὶ χριστὸς [h] ἅπαξ [i] περὶ [i] ἁμαρτιῶν [k] ἔπαθεν [l] δίκαιος ὑπὲρ [m] ἀδίκων, ἵνα ἡμᾶς

y ch. ii. 12. z James iv. 11 reff. a = ch. ii. 7 reff. b Luke vi. 28 (Matt. v. 44 v. r.) only+. (-αστής, Ps. lvi. 2 Symm.) c ch. i. 15 reff. d = 1 Cor. vii. 9. Phil. i. 23. 2 Pet. ii. 21. (Heb. i. 4 reff.) Prov. iii. 14. e ch. ii. 15 reff. f opt., see ver. 14. g Mark iii. 4 || L. 3 John 11 only. 2 Kings xxiv. 17 A. h = Heb. ix. 26, 27, 28. x. 2. Jude 3, 5. i Heb. x. 7, 8 al. fr. k absol. of Christ, Heb. ix. 28 reff. l 1 John ii. 1. m Matt. v. 45. Acts xxiv. 15.

16. Steph (for καταλαλεισθε) καταλαλουσιν [appy from ch ii. 12], with ACK[P]ℵ b[2] d f h 13 [vulg], καταλουσιν j: elz καταλαλωσιν, with L rel Syr copt Thl Œc Bede$_1$: txt B a c 69. 137 syr Clem$_1$. rec adds υμων ως κακοποιων [also from ch ii. 12], with ACKL[P]ℵ 13 fuld(and harl tol) Syr syr-w-ast copt [æth] Thl Œc Bede$_1$: om B a c 69. 137 vulg spec arm Clem$_1$. εν χριστω bef αγαθην (C)[KL] a b c o.—for αγαθην, αγνην C [syr-mg]. for εν χριστω, εις χν. ℵ[1].

17. [αγαθοποιουντες and] κακοποιουντες C. rec θελει, with 13: om l 26: txt ABCKL[P]ℵ rel Clem$_1$ Thl Œc. for η, ει ℵ[1][L].

18. om και ℵ [harl Cyr$_1$ Orig-int$_1$ Aug$_1$]. ins των bef αμαρτιων ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving). aft αμαρτιων ins ημων [C[2](appy)] vulg-ed Syr Cypr$_1$ Aug$_1$; υπερ ημων [C[1](appy)] Lℵ c 13. 36 [copt Did$_1$]; υπερ υμων A a b o [arm]: om BK[P] rel am tol [Cyr$_1$ Thl Œc]. for επαθεν, απεθανεν A[C]ℵ a k 13 vulg syrr copt [æth arm] Cyr$_1$ Did$_2$ Sev$_1$ Cypr$_1$ Aug$_1$: txt BKL[P] rel Thl-comm Œc Aug$_1$. om ημας ℵ[1]: υμας B a b j m o syrr arm.

stood before God's tribunal . . . . so must thou stand in fear, and not rest on thine own strength, but on the word and promise of Christ," Matt. x. 19 f. (in Wiesinger)): **16.] having a good conscience** (viz. when you make your apology, "quia parum auctoritatis habet sermo absque vita, ideo fidei professioni bonam conscientiam adjungit." Calv. This is better, seeing that the same subject, that of behaviour under persecution, is afterwards carried on, ver. 17, than with De Wette and Steiger to regard these words as taking up the former part of ver. 15), **that in the matter in which** (*ἐν ᾧ*, see note on ch. ii. 12) **ye are spoken against** (see var. readd.) **they who traduce** (ref. Aristotle, Rhet. ii. 2, gives the idea of *ἐπηρεασμός*: *ἔστιν ὁ ἐπηρεασμὸς ἐμποδισμὸς ταῖς βουλήσεσιν, οὐχ ἵνα τι αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἐκείνῳ*. If so, when applied to words, it will mean envious detraction) **your good** (*ἀγαθός* = *καλός*, ch. ii. 12) **conversation** (behaviour in life) **in Christ** (as Christians, —your whole life being *in Christ*, as its element: see 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. ii. 6) **may be ashamed. 17.] For** (confirmation of the exhortation to a good conscience above: Œc., al., refer it to ver. 14, *μακάριοί ἐστε*) **it is better** (we have had a similar argument in ch. ii. 19, 20, from which passage the sense of *κρεῖττον* here is made clear: there it is said of the suffering for well-doing, that it is *χάρις*, that it is *κλέος*, that *εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε*. "Beatius," says Bengel, "infinitis modis:" "Hæc consolatio," says Calvin, "arcana potius meditatione, quam longo verborum circuitu percipitur:" and Gerhard, "Occurrit tacitæ objectioni . . . . Non adeo graviter . . . . ferrem, si essem promeritus. Respondet Petrus, satius est te non esse meritum, ut benefaciens ac male audiens te verum Christianum probes" (mainly from Wiesinger)) **to suffer (for)** (see ch. ii. 20, and the connexion as given there) **doing well, if the will of God should will (it so)** (on the optative after *εἰ*, signifying "if perchance it should be so," see above on ver. 14. In the expression, *εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα*, *τὸ θέλημα* is the divine Will itself, *τὸ θέλειν* is the putting forth of that Will in act: see Winer, § 65. 2. Luther (in Wies.) says beautifully, Gehe du hin in Glaube und Liebe: kommt das Kreuz, so nimm es an: kommt es nicht, so such' es nicht), **than (for) doing ill: 18—22.]** *Establishment of the above position on the fact of Christ having Himself suffered, being righteous*, and through death, even in death vanquishing the power of death, entered into His glory at God's right hand: **18.] because** (not 'for:' it does not only render *a reason*, but lays down *the reason* why Christian suffering for well-doing is blessed) **Christ also** (as well as yourselves if ye be so called as to suffer) **suffered for sins** (the thought is somewhat similar to that in ch. ii. 21, but the intent of it different: there, it was as an example *to us* that the sufferings of Christ were adduced: here, it is as a proof of the blessedness and advantage of suffering for well-doing, that proof being closely applied to us by the fact that that suffering was undertaken on our behalf, and that

[n] προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ, [o] θανατωθεὶς μὲν [p] σαρκί, [q] ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ [r] πνεύματι, [19] ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν [s] φυλακῇ [t] πνεύμασιν

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

n = Luke ix. 41. Acts xvi. 20. Gen. xlviii. 9. (-αγωγή, Rom. v. 2. Eph. ii. 18. iii. 12.) o Matt. x. 21 al5. in gospp. Rom. vii. 4 al3. (Paul) only. 2 Chron. xxiii. 15. p dat. (1 Cor. vii. 28. 2 Cor. xii. 7. Gal. v. 13. Col. ii. 5.) Gal. iii. 3. ch. iv. 1, 6. elsw., ἐν σ. or κατὰ σ. q 1 Cor. xv. 22, 36, 45. Rom. iv. 17. viii. 11. John v. 21. 4 Kings v. 7. r = ch. iv. 6. 1 Cor. v. 5 al. s = Rev. xx. 7. t = Heb. xii. 23 reff.

om τω θεω B: om τω C: τω πατρι b o. [om μεν A1(appy) Epiph5.] rec ins τω bef πνευματι, with g 13 Epiph2: om ABCKL[P]ℵ rel [arm] Orig1 [Petr1 Ath1] Epiph3 Did1 Cyr2.

19. aft εν φυλακη ins κατακεκλεισμενοις C 8. 25 [harl tol] Ath1 Aug2 Ruf1.

blessedness is our salvation. **περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν** I distinctly hold, with Wiesinger, to come in, as a point of comparison between Christ and ourselves, under the *καί*,—against most Commentators, among whom are De Wette and Huther. Considering St. Peter's love of antanaclasis (using the same term in two meanings), of which we have already had several examples, e. g. vv. 9, 14, 15, I have no hesitation in applying the *παθεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* the one time to Christ, the other to ourselves, though His suffering for sin, and ours, are two very different things. He, the sinless One, suffered *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*, for sins; as a sacrifice for sin, as a sinner, made sin for us, dying the death of a criminal: we, though not sinless, yet *ἀγαθοποιοῦντες*, are to suffer if God's will so will it, *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*, for sins which we are supposed to have committed, and as sinners. To miss this, is to miss one of the cardinal points of the comparison) **once** ("from this **ἅπαξ**, through the *καί*," as has been beautifully said (Besser, in Wies.), "a beam of comforting light falls on the sufferings of Christians." He suffered *once*: His sufferings are summed up and passed away: He shall suffer no more. And we are suffering *ἅπαξ*: it shall be soon so thought of and looked back upon. For this reason doubtless, and not as Œc. to shew *τὸ τοῦ παθόντος δραστήριόν τε καὶ δυνατόν*, nor as Pott, al., to contrast the sufferings of Christ as in Heb. x. 1, 2, with the often-repeated sacrifices of the O. T., is *ἅπαξ* inserted), **a just person** (**δίκαιος** is purely predicative: not as E. V. 'the just,' which again loses the point of comparison) **on behalf of unjust persons** (this again, though the resembling tints are beginning somewhat to fade off, is another point of comparison: He suffered, just, righteous, *ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*: He represented, He was offered for, the unjust, the unrighteous: and so we in our turn, though in a far less deep and proper meaning, when we, being *δίκαιοι* (ver. 12), suffer as *ἄδικοι*, though not in any propitiatory sense *ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*. We have similar uncertainty and play of meaning where the same subject is treated Rom. vi. 10, 11, *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν . . . ζῇ τῷ θεῷ, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ*: where the two expressions, though they have a common meaning of small extent, are in their widest and most important references of necessity widely divergent), **that** (with this **ἵνα** we leave the comparison, as far as suffering is concerned, returning to it presently for a moment with the *θανατωθείς*, and pass up to the *μακαριότης* of His innocent suffering, and to that which makes it so glorious and precious to us, as the ground of all our blessedness in suffering) **He might bring us near to God** ("ut nos, qui abalienati fueramus, ipse abiens ad Patrem, secum una, justificatos adduceret in cœlum, ver. 22, per eosdem gradus quos ipse emensus est, exinanitionis et exaltationis. Ex hoc verbo Petrus, usque ad cap. iv. 6, penitus connectit Christi et fidelium iter sive processum (quo etiam ipse *sequebatur* Dominum, ex ejus prædictione, Joh. xiii. 36) infidelitatem multorum et pœnam innectens." Bengel: who also remarks on **τῷ θεῷ**, "Deo id volenti. Plus notatur per dativum quam si diceretur *ad Deum*"), **put to death** (this participial clause conditions the *ἵνα προσαγάγῃ*, giving the manner of that bringing us near to God) **indeed in the flesh** (of this there can be no doubt, and in this assertion there is no difficulty. **σαρκί** is adverbial; it was thus, in this region, under these conditions, that the death on the cross was inflicted: His flesh, which was living flesh before, became dead flesh: Christ Jesus, the entire complex Person, consisting of body, soul, and spirit, was put to death *σαρκί*), **but made alive** (**again**) **in the spirit** (here there may seem to be difficulty: but the difficulty will vanish, if we guide ourselves simply and carefully by the former clause. 'Quod ad carnem,' the Lord was put to death: 'quod ad spiritum,' He was brought to life (for this, and not "remained alive," must be insisted on as the meaning of *ἐζωοποιήθη*). His flesh was the subject, recipient, vehicle, of inflicted death: His spirit was the subject, recipient, vehicle, of restored life. But here let us beware, and proceed cautiously.

^{u} πορευθεὶς ^{u} ἐκήρυξεν ^{20} ^{v} ἀπειθήσασιν ^{w} ποτὲ ὅτε ^{x} ἀπεξεδέ-

u Mark xvi. 15. (see note.) v = ch. ii. 7, 8 reff. w = ver. 5. x Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25. 1 Cor. i. 7. Gal. v. 5. Phil. iii. 20. Heb. ix 28 only †.

20. rec απαξ εξεδεχετο (*from Erasmus' conjecture?*), with Orig-ed$_1$ Œc-txt-ed: απαξ εδεχετο [K?] m Amerbach's Basle ms (Delitzsch ii. 24): txt ABC K[appy] L[P]ℵ rel [vulg syr copt] Orig$_2$[and ms$_1$] lat-ff. (13 is defective, only ξεδεχετο being legible.)

What is asserted is not that the *flesh died* and the Spirit was *made alive*; but that 'quoad' the flesh the Lord died, 'quoad' the Spirit He was made alive. He, the God-man Christ Jesus, body and soul, ceased to live in the flesh, began to live in the Spirit; ceased to live a fleshly mortal life, began to live a spiritual resurrection life. His own Spirit never died, as the next verse shews us. "This is the meaning, that Christ by His sufferings was taken from the life which is flesh and blood, as a man on earth, living, walking, and standing in flesh and blood .... and He is now placed in another life and made alive according to the Spirit, has passed into a spiritual and supernatural life, which includes in itself the whole life which Christ now has in soul and body, so that He has no longer a fleshly but a spiritual body." Luther. And Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 336, says, "It is the same who dies and the same who is again made alive, both times the whole Man Jesus, in body and soul. He ceases to live, in that *that*, which is to His Personality the medium of action, falls under death; and He begins again to live, in that He receives back this same for a medium of His action again. The life which fell under death was a fleshly life, that is, such a life as has its determination to the present condition of man's nature, to the externality of its mundane connexion. The life which was won back is a spiritual life, that is, such a life as has its determination from the Spirit, in which consists our inner connexion with God." It is impossible, throughout this difficult and most important passage, to report all the various shades of difference of opinion which even the greater expositors have given us. I shall indicate only those which are necessary to be mentioned as meanings to be distinguished from that which I advocate, or as errors likely to fall constantly under the eye of my readers. Of this latter class is the rendering of the E. V. here, "*by the Spirit*," which is wrong both grammatically and theologically: the explanation of Œc., Calov., al., τουτέστιν ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τῆς θεότητος δυνάμει: ἀνέστη γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὡς θεός: and that of Grot. that πνευματι = ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ, 2 Cor. xiii. 4): **19.**] **in which** (viz. πνεύματι, in the spirit, according to which His new life was. ἐν ᾧ, not simply ᾧ this time: see below) **He also went and preached** (πορευθείς of a local transference here, just as below in ver. 22, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν: and ἐκήρυξεν of a preaching good news, nearly = εὐηγγελίσατο, as in all other places of the N. T.) **to the spirits in prison** (the disembodied spirits, which were kept shut up (Jude 6: 2 Pet. ii. 4) in the place of the departed awaiting the final judgment: in Scheol, as Syr.), **20.**] **which were once disobedient** (this clause is a secondary and dependent one, descriptive of the spirits intended: that they were those of men who were formerly disobedient) **when** (ὅτε marks distinctively the time intended by the ποτέ) **the longsuffering of God was waiting** (and this marks the period of their disobedience, viz. those 120 years of Gen. vi. 3. ἀπεξεδέχετο, imperf.: the ἀπ- betokening the full time during which it was exercised. "Exspectabat donec exspectandi finis erat." Beng.) **in the days of Noah while the ark** (κιβωτοῦ anarthrous as the well-known name for the ark in the LXX) **was being prepared, in which** (pregn. constr., "by having entered into which:" not "into which," see below) **a few persons, that is eight souls** (individuals: ψυχαί, as being in the body: the distinction may be noted here, but is not always kept: the disembodied are ψυχαί in Rev. vi. 9, xx. 4) **were saved** (from drowning) **by water** (not, "into which a few, &c. got safe through the water," which was not the fact. The water is in the Apostle's view the *medium of saving*, inasmuch as it bore up the ark: cf. the next verse: or it may be, and so Bengel, Steiger, De Wette, Huther, "through (the) water"). So much for the exegesis of the detail of this passage; from which it will be seen that we have regarded it, in common with the majority of Commentators, as necessarily pointing to an event in our Lord's redemptive agency which happened, as regards time, in the order of the context here: and that that event was, His going (whether between His death and resurrection, or after the latter, will be presently discussed) to the place of custody of departed spirits, and there preaching to those spirits, which were formerly disobedient when God's longsuffering waited in the days of Noah.

χετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ [y] μακροθυμία ἐν [z] ἡμέραις [z] Νῶε [a] κατασκευα-

y = Rom. ii. 4. ix. 22. 2 Pet. iii. 15. Prov. xxv. 15. z Matt. xxiv. 37. Luke xvii. 26. a = Heb. xi. 7 (reff.).

ABCKL P ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

for η . . μακροθυμια, την . . μακροθυμιαν ℵ (την is corrected, but not μακροθυμιαν)

Thus far I conceive our passage stands committed: and I do not believe it possible to make it say less, or other, than this. What was the intent of that preaching, and what its effect is not here revealed; the fact merely is stated. The statement of the fact, however, has been felt to be accompanied by such great difficulties, that other meanings have been sought for the passage than that which the words present at first sight. Expositors have endeavoured to remove the idea that the gospel was preached to the dead in Hades, either, 1. by denying the reference to our Lord's descent thither at all, or, 2. by admitting that, but supposing it to have had another purpose. I give, following the classification in Huther's note, an account of the principal upholders of these views. Under I., I place all those who deny any reference to Christ's descent into Hades, distinguishing the minor differences between them as to what κήρυγμα is there indicated.

I. 1. Augustine, Bede, Thos. Aquinas, Lyra, Hammond, Beza, Scaliger, Leighton, Horneius, Gerhard, al., and recently Hofmann, Schriftbeweis ii. 1. 335—341, maintain that the κήρυγμα was the preaching of righteousness *by Noah to his contemporaries:* that Noah thus preached not of himself, but by virtue of the Spirit of Christ inspiring him; and that thus his preaching was in fact a preaching by Christ in the Spirit. So, e. g. Augustine, Ep. 164 (99), vol. ii., suggests, that the "spiritus conclusi in carcere" may be "animæ quæ tunc erant in carne, atque ignorantiæ tenebris velut carcere claudebantur." Also that Christ had not indeed come in the flesh, but from the beginning of the race came from time to time to convict the evil, to console the good, or to admonish both. For this He came not in flesh, but in spirit, i. e. in substantia Deitatis. But he qualifies this by asking, "Quid facit Filius sine Spiritu Sancto, vel sine Patre, cum inseparabilia sint omnia opera Trinitatis?" But this arbitrary interpretation of φυλακή = "caro, et ignorantiæ tenebræ," is not common to all the supporters of this view. Beza represents a large class: "Christus . . . . jam olim in diebus Noe . . . . prædicavit spiritibus illis, qui *nunc in carcere* meritas dant pœnas, utpote qui recta monenti Noe . . . . parere olim recusarint." Thus Scaliger, Horneius, al.: and Hofmann, except that he joins ποτέ with πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, not with ἀπειθήσασιν. It must be evident to every unprejudiced scholar, how alien such an interpretation is from the plain meaning and connexion of the words and clauses. Not a word is indicated by St. Peter on the very far-off lying allusion to the fact that the Spirit of Christ preached in Noah: not a word, here, on the fact that Noah himself preached to his contemporaries. Again, the same subject χριστός runs through the whole, without a hint, that we are dealing with historical matter of fact in ἔπαθεν, θανατωθείς, ζωοποιηθείς, and with recondite figure in πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν. Again, whether we take the metaphorical φυλακή of Aug., which I suppose will find hardly any advocates, or the τοῖς νῦν ἐν φυλακῇ of Beza, al., it cannot surely be doubted that we are equally putting force on the Apostle's words, and that the τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν must describe the local condition of the πνεύματα *at the time when the preaching took place.* Moreover πορευθείς, as compared with ver. 22 (which Hofmann gets most lamely over, by saying that it presents no greater difficulty than the statement that Christ accompanied the Israelites through the wilderness in 1 Cor. x. 4: to which we may answer, If this were a plain statement involving such an application of the word, we might then discuss the intelligibility of it)—the part. ἀπειθήσασιν, marked off by the ποτέ as not belonging to the same time as the ἐκήρυξεν (which Hofmann shews he feels, by his impracticable attempt to connect ποτέ with ἐκήρυξεν), shew, as plainly as words can shew, that we are reading of some act of Christ which He *then, at the time described, went and did, with reference to spirits who were, at some other time* (ποτέ) *specified* (ὅτε), *in a certain state* (ἀπειθήσασι). And, which has not been sufficiently noticed, a crowning objection to this view is the use of the word πνεύμασιν, connecting ἐν ᾧ (πνεύματι) our Lord's state, with the state of those to whom He preached: a word only used of men when departed out of this life (ref.).

I. 2. Several Commentators, principally Socinian, but also Vorst., Grot., Schöttgen, al., understand by τὰ ἐν φυλ. πν. either the Gentiles, or the Jews ("sub jugo legis existentes") and Gentiles ("sub potestate diaboli jacentes:" so in both cases, Schöttg. and Amelius) together, and by ἐκήρυξεν the preaching of the Spirit of Christ by the Apostles. These expositors take the mention of the disobedient in Noah's time to

ζομένης [b] κιβωτοῦ, [c] εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, [d] τουτέστιν ὀκτὼ [e] ψυχαὶ

b Heb. xi. 7 reff. c constr., see Luke iv. 44. d Heb. ii. 14 reff. e = Acts ii. 41. vii. 14. xxvii. 37. Exod. i. 5.

[vulg-ed(with harl) Orig-int$_1$]. rec ολιγαι, with CKL[P] rel syr [Cyr$_1$ Damasc$_1$] Thl Œc: txt ABℵ vulg Orig$_1$[-int$_2$] Cypr$_2$ Aug$_2$ Vig Fulg Bede.

be merely by way of sample of the disobedient in all time, or, at least, in the time when the Apostle was writing. So Grot.: "adjungere voluit Petrus similitudinem a temporibus Noe, ut ostendat quanto res nunc melius per Christum quam tunc per Noen processerit." As Huther well says, "How this interpretation heaps on caprice upon caprice, need not be shewn." I will add, that its fautors do not appear to attempt to justify it philologically, as indeed it is plain they cannot. Every word of every clause protests against it.

II. We now come to those who understand the passage of our Lord's descent into Hades, but, offended by the idea of the possibility of salvation being opened to spirits of the disobedient kept awaiting judgment, diverge from one another and from the 'prima facie' explanation.

II. 1. Flacius, Calov., Buddæus, Wolf, Aretius, al., understand τὰ ἐν φυλ. πν. of souls awaiting condemnation, but explain ἐκήρυξεν of announcing, not salvation, but condemnation. So Hollaz (in Huther),—"fuit prædicatio Christi in inferno non evangelica, quæ hominibus tantum in regno gratiæ annunciatur, sed legalis, elenchtica, terribilis, eaque tum verbalis, qua ipsos æterna supplicia promeritos esse convincit, tum realis, qua immanem terrorem iis incussit." But, besides that κηρύσσειν, as remarked above, has, as applied to Christ and His Apostles, but the one meaning of preaching the good tidings of salvation,—besides the utter superfluity of such a 'concio damnatoria' to spirits already reserved to damnation,—what a context would such a meaning give, in the midst of a passage intended to convey consolation and encouragement by the blessed consequences of Christ's sufferings! See this well insisted on in Wiesinger's careful discussion of the opinions on our passage, p. 241.

II. 2. Some of the Fathers, as Iren. (iv. 27. 2, p. 264; v. 31. 1, p. 331; al.; see Stieren's Index, p. 1017), Tertullian, Hippolytus,—the Schoolmen, Zwingle, Calvin, al., explain ἐκήρυξεν rightly, of announcing salvation, but regard τὰ ἐν φυλ. πνεύματα as the spirits of the *just*, especially of the O. T. saints. The most extraordinary instance of this class of interpreters is Calvin, who explains φυλακή to mean "specula, sive ipse excubandi actus:" and the spirits in φυλακῇ are, according to him, those which were in waiting for Christ's salvation: "piæ animæ in spem salutis promissæ intentæ, quasi eminus eam considerarent." Then he proceeds, "Postquam dixit, Christum se mortuis manifestasse, mox addit: *quum increduli fuissent olim*; quo significat, nihil nocuisse sanctis patribus quod impiorum multitudine pæne obruti fuerint:" and regards this consideration as one calculated to console the believers, few as they were in the midst of the ungodly world. And having thus interpreted, he ingenuously confesses, "Discrepat, fateor, ab hoc sensu Græca syntaxis; debuerat enim Petrus, si hoc vellet, genitivum absolutum ponere. Sed quia apostolis novum non est liberius casum unum ponere alterius loco, et videmus Petrum hic confuse multas res simul coacervare, nec vero aliter aptus sensus elici poterat: non dubitavi ita resolvere orationem implicitam, quo intelligerent lectores, alios vocari incredulos, quam quibus prædicatum fuisse evangelium dixit." A sentence to be well remembered for many reasons.

II. 3. Suarez, Estius, Bellarmine, Luther (on Hos. iv. 2, anno 1545, quoted in Bengel), Peter Martyr, Bengel, al., assume that the words refer, not to all the unbelievers of Noah's time, but only to those who repented at the last moment when the flood was upon them. "Probabile est," says Bengel, "nonnullos ex tanta multitudine, veniente pluvia, resipuisse: cumque non credidissent dum exspectaret Deus, postea cum arca structa esset et pœna ingrueret, credere cœpisse: quibus postea Christus, eorumque similibus, se præconem gratiæ præstiterit."

II. 4. Athanasius, Ambrose, Erasmus, Calvin (Instit. ii. 16. 9), hold both kinds of prædication, the 'evangelica' to the spirits of the just, the 'damnatoria' to those of the disobedient.

One or two singular interpretations do not fall under any of the above classes: e. g. Marcion maintained that the preaching of Christ was to those whom the O. T. calls ungodly, but who were in reality better than the O. T. saints; Clem.-alex. (Strom. vi. 6, p. 762 P.), that they were the δίκαιοι κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, who were nevertheless imprisoned under idolatry.

It remains that we should enquire, whether this preaching to the imprisoned spirits by our Lord, took place between His death and His resurrection, or after the latter. The answer will very much

τοῖς [h] ἰδίοις [h] ἀνδράσιν, [6] ὡς Σάῤῥα [i] ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, [k] κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα, ἧς ἐγενήθητε [l] τέκνα [m] ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν [n] πτόησιν. [7] Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως [o] συνοικοῦντες κατὰ [p] γνῶσιν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

i = Heb. xi. 8 reff.—aor., as Gal. iv. 8. 1 Cor. ix. 20. k Gen. xviii. 12. l Gal. iv. 31. m ch. ii. 15 reff. n here only. Prov. iii. 25. 1 Macc. iii. 25 Ed-vat. [πτοη (?), ABℵ] only. (-εῖσθαι, Luke xxi. 9.) o here only. = Sir. xxv. 8, 16. p = 2 Pet. i. 5, 6.

6. υπηκουεν B(sic : see table) m vulg spec Syr æth[?] Aug₂ Fulg.
7. om οι B. for συνοικουντες κατα γνωσιν, συνομιλουντες ℵ[1]. rec συγκλη-

and quiet spirit which belongs to it): 6.] **As** (e. g.) **Sarah obeyed** (aor. It refers to her whole course of obedience considered as a completed whole: cf. reff., and John xvii. 4) **Abraham calling him lord** (ref.: ὁ δὲ κύριός μου πρεσβύτερος): **of whom ye have become** (i. e. by your implanting through faith into the family of faithful Abraham. The aor. properly refers back to the precise time when they were so made; but cannot be so expressed in English) **children, if** (the connexion of the following participles is variously taken. The worst way is with Bengel, Ernesti, al. to suppose them in apposition with ὑποτασσόμεναι above, ὡς . . . τέκνα being in a parenthesis: for there is nothing in either of the participles which finds any historical justification in the history of the holy women. Didymus, al., understand them of the manner in which ye are to become Sarah's children: Harless, Wies., al., of the sign by which your having so become is to be known: but it is perhaps better to take them as the condition on which: and so most Commentators and virtually the E. V. "as long as," rendering literally the *dum* of Beza) **ye do good, and are not afraid of any sudden fear** (to what do these words allude? As in reff., they appear to be a citation from Prov.: where it is said to him that obeys the counsels of wisdom, οὐ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν ἐπελθοῦσαν, οὐδὲ ὁρμὰς ἀσεβῶν ἐπερχομένας. This passage, the coincidence with which can hardly be fortuitous, seems to point to the objective rather than the subjective sense of πτόησις, so that φοβεῖσθαι πτόησιν is not = φοβεῖσθαι φόβον, but πτόησις is some external cause of terror. And such a meaning would suit very well with the context, in which as in ver. 14, the Apostle is often encouraging his readers to bear affliction and persecution cheerfully. So that we may interpret πτόησιν with Est., "quod dum facitis, non est quod metuatis quidquam mali: velut, ne maritis vestris displiceatis, si minus corruptæ inceditis: aut ne serviliter vos tractent, si faciles ad obsequium vos præbeatis; ut solet sexus muliebris vanis pavoribus esse obnoxius. Sed et si forte nacti estis maritos iniquiores, silentio potius ac patientia, quam multis verbis studete eorum animos lenire." Cf. Luke xxi. 9; xxiv. 37. Huther quotes from Stephanus an extraordinary explanation, "jubentur mulieres officium facere etiam cum nullus eas metus constringit, i. e. sponte et ultro." And Œc., interpreting ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι of doing good deeds of benevolence, understands this of the wives not being afraid of the account which their (unbelieving) husbands would require of them: ἐλεήμονας αὐτὰς εἶναι παραινεῖ, μηδὲν ὑποβλεπομένας τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλογισμόν. See Winer, § 32. 2. *b*, who however interprets πτόησιν subjectively). With regard to the much-disputed question whether by the preceding injunction all ornament of dress is forbidden, or only the making such ornament *the adorning*, it may safely be left to the Christian wisdom of believing women, to be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is, in this as in other similar matters. Within the limits of propriety and decorum, the common usage is the rule. There is sin in singularity, both as ministering to pride in ourselves, and as giving offence to others and discommending our holy religion. As Leighton well says, "There may be in some an affected pride in the meanness of apparel; and in others, under either neat or rich attire, a very humble unaffected mind . . . . 'Magnus qui fictilibus utitur tanquam argento; nec ille minor qui argento tanquam fictilibus,' says Seneca: Great is he who enjoys his earthenware as if it were plate, and not less great is the man to whom all his plate is no more than earthenware." 7.] ***Duty of husbands to their wives.*** **Ye husbands in like manner** (ὁμοίως, not as Est., Grot., Steiger, al., '*vicissim*,' but referring back to the πάντας τιμήσατε ch. ii. 17: cf. τιμὴν below. This has not been seen, owing to inattention to the aor. there: even Huther, who interprets ὁμοίως rightly, that there is a certain τιμή due to the wife, as to the husband and the master before, does not connect the idea with the general precept under which all these are ranged) **dwelling** (συνοικεῖν is referred by the older expositors (e. g. Jerome contra Jov. i. 7, vol. ii. p. 248, Aug. in Ps. cxlvi., vol. iv. pt. ii.,

[q] σκεύει τῷ [r] γυναικείῳ, [s] ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ [t] συγκληρονόμοις [u] χάριτος [v] ζωῆς, [w] εἰς τὸ μὴ [x] ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.

8 [y] Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες [z] ὁμόφρονες, [a] συμπαθεῖς, [b] φιλ-

q (see note.) Rom. ix. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 21. 1 Thess. iv. 4. r here only. Esth. ii. 11. Tobit ii. 11. s here only. Deut. iv. 19 only. w. τιμ., Jos. Antt. i. 7. 1. t Rom. viii. 17. Eph. iii. 6. Heb. xi. 9 only †. (-μεῖν, Sir. xxii. 23.) u = ch. i. 13. v = James i. 12 reff. w = Heb. ii. 17 reff. x Acts xxiv. 4. Rom. xv. 22. Gal. v. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 18 only †. Dan. ix. 26 Theod-Ald. only. y = here only. Xen. Cyrop. i. 4. 1. z here only (see Rom. xii. 16) †. ἐννέα κοῦρας ὁμόφρονας, Hes. Theogon. 60. ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες, Theognis 81. a here only †. Jos. Antt. xix. 7. 3. (-θεῖν, Heb. iv. 15. x. 34.) b here only †. 2 Macc. xv. 14 only. (-φία, ch. i. 22.)

ρονομοι, with ACKL[P] rel syr Jer$_1$: -μους ℵ[1]: txt Bℵ[3] m o [13] vulg spec Syr [copt (appy)] æth arm Thl Œc Aug Ambr Cassiod. ins ποικιλης bef χαριτος (see ch iv. 10) AC[2]ℵ a c Jer. rec εκκοπτεσθαι, with C[2]KL rel Thl$_2$, *ut non intercidantur* syr: txt AB[P] d j k l, ενκ. ℵ c, *ut ne impediantur* vulg spec [Ambr Aug] Jer. (C[1] uncert.) ταις προσευχαις B, *impingatis in orationibus vestris* Syr [(copt)].

8. (B has φιλαδελφοι, not φυλ., see table.)

al.) to the 'tori conjugalis consuetudo:' but for this there seems no reason, as the word is often used of the whole conjugal life: so Kypke here, "*connubio juncti vivant:* ad totum respicit vitæ consortium, in quo justo copulati matrimonio vitam transigunt. Est hæc frequentior vocis notio, quæ apud Græcos antiquiores, ni fallor, sola occurrit. Demosth. in Neæram, p. 584, scopum τοῦ συνοικεῖν esse dicit, ut liberi gignantur legitimi et ingenui, et ab hoc distinguit τὸ ἑταίρας καὶ παλλακὰς ἔχειν") **according to knowledge** (in an intelligent and reasonable manner, well aware of the ἀσθένεια spoken of below: see reff.) **with the feminine as with the weaker vessel** (γυναικείῳ is an adj. not a subst. as Wahl: see reff. For σκεῦος, instrument, applied to the wife, see ref. 1 Thess. Here the man is a σκεῦος also; both being God's instruments in His beneficent work of the multiplication of mankind. The higher use of the word as a vessel of grace, or of wrath, does not preclude the lower one which is most obvious here, where the married relation is the subject of consideration. On ἀσθενεστέρῳ, Bengel says, "comparativus: etiam vir habet infirmitatem:" and so Steiger: but this is plainly not so: the word 'weaker' being used as comparing with something which is stronger, viz. the man. Some, as Luth., Calv., Beza, Est., Grot., Hamm., E. V., join these words, ὡς ἀσθενεστ. κ.τ.λ., with ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν. But this mars the parallelism and the sense. For the Apostle prescribes two things: 1. consideration for the wife, as of the weaker sex: 2. honour for the wife, as a fellow-heir of the grace of life. Œc. carries on the same idea, of not exacting too rigid accounts, as on ver. 6: τουτέστιν, αἴσθησιν λαμβάνοντες τῆς τοῦ θήλεος κουφότητος καὶ τοῦ εὐπαραφόρου ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ εἰς μικροψυχίαν εὐολίσθου, μακρόθυμοι γίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς, μὴ λόγον ἀπαιτοῦντες πικρῶς τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῶν εἰς ταμιεῖον παρακατατεθέντων. But for this there does not seem any reason), **giving** (ἀπονέμειν, to apportion, see reff.) **honour as to those who are also** (besides being your wives) **fellow-inheritors** (with you) **of the grace of life** (i. e. God's gracious gift of life eternal: ch. i. 4, 13 suffice to clear the meaning, the former explaining κληρον., the latter, χάριτ. So that χάρις ζωῆς must not be weakened into χάρις ζῶσα with Erasm., nor into χάρις ζωοποιοῦσα with Grot. The reading συγκληρονόμοι, which it is now proved that B has not [Tischdf. however, though he assigns the ς to B[1](appy), does not think it quite free from doubt], seems to have arisen from the mistaken joining of ὡς ἀσθ. κ.τ.λ. with ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν: see var. readd.): **in order that your prayers be not hindered** (ἐγκόπτειν, ἐμποδίζειν, διακωλύειν, Hesych. The hindrance meant seems to be, that which would be occasioned by the man not giving his wife proper honour as a fellow-heir of the grace of life; in which case the peculiar promise of advantage in social united prayer would be lost: cf. Matt. xviii. 19. According to this view, the united prayers of man and wife are meant. And so most of the Commentators. Cf. Schol.-Matth., ὁ γὰρ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν θόρυβος τῶν κατὰ θεὸν ἔργων ἐμπόδιον: and Lyra, "Cum vir et uxor non sunt bene concordes, minus possunt orationi vacare, et eorum orationes sunt minus exaudibiles." De Wette understands it of losing the confidence requisite for (mutual?) prayer; Wiesinger, of the prayers of the husband alone. If ἐκκόπτεσθαι be read, it must be "be not cut off," see Rom. xi. 22, 24; 2 Cor. xi. 12).

8, 9.] *General summary exhortations to mutual forbearance and love.* 8.] **Finally** (τὸ τέλος, adverbial accusative, as μακράν, μάτην, ἀκμήν, τὴν ἀρχήν, John viii. 25, δωρεάν, &c. See Winer, § 32. 6. Œc. gives the connexion well: τί χρὴ ἰδιολο-

τῶν ἐθνῶν [i] κατειργάσθαι, [k] πεπορευμένους ἐν [l] ἀσελγείαις, [a] ἐπιθυμίαις, [m] οἰνοφλυγίαις, [n] κώμοις, [o] πότοις, καὶ [p] ἀθεμίτοις [q] εἰδωλολατρείαις· [4] [r] ἐν ᾧ [s] ξενίζονται μὴ [t] συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς [u] ἀσωτίας [v] ἀνάχυσιν,

i James i. 3 reff. k w. ἐν, Luke i. 6. 2 Pet. ii. 10. 1 Kings viii. 5. dat., Acts ix. 31 al. l Mark vii. 22. Rom. xiii. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 21 al.† Wisd. xiv. 26 only. m here only†. Xen. Œc. i. 22. Æl. V. H. iii. 14. (-γεῖν, Deut. xxi. 20. Isa. lvi. 12 F. Ald. compl. [the ver. is not found in the uncial MSS.].) n Rom. xiii. 13. Gal. v. 21 only†. Wisd. xiv. 23. 2 Macc. vi. 4 only. o here only. Gen. xix. 3. xl. 20. p Acts x. 28 only†. 2 Macc. vii. 1 al[2]. Jos. B. J. iv. 9. 10. Xen. Mem. i. 1. 9 (-ιστα). q 1 Cor. x. 14. Gal. v. 20. Col. iii. 5 only†. r constr., ch. i. 6. s = ver. 12. see Acts xvii. 20. Heb. xiii. 2 (reff.). w. ἐπί, Jos. Antt. i. 1. 2. Polyb. ii. 27. 4. διά, id. i. 49. 7. κατά, i. 33. 1. dat., i. 23. 5 al. absol., iii. 49. 1. t = here (Mark vi. 33. Acts iii. 11) only. Ps. xlix. 18. Demosth. 214. 7. u Eph. v. 18. Tit. i. 6 only. Prov. xxviii. 7. 2 Macc. iv. 6 only. (-τος, Prov. vii. 11. -τως, Luke xv. 13.) v here only†.

rec κατεργασασθαι, with KL[P] rel Œc : κατειργασασθαι, but ασ appy erased, C : txt ABℵ a Clem[1] Thl. [πορευομενους ℵ.] ονοιφλυγιοις B[1]: οινοφρυγιαις ℵ[1]. αθεμιταις C.

actual matter-of-fact element, in which we corporeally live and move for a certain time). **3.]** **For** (follows on τὸν ἐπίλοιπον χρόνον : "I say, the rest of the time, for the past time surely" &c.) **sufficient is the past time** ("μείωσις. Nam ne pristina quidem tempora debuere peccatis teri. Fastidium peccati apud resipiscentes." Bengel) **to have wrought out** (κατεργάζομαι cannot always be pressed in the sense of "to work out to an end," as distinguished from ἐργάζομαι : but this sense may fairly be insisted on here. The perf. implies that the course is closed and done, and looked back on as a standing and accomplished fact) **the will of the Gentiles** (that which the Gentiles βούλονται, would have you do. In ref. Rom. it is used of God. The N. T. line of demarcation between θέλω and βούλομαι appears to be but slender: and slenderer still that between their derivatives. We may perhaps say here, that the θέλημα, used of God, carries with it more of authority and "*willing*," βούλημα, used of man, more of persuasion, and wishing (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 9): so that the βούλημα is that which we may be overpersuaded into following, the θέλημα that which we are bound to obey. **τῶν ἐθνῶν**, used not of any national distinction, but of heathens as distinguished from Christians, shews that the majority of the readers of the Epistle had been Gentiles, among these ἔθνη, themselves. Cf. a very similar passage in Isocr. Panegyr. p. 75 D: ἄξιον δ' ἐπὶ τῆς νῦν ἡλικίας ποιήσασθαι τὴν στρατείαν, ἵν' οἱ τῶν συμφορῶν κοινωνήσαντες, οὗτοι καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύσωσι· καὶ μὴ πάντα τὸν χρόνον δυστυχοῦντες διαγάγωσιν. ἱκανὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθώς, ἐν ᾧ τί τῶν δεινῶν οὐ γέγονεν ;), **walking as ye have done** (the perf. part. connects with κατειργάσθαι : the absence of the art. gives it the slight inferential force which justifies the former assertion) **in lasciviousnesses** (outbreaks of ἀσέλγεια), **lusts** (here perhaps not general, as in ver. 2, but particular, lusts of uncleanness), **wine-bibbings** (οἰνοφλυγία ἐστὶν ἐπιθυμία οἴνου ἄπληστος, Andronicus Rhodius, περὶ παθῶν, p. 6. But from the other examples of its use in Wetst., it seems to express not only the desire, but its indulgence), **revellings** (see for a full explanation of κῶμοι, the word in Palm and Rost), **drinking-bouts** (Appian says of Sertorius, Bell. Civ. i. p. 700 (Wetst.), τὰ πολλὰ ἦν ἐπὶ τρυφῆς, γυναιξὶ καὶ κώμοις καὶ πότοις σχολάζων. Suidas gives, ποτὸς τὸ πινόμενον, πότος δὲ τὸ συμπόσιον), **and nefarious** ("quibus sanctissimum Dei jus violatur," Beng.) **idolatries** (I may remark as against the view that this Epistle was written to Jews, that this passage cannot be explained on that supposition. The Jews certainly never went so far into Gentile abominations as to justify its assertions): **4.]** **at which** ([**wherein**, viz. at] your having done with such practices, implied in the κατειργάσθαι and πεπορευμένους above: then the gen. absolute following further explains the ἐν ᾧ. ἐν, as the element in which their ξενίζεσθαι is versed. The aim of this verse is well given by Gerhard : "monuit hæc προθεραπεία ipsorum animos, ne perversis et præposteris illis impiorum judiciis ac blasphemis sermonibus turbentur, multo vero minus ad pristinorum vitiorum societatem sese pertrahi patiantur." They *must* give offence to their former companions : for this there is no help) **they are astonished** (think it strange, as E. V. see reff.), **that you run not** (the μή puts the reader on *their* footing : "when they notice that you run not") **with them** (συντρεχ., 'turmatim,' 'avide,' Bengel) **to** (εἰς, of the direction and purpose of the confluence) **the same slough** (of **ἀνάχυσις**, Strabo iii. p. 206 A, says, λέγονται δὲ ἀναχύσεις αἱ πληρούμεναι τῇ θαλάττῃ κοιλάδες ἐν ταῖς πλημμυρίσι :

...νεκ-ρους C. ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

[w] βλασφημοῦντες, [5] οἳ [x] ἀποδώσουσιν [x] λόγον τῷ [yz] ἑτοίμως [ya] ἔχοντι [b] κρῖναι [b] ζῶντας καὶ [b] νεκρούς. [6] [c] εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς [d] εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσιν μὲν [e] κατὰ [e] ἀνθρώπους [f] σαρκί, ζῶσιν δὲ [g] κατὰ [g] θεὸν [f] πνεύματι.

w absol., Acts xiii. 45. xviii. 6. 2 Macc. x. 34. x Heb. xiii. 17 reff. y Acts xxi. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 14 only. Dan. iii. 15. z as above (y). Josh. iii. 17 F(not A) compl. only. a see above (y). = Matt. viii. 16. Mark v. 23. Acts vii. 1. 1 Tim. v. 25. b 2 Tim. iv. 1. see Acts x. 42. Rom. xiv. 9. c Rom. xiv. 9. John xviii. 37 al. d constr., Rom. i. 15. Gal. i. 8. iv. 13. pass., ch. i. 25 reff. e Rom. iii. 5. 1 Cor. iii. 3. xv. 32. Gal. i. 11. iii. 15. f ch. iii. 18. g Rom. viii. 27. 2 Cor. vii. 9—11. Eph. iv. 24 only.

4. for *βλασφημουντες, και βλασφημουσιν* Cℵ[1] 27. 29 (æth).
5. om *οι αποδωσουσιν λογον* ℵ[1]. for *τω, οι* ℵ[1](corrd eadem manu). for *εχοντι, κριναι, κρινοντι* B C[1](perhaps) a 69. 137: txt AC[2]KL[P]ℵ rel.
6. *ζησωσι* ℵ[3].

æstuaries: and so *ἀναχ.* = 'sentina,' a sink, or slough, or puddle: and this is the meaning taken by Huther and Wiesinger. But Suidas interprets it *βλακεία, ἔκλυσις;* and *ἀνακεχυμένος,—ἀνειμένος, κεχαυνωμένος, ἀνετός.* Hence Gerhard takes it for 'virium exsolutio, mollities.' De Wette follows Grotius: 'profusio,' which in its etymology, though not in its ordinary acceptation, exactly answers to *ἀνάχυσις.* On the whole the local meaning is I think to be preferred, on account of the figure in *συντρεχόντων*) of profligacy (*ἀ, σώζειν*: see note on ref. Eph.), **speaking evil of you** ("jactantes convicia in vos superbiæ, singularitatis, occultæ impietatis," &c. Bengel. The early apologists testify abundantly to the fact): **5.] who** (your blasphemers. The consideration is propounded for the comfort and stay of Christians unjustly slandered) **shall render account** (reff.) **to Him that is ready** (reff.) **to judge** (aor.: once for all, decisively) **living and dead. 6.] For** (assigns a reason for the *κρῖναι νεκρούς* just mentioned) **to this end** (viz. that enunciated by the **ἵνα** which follows: see ref. John; ch. iii. 9) **to dead men also** (as well as to *living*, which is the ordinary case: **καί** carrying with it a climax,—"even to the dead") **was the gospel preached** (when, and by Whom, see below), **that they might indeed be judged** (aor.) **according to men as regards the flesh, but might live on** (pres.) **according to God as regards the spirit.** In examining into the meaning of this difficult verse, one thing may be laid down at the outset, as certain on any sure principles of exegesis: and thereby a whole class of interpretations removed out of our way. Seeing that **γάρ** binds vv. 5 and 6 logically together, and that **καὶ νεκροῖς** distinctly takes up the **νεκρούς** before in this logical connexion, all interpretations must be false which do not give **νεκροῖς** in ver. 6 the same meaning as **νεκρούς** in ver. 5: i. e. that of *dead men*, literally and simply so called: men who have died, and are in their graves. This at once rids us of all the Commentators who interpret this second *νεκροῖς* of the *dead in trespasses and sins*, so Aug., Cyril, Œc.(only as an altern., and he blames the interpretation, saying that *οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν πατέρων* so explained it, *οὐδὲν φροντίσαντες τῆς συνεχείας τῶν ἄνω, οὐδ' ὅτι αἰτιολογικῶς εἰρημένων δεῖ πρὸς τὰ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἀναφέρεσθαι.* He himself interprets it of the descent of our Lord into Hades), Bede, Erasmus, Luther, Whitby, Gerhard, al., as well as those who to gain this meaning here, distort *νεκρούς* in ver. 5 from its constant reference in that connexion, to mean the *spiritually dead*, or the *Gentiles*, as e. g. Severus in Cramer's Catena, Huss, Benson, Macknight. A second principle which we may lay down is this: that *νεκροῖς* in ver. 6 must be kept as wide in its *reference* as *νεκρούς* in ver. 5: i. e., that it must not be interpreted as applying merely to the blasphemers of the Christians who should have died before the judgment, or merely to such blasphemed Christians themselves as shall have then died, or merely to the spirits in prison of ch. iii. 19, but must be treated as a general assertion in the literal meaning of *νεκροῖς*. The want of the article does not justify any limitation of this word: for the art. is also wanting before *νεκρούς* in ver. 5, which indisputably is universal in its reference. At the same time, seeing that *νεκροῖς* asserts that which it asserts of the *genus*, the *ground* of so doing may be the occurrence of it with reference to certain forementioned instances, though those instances themselves are not the subjects here. So that we cannot remove from consideration these last-mentioned interpretations, but must deal with them seriatim. First then comes that of Hofmann (Schriftb. ii. 1. 339—341), al., that the Apostle comforts his readers in persecution and slander, by the thought that bodily death would not exempt their adversaries from the divine judgment. In this case *νεκροῖς* would mean "*now dead*," and *εὐηγγελίσθη* would point to the time

7 Πάντων δὲ τὸ [h] τέλος [i] ἤγγικεν· [j] σωφρονήσατε οὖν

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

h = Matt. xxiv. 6, 14. 1 Cor. xv. 24. i = Matt. iii. 2. Rom. xiii. 12. Heb. x. 25. James v. 8 al. j Mark v. 15. Luke viii 35. Rom. xii. 3. 2 Cor. v. 13. Tit. ii. 6 only †.

when the gospel was preached to them, before they died. This of itself is a very weighty objection. Such a divulsion of the verb from its object by an intervening change of state and time was precisely that against which we protested in τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν ἐκήρυξεν above, ch. iii. 19. But even granting that this might be so, other as great objections remain. For how does it consist with the ἑτοίμως ἔχειν above, that the Apostle should assume the deaths of these persecutors as a matter of course, to happen before the Lord's coming to judgment? Again, even granting such assumption, the number of their persecutors who would be amenable to punishment would thus be confined to those to whom the Gospel had been preached: any who might never have heard it would, by this reasoning, escape such judgment. Again, even supposing that all such objections were removed, the point established would be an utterly unworthy one. For who ever thought, that the fact of death before the Lord's coming would exempt any man from judgment? And to what purpose would it be, to speak to the readers in so marked a manner of their *dead* persecutors, in the midst of exhortations concerning their behaviour amidst their living ones? Next, we have the view (Calv., al.) that the particular case, on which the general νεκροῖς is founded, is that of such *persecuted Christians* as should decease before the Lord's coming. To this the first of the before raised objections, that νεκροῖς must mean '*now* dead,' and εὐηγγ. refer to a *former* preaching when they were alive, applies in full force. And this I should hold to be fatal to it. It must be confessed, that it agrees better with the context than the last: for while that finds no assignable contextual justification, it might be said in this case, that for this very reason was the Gospel preached to those among you who have suffered death at the hands of persecutors,—even hereunto were they called,—that they might indeed be judged, condemned, by human persecution, as regards the flesh, but notwithstanding might live eternally with God as regards the spirit. Still I conceive we are not at liberty to receive it, on account of the above objection. If καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη may mean, "the Gospel was preached to some during their lifetime, who are now dead," exegesis has no longer any fixed rule, and Scripture may be made to prove any thing. (Bengel takes it in *both* the last-mentioned references: to the persecutors, and to the Christians.) It remains that we consider the view, that the persons pointed at are those spirits in prison to whom our Lord went and preached, ch. iii. 19. This supposition, but always with the protest raised above, that νεκροῖς does not refer only to these, but to the dead generally, and that these are only the occasion of the general assertion, is also adopted by Wiesinger. And it may be thus defended: granted, that the γάρ of our verse assigns a reason, not for the persecutors giving an account to the judge of the quick and dead, nor for the Christians bearing up under the prospect of martyrdom,—it will follow of necessity that it assigns a reason for the κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς which it immediately follows: or rather, for the νεκρούς portion of that clause. Our Lord is ready to judge the dead: and with reason: for even they have not been without opportunity of receiving His gospel: as the example which was adduced in ch. iii. 19 shews. For this end the gospel was preached even to the dead,—that they might—not indeed escape the universal judgment on human sin, which is physical death,—but, *that they might be judged* (aor.; be in the state of the completed sentence on sin, which is death after the flesh) *according to* (as) *man as regards the flesh* (this first clause following ἵνα being the subordinate one, of the state which the εὐηγγελίσθη left remaining), but (notwithstanding) *might live* (pres.; of a state to continue) *according to God* (a life with God, and divine) *as regards the spirit:* so that the relation of these two clauses with μέν and δέ is precisely as in Rom. viii. 10, εἰ δὲ χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην: where the former clause in the apodosis is not the consequence of the protasis, but an abiding fact, seeming to militate against, but really not hindering that consequence. And this interpretation I adopt, believing it to be the only one which satisfies the philological conditions of the sentence: which justifies the γάρ as accounting for the κρῖναι νεκρούς: the καί, as taking up, and bringing into prominence and climax the νεκροῖς: the νεκροῖς, as used in precisely the same sense as in the last verse, and contemporary with the verb which governs it: the εὐηγγελίσθη, as grounded on a previously announced fact, ch. iii. 19: the aim and end introduced by the ἵνα, which on this, and on no other rendering, receives meaning and perspi-

καὶ [k] νήψατε [l] εἰς προσευχάς, 8 [m] πρὸ πάντων τὴν [n] εἰς [o] ἑαυτοὺς [n] ἀγάπην [p] ἐκτενῆ [q] ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη [r] καλύπτει

k 1 Thess. v. 6, 8. 2 Tim. iv. 5. ch. i. 13. v. 8 only †.
l = Eph. vi. 18.
m James v. 12.
n Rom. v. 8. Eph. i. 15. Col. i. 4.
o = (see note.) Heb. iii 13 reff.
p here only †. (see ch. i. 22 reff.) Polyb. xxii. 5. 4.
q = ch. ii. 12 reff.
r James v. 20. Prov. x. 12.

7. om *και* ℵ[1]. rec ins *τας* bef *προσευχας*, with KL[P] rel (Polyc) Thl Œc: om ABℵ b[1] c d j k o (13) [Cyr_1].

8. rec aft *παντων* ins *δε*, with KL[P] rel [vulg](with fuld demid) spec syr coptt [$Antch_1$] Thl Œc Bede: om A(appy) Bℵ 13 am(with harl tol) arm [Cyr_1] Aug_2. elz ins *η* bef *αγαπη*, with a b f g h m [Cyr_1 $Antch_1$] Thl: om ABKL[P]ℵ rel $Clem\text{-}rom_1$ $Clem_3$ Chr_2 Œc. rec *καλυψει*, with L[P]ℵ rel æth Œc: txt ABK a c h o 13. 36 vulg syrr copt arm $Clem\text{-}rom_1$ $Clem_3$ Cyr_1 Chr_2 $Antch_1$ $Tert_1$ [Hil].

cuity. And so, in the main, with minor deviations, the more accurate of the modern Commentators: Steiger, De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger, Weiss.

7—V. 11.] *General exhortations with reference to behaviour within the Christian body, in contemplation of the approaching end.* This portion of the Epistle falls into three sections: 7—11, *Christian and social duties*, in consideration of the end being at hand: 12—19, *Christian bearing of suffering*, in the same consideration: v. 1—11, *ecclesiastical and general mutual ministrations: passing off* into fervent *general exhortations and aspirations.* 7.] **But** (the connexion is close with what had gone before: the ἑτοίμως ἔχοντι of ver. 5 is in the Apostle's mind: and he passes, with it before him, from considerations external to the church, to those affecting its internal condition) **the end of all things** (not, '*of all men*:' nor as Œc. altern. is τέλος, the τέλος πάντων προφητῶν· τοῦτο δὲ ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ, ὁ χριστός: but simply *the end*, as in reff. Observe the emphatically prefixed πάντων, almost bearing the sense of τούτων πάντων: as Bengel: "Finis adeoque etiam petulantiæ malorum et passionum piorum") **is at hand** (on this being the constant expectation of the apostolic age, see Acts i. 7, note: 1 Thess. iv. 15, note): **be therefore of temperate mind** (see note on 1 Tim. ii. 9), **and be sober unto** (with a view to) **prayers** (the τάς before προσευχάς, which Tischdf. in his 7th edition has again inserted [not in edn. 8], as probably omitted in AB &c., because its force was not perceived, may just as well be regarded as an insertion owing to the plural seeming strange, which has also led to the correction into προσευχήν in ms. 13. Possibly Polycarp's νήφοντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχάς, ad Phil. 7, p. 1012, led to the change. At all events, where subjective considerations are so equivocal, it is our simple duty to follow the most ancient testimonies),

8]. **above all things** (πρὸ πάντων, as Wies. well remarks, not placing love above prayer, but because all social life and duty must presuppose love as its necessary bond and condition. Here again it is just as likely that the δέ was inserted because there seemed to be no immediate connexion, as that it was omitted to produce that connexion), **having your love towards one another** (on ἑαυτούς in this sense, see note, Col. iii. 13) **intense** (see ch. i. 22. "Amor jam præsupponitur: ut sit vehemens, præcipitur." Beng.): **because love covereth a multitude of sins** (from ref. Prov., except that there it is כָּל־פְּשָׁעִים, all sins. The LXX have translated this word wrongly πάντας τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας. De Wette denies the reference, seeing that if St. Peter had cited from the Heb., he would in all probability have written πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας, or rather πάντα τὰ ἀδικήματα, as in Prov. xvii. 9: and thinks, on account of the verbal correspondence with ref. James, that the expression was a proverb in common use. But even if so, there can be no reasonable doubt that Prov. x. 12 was the source of it: so that it comes to nearly the same thing. As to the meaning, the words here are used in a different reference from that in St. James, where see note. Here it is the hiding of offences (both from one another and in God's sight: see below) by mutual forbearance and forgiveness, which is meant. This has been recently denied by De Wette and Huther, the former understanding the sins rather as those of the Christian body, which mutual love keeps back from being committed, and the latter not excluding the other meaning. They would understand the words, as of old Œc., ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἔλεος, τὸν θεὸν ἡμῖν ἵλεων ποιεῖ, and many Commentators both Romanist (not Estius) and Protestant, that love causes God to overlook a multitude of sins. This they do partly on account of ἁμαρτιῶν, which they maintain cannot well be applied to the mutual offences of common life (see however Matt. xviii. 15, ἐὰν ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου) and partly on account of ὅτι, which "indicare videtur incitamentum aliquod, quo Christianus amor

[s] πλῆθος [s] ἁμαρτιῶν. 9 [t] φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους [u] ἄνευ [v] γογγυσμοῦ· 10 ἕκαστος [w] καθὼς ἔλαβεν [x] χάρισμα, εἰς [o] ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ [y] διακονοῦντες ὡς [z] καλοὶ [a] οἰκονόμοι [b] ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ· 11 εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς [c] λόγια θεοῦ· εἴ τις [d] διακονεῖ, [e] ὡς [ef] ἐξ [f] ἰσχύος ἧς [g] χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός· ἵνα [h] ἐν πᾶσιν [i] δοξάζηται ὁ [i] θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ [k] δόξα καὶ τὸ [l] κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

s Ezek. xxviii 18.
t 1 Tim. iii. 2. Tit. i. 8 only †. (-νία, Heb. xiii. 2.)
u ch. iii. 1 reff.
v John vii. 12. Acts vi. 1. Phil. ii. 14 only. Exod. xvi. 7, 9.
w = Mark iv. 33. Acts xi. 29. Num. xxvi. 54.
x Rom. i. 11. xii. 6. 1 Cor. i. 7 al.†
y trans., ch. i. 12 reff.
z = John x. 11. 1 Tim. iv. 6. 2 Tim. ii. 3.
a = 1 Cor. iv. 1. Tit. i. 7.
b Heb. ii. 4 reff.
c Acts vii. 38. Rom. iii. 2. Heb. v. 12 only. Isa. v. 24.
d absol., 1 Tim. iii. 10, 13.† (so διακονία, Rom. xii. 7.)
e 2 Cor. ii. 17.
f Mark xii. 30 ‖ L., 33.
g 2 Cor. ix. 10 only. 3 Kings iv. 7 bis. Judith xii. 2 al.
h = 1 Tim. iii. 11.
i ver. 16. Luke v. 25, 26 al. fr. in gospp. Acts iv. 10. Gal. i. 24 al.
k Jude 25 reff.
l in doxoll., 1 Tim. vi. 16. ch. v. 11. Jude 25. Rev. i. 6. v. 13.

9. rec *γογγυσμων* (*see Phil* ii. 14), with KL[P] rel Œc : txt ABℵ a b d 13 vulg spec syrr [sah arm(appy) Damasc-ms] Thl Fulg.
11. [for *ης*, *ως* KLP m.] om *εστιν* A d k l 13 arm [Damasc-ms].

commendatur" (Hottinger in De W.). And doubtless there is something in this latter consideration, especially when we remember that the nearness of the divine judgment is a pressing motive throughout these exhortations. I do not see why we should not take the saying in its widest reference, understanding it primarily perhaps of forgiveness, but then also of that prevention of sin by kindliness of word and deed, and also that intercession for sin in prayer, which are the constant fruits of fervent love. It is a truth from which we need not shrink, that every sin which love hides from man's sight, is hidden in God's sight also. There is but One efficient cause of the hiding of sin: but mutual love *applies* that cause: *draws the universal cover over the particular sin.* This meaning, as long as it is not perverted into the thought that love towards others covers a man's own sin 'ex promerito,' need not and should not be excluded):—

9.] **hospitable towards one another** (see besides reff., Rom. xii. 13. "Loquitur non de pomposa hospitalitate Luc. xiv. 12, . . . sed de Christiana illa et sancta hospitalitate, qua peregrinos egenos, maxime vero propter religionis veræ professionem exules Christiani ex sincera caritate promte in sedes suas recipiunt, eos amanter et benigne complectuntur, tanquam Christi membra et ecclesiæ concives fovent" &c. Gerhard) **without murmuring** (see ref. Phil. and note. The opposite to **γογγυσμός** in hospitality is simple open-heartedness, Rom. xii. 8: the consequence of it, "occulta maledicentia, odiosa exprobratio beneficiorum," as Gerhard here):

10.] And this is to be so, not merely in the interchange of this world's good offices, but also in the communication of the gifts of the Spirit, which are the common endowment of the whole body, individual Christians being only the stewards of them. **Each man even as** (in whatever quality and quantity: but the subsequent injunctions seem more to regard the quality than the quantity. It is otherwise in Eph. iv. 7; Rom. xii. 3. The **καθώς** has no reference to the *manner* of reception,—"Sicut gratis accepimus, ita gratis demus," Lorinus in Huther) **he received a gift of grace** (see Rom. xii. 6 ff.: 1 Cor. xii. 4, 28. **χάρισμα**, anarthrous, any one of the gifts known by that name), **to each other** (see above ver. 8: the **ἑαυτούς** here brings up strikingly the idea that all are members of one body) **ministering it** (**διακονεῖν**, transitive, as in ch. i. 12: ministering to the need of others; his store out of which he ministers being that gift thus bestowed upon him) **as** (being: or, as becometh: see ch. i. 14) **good** (reff.) **stewards** (reff., there is most likely a reference to our Lord's parable of the talents) **of the various** (see this illustrated 1 Cor. xii. 4; Matt. xxv. 15; Luke xix. 13) **grace of God.**

11.] And this both in speaking and acting. **If any one speaketh** (as a *προφήτης* or *διδάσκαλος*, see 1 Cor. xii. 8, 10, where the several branches of this gift are laid out), **speaking** (understand **λαλοῦντες**, from the former construction, not **λαλείτω**) **as oracles** (not, "the oracles;" the meaning is not, speaking in accord with Scripture, but, speaking what he does speak, as God's sayings, not his own: as a steward, "non liberalis de proprio sed de alieno," as Gerh. on the last verse. On **λόγια**, see note, ref. Heb.) **of God: if any one ministereth** (in Rom. xii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28, we have the several parts of this **διακονία** laid out), (**διακονοῦντες**) **as** (see above) **out of** (as his store and power of ministration) **the power** (thus to minister) **which God bestoweth** (**ἐπιχορηγέω** is commoner than the simple word: cf. 2 Pet. i. 11; 2 Cor. ix. 10; Gal.

[12] Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ [m] ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν [n] πυρώσει [o] πρὸς [p] πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένῃ, ὡς [q] ξένου ὑμῖν [r] συμβαίνοντος, [13] ἀλλὰ [s] καθὸ [t] κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ χριστοῦ

m ver. 4 reff. n Rev. xviii. 9, 18 only. Prov. xxvii. 21. o = 1 Cor. x. 11. xii. 7. 2 Cor. i. 20. viii. 19 al. p Luke iv. 13. 1 Tim. vi. 9 al. Sir. xxvii. 5. q = Acts xvii. 18. Heb. xiii. 9. Wisd. xvi. 2, 3, 16. r = & constr., Mark x. 32. (Luke xxiv. 14.) Acts iii. 10. xx. 19. (xxi. 35.) 1 Cor. x. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 22 only. Josh. ii. 23. s Rom. viii. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 12 bis only. Levit. ix. 5 B. t Rom. xii. 13. Gal. vi. 6. Phil. iv. 15 al. Wisd. vi. 25. Polyb. ii. 32. 8 al.

13. elz καθως: txt ABKL[P]א rel Clem₁ Did₁ Thl Œc. (B does not om του as Btly: see table.)

iii. 5; Col. ii. 19: and ἐπιχορηγία Phil. i. 19; Eph. iv. 16. From signifying the supply of means to furnish a chorus for the public performances at Athens, it came to mean generally, to *supply*, or *furnish*): **that** (aim and end of all this, as of every act both of the Christian community and of the Christian man) **in all things** (not, as De Wette, in all of you as His organs, referring to John xiii. 31, xvii. 10: but as in ref. The fact that all things are referred to God and done as of and to Him, is His being glorified in the Christian church. Œc. gives as an altern., ἐν πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν, which is still more in fault) **God may be glorified through Jesus Christ** ("sicut a Deo per Christum omnia beneficia ad nos descendunt, ita quoque . . . per Christum omnia ad Dei gloriam referri debent." Gerh.), **to whom** (viz. to God, as the main subject of the foregoing, and also because ἡ δόξα refers back to δοξάζηται. Grot., Calov., Steiger, al. refer the words to Christ, which is not so natural here, seeing that διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ is introduced only secondarily. The case is very similar to Heb. xiii. 21, where see note. See similar doxologies, ch. v. 11; Rom. xi. 36; Eph. iii. 21) **is the glory and the might** (exactly so in Rev. i. 6; see also ib. v. 13) **to the ages of the ages** (i. e., for ever and ever, see note, 1 Tim. i. 17). **Amen** (is, as Harl., not a note of conclusion, but of strong emotion of heart).

12—19.] *Exhortations* (see summary above) *in reference to the trial of affliction which they were to undergo:* and that, in view of the end of things. The section falls into three parts: 1) vv. 12, 13,—these sufferings, as participation in Christ's sufferings, are to be rejoiced in, as in prospect of participation of His glory also: 2) 14—16—if really sufferings for Christ, the glory of Christ already rests on you: take care then that they *be verily* sufferings for Him: 3) 17, 18, these sufferings are a part of the coming judgment which begins at the house of God. Then ver. 19 concludes. This passage is no repetition of ch. iii. 13—iv. 6, which treated of their sufferings with reference to their inflictors: whereas this proceeds wholly on reference to a Christian's own inner hopes, and considerations within the church itself. 12, 13.] See above.

12.] **Beloved** (so ch. ii. 11; here it begins an affectionate address in which comfort and joy is about to be introduced), **be not astonished at** (see on ver. 4: think it not a thing alien from you, in which you are not at home. St. Peter himself ἐξενίζετο at our Lord's sufferings, when he said Ἵλεώς σοι, κύριε. On the construction with dat. of reference, cf. Brasidas, Thuc. iv. 85, θαυμάζω δὲ τῇ τε ἀποκλείσει μου τῶν πυλῶν, καὶ εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.: and Winer, § 31. 1. *f*) **the passing through the fire** (πύρωσις, lit. *burning:* in its later use, smelting, trying of metal by fire: cf. Ps. lxv. 10 LXX, ἐπύρωσας ἡμᾶς, ὡς πυροῦται τὸ ἀργύριον: Prov. xxvii. 21, δοκίμιον ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσῷ πύρωσις. See also Rev. iii. 18. Œc. says, πύρωσιν τὰς θλίψεις εἰπών, ἐνέφηνεν ὡς διὰ δοκιμασίαν αὐτοῖς αὗται) **which is taking place** (γινομένῃ (not τῇ γινομένῃ) may be rendered "taking place," as predicate after πυρώσει: so that the object of their astonishment was τὸ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς πύρωσιν γίνεσθαι: the sentence would thus stand, "at the πύρωσις in your case happening for a πειρασμός to you." But this is not grammatically necessary, and would be pragmatically hardly justifiable: because it would take the occurrence of the πύρωσις for granted, and make its *purpose* alone matter of astonishment: which was not so) **in your case** (ἐν ὑμῖν is rendered "among you" by De Wette and Huther (einige in eurer Mitte betreffende, De W.), and this may be: we can hardly say with Wiesinger that it is afterwards treated as a trial for all: the εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε and εἰ (τις πάσχει) ὡς χριστιανός necessarily assume that there were exceptions from the supposition. But I prefer the other rendering, as the Apostle evidently is in this and the next verse speaking generally) **for a trial to you** (ὑμῖν, dat. commodi), **as if** (explanatory of ξενίζεσθε) **some strange thing were happening to you** (συμβαίνοντος, as Bengel, "temere:" were falling by chance on you: opposed to πρὸς πειρασμὸν γινομένῃ, done with a purpose, by One who knows how to serve that purpose): 13.] **but in as far as** (καθό, not "*in that,*" "*inasmuch as,*" E. V., nor

u ch. i. 11 reff.
v ch. i. 7 reff.
w see ch. v. 1.
x Matt. v. 12. Rev. xix. 7. see John viii. 56. ch. i. 8.
y ch. i. 6 reff.
z Matt. v. 11.
a = Luke x. 6. Acts iv. 33. (Rom. iii. 22.)

[u] παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ [v] ἐν τῇ [vw] ἀποκαλύψει τῆς [w] δόξης αὐτοῦ [x] χαρῆτε [xy] ἀγαλλιώμενοι. [14] εἰ [z] ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι χριστοῦ, [z] μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα [a] ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς [b] ἀναπαύεται. [15] μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν [c] πασχέτω ὡς [d] φονεὺς ἢ [e] κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιός, ἢ ὡς

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

b = and w. ἐπί, here only. (Matt. xi. 29. 1 Cor. xvi. 18 al.) Isa. xi. 2.* c see ch. iii. 13. d Matt. xxii. 7. Acts iii. 14. vii. 52. xxviii. 4. Rev. xxi. 8 xxii. 15 only †. Wisd. xii. 5 only. e = Matt. vi. 19 al. Exod. xxii. 7. see 2 Pet. iii. 10. f ch. ii. 12 reff.

14. om εν ℵ[1] l. aft δοξης ins και δυναμεως A[P] a c g k 13. 36 vulg-ed[with demid harl tol] syr sah [æth arm] Ath$_1$ Did$_1$ [Antch$_1$ Damasc-ms] Cypr$_2$: και της δυναμεως αυτου ℵ(ℵ[3] disapproving αυτου): om BKL rel am(with [fuld] lux) Syr Clem$_1$ [Ephr$_1$ Thl] Œc Tert Fulg$_1$. επαναπαυεται A [: επαναπεπαυεται] ℵ[3](Treg) c: επαναπεπαυται ℵ[3](Tischdf, expr [who cites for this readg 13 Damasc-ms and the fathers given under αναπεπαυται]): αναπεπαυται (see 2 Cor vii. 13) b d f g h k o 13 Ath Did Ephr Antch. rec at end ins κατα μεν αυτους βλασφημειται κατα δε υμας δοξαζεται, with KL[P] rel am(with harl tol) syr-w-ast sah Thl Œc Cypr$_2$: om ABℵ a c d 13 vulg-ed (with fuld demid) Syr copt æth arm [Ephr$_1$] Tert$_1$.

quando, Pott: see reff.) **ye are partakers with the sufferings of Christ** (i.e. have a share, in your own persons, of those sufferings which He personally bare: cf. 2 Cor. iv. 10; Phil. iii. 10; Heb. xiii. 13 &c. It is not the sufferings of Christ mystical in His Body the church (cf. Col. i. 24) which are meant: in these the readers might bear their part, but could hardly be said κοινωνεῖν), **rejoice, that** (ἵνα simply of the scope of that joy, as the preparation for what follows) **ye may also at** (in, i.e. "in the day or time of:" not to be taken with χαρῆτε, as indicating that at which or because of which the joy takes place) **the revelation of His glory rejoice** (aor.: χαίρετε before, of the habit of life; now χαρῆτε, of the single event of that day) **exulting** ("quia prius illud cum dolore et tristitia mixtum est, secundum cum exultatione conjungit." Calv.). 14—16.] See the summary above, at ver. 12.

14.] **If ye are reproached in** [i.e. in the matter of, for] **the name of Christ** (see Matt. v. 11, from which the words are adopted, as also ch. iii. 14. The word there added, ψευδόμενοι, comes below, vv. 15, 16. On ὀνειδ. Bengel says, "probrum putabant gentes si quem appellarunt Christianum, ver. 16." But probably the reference is more general, and Calv. is right, "probrorum meminit, quoniam plus sæpe acerbitatis in se habent quam bonorum jactura, vel etiam tormenta et cruciatus corporis: itaque nihil est quod ingenuos animos magis frangat." And ἐν ὀνόματι χριστοῦ also must have a wider sense: on account of your confession of Christ in word and deed, as De Wette: cf. ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι χριστοῦ ἐστέ, Mark ix. 41), **blessed are ye** (cf. ch. iii. 14: blessed, and that even now), **because the Spirit of glory and that of God** (the Apostle does not mean, by repeating the art., two different spirits, but identifies the same Spirit under two different denominations: the Spirit of glory, which is also the Spirit of God: "qui idem Spiritus Dei." Winer, § 20. 1. *c*, compares Thuc. i. 126, ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τῇ μεγίστῃ ἑορτῇ: and Plato, Rep. viii. 565 D, περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερόν, both of which however want the καί. Huther strangely takes τὸ τῆς δόξης alone, independent of πνεῦμα, as a periphrasis of δόξα: Bengel takes τῆς δόξης as concrete, "ut sit appellatio Christi, Jac. ii. 1," and remarks, "ut innuatur, Spiritum Christi eundem esse Spiritum Dei Patris") **resteth upon you** (from ref. Isa.: on you, as on Him: cf. also Num. xi. 25, 26; 4 Kings ii. 15. ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς, prægn., "demissus in vos requiescit in vobis," as Wahl: not, as Huther, "the construction of the prep. with the acc. denotes the living operation of the Spirit on him upon whom He rests:" for no such idea as living operation, however true the fact may be, is contained in ἀναπαύεται).

It is of course possible that the clause which follows in the rec. (see var. readd.) may have fallen out by similarity of endings, ἀναπαύεται . . . . δοξάζεται: but in judging of this as a likelihood, we must remember that not only the three great MSS. ABℵ omit it, but so many of the ancient versions, as to make it very improbable that it has been thus overlooked: and its very glossematic appearance, to explain τῆς δόξης, is against it.

15, 16.] *Negative, and positive, resumptions and enlargements of ἐν ὀνόματι χριστοῦ.* 15.] In the name of Christ, I say: **for let no one of you suffer** (reproach or persecution: suffer in any way) **as** (being) **a murderer, or a malefactor** (as opposed to ἀγαθοποιῶν, ch. iii. 17), **or as** (the re-

[g] ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος· 16 εἰ δὲ ὡς [h] χριστιανός, μὴ [i] αἰσχυνέσθω, [k] δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν [k] θεὸν ἐν τῷ [l] ὀνόματι τούτῳ. 17 ὅτι ὁ [m] καιρὸς [n] τοῦ [o] ἄρξασθαι τὸ [p] κρῖμα [o] ἀπὸ τοῦ [q] οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ [r] τέλος τῶν [s] ἀπειθούντων τῷ [t] τοῦ θεοῦ [t] εὐαγγελίῳ; 18 καὶ [u] εἰ ὁ

g here only † (not found elsw.). h Acts xi. 26. xxvi. 28 only. i Luke xvi. 3. 2 Cor. x. 8. Phil. i. 20. 1 John ii. 28 only. Jer. xii. 13. Sir. xlii. 1.
k ver. 11. l = Mark ix. 41. Rev. iii. 1. m w. inf., Heb. xi. 15 reff. Eccl. iii. 2, &c. n gen., Luke i. 57. ii. 6. xxii. 6. Acts xiv. 9. Winer, § 44. 4, a. o Matt. xx. 8. Luke xxiv. 27, 47. [John viii. 9.] Acts i. 22. viii. 35 al. Ezek. ix. 6. p Acts xxiv. 25. Heb. vi. 2. Rev. xx. 4. q = Heb. iii. 6 reff. r = Heb. vi. 8 reff. s ch. ii. 7, 8 reff. constr., ch. iii: 1. t Rom. xv. 16. 2 Cor. xi. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8, 9. u Prov. xi. 31.

15. *αλλοτριεπ.* Bℵ [d]: *αλλοτριος επισκ.* A m [Ephr$_1$].
16. *χρηστιανος* ℵ(but corrd). rec (for *ονοματι*) *μερει*, with KL[P] rel Thl: txt ABℵ m 13 vss Ephr$_1$ Cyr[-p$_1$] Œc Tert$_1$ Aug Promiss.
17. om *ὁ* Aℵ c d j. [for *αφ'*] *απο* B. *υμων* A[2]ℵ[1] c j m æth[-rom(Tischdf)] Thl Œc-comm. aft *τω* ins *λογω* ℵ[1]: but "prima manus puncta imposuit." (Tischdf.)

petition of *ὡς* separates the following word from the foregoing, as belonging to a separate class) **a prier into other men's matters** (*ὁ ἐπισκεπτόμενος τὰ ἀλλότρια.* "Hanc explicationem," says Gerhard, "probat 1) ipsa vocis compositio, 2) veterum expositio, Tert. Cypr. Aug. (Œc., *ὁ τὰ ἀλλότρια περιεργαζόμενος*), 3) temporis et loci circumstantia. Procul dubio quidam Christiani, ex incogitantia, temeritate et levitate, in actiones infidelium utpote vicinorum suorum curiosius inquirebant, eas proprio arbitrio redarguebant, ac judices eorum esse volebant, quod non pertinebat ad eorum vocationem." Wies. suggests that the word probably alludes to the *ἐπίσκοπος* of the church, combining it with *ἀλλοτριο-*, to shew the incongruity). 16.] **But if** (he suffer) **as** (being) **a Christian** (see reff. The word appears here, as in Acts xxvi. 28, to be used as carrying contempt, from the mouth of an adversary) **let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name** (viz. that of *χριστιανός*: at, or in, the fact that he is counted worthy to suffer by such a name. This seems better, with Wies., al., than to take *ὀνόματι* as = *μέρει*, the word substituted for it in the later MSS., as "causa nominata," "behalf" E. V., "regard, matter," as most Commentators. Even in ref. Mark, *ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι* does not lose its allusion to the *ὄνομα* itself: see there. On the sense, Bengel well remarks, "Poterat Petrus antitheti vi dicere, honori sibi ducat: sed honorem Deo resignandum esse docet").

17—19.] See summary at ver. 12. The thought which lies at the root, is this: all men must come under the judgment of God. His own family He brings first under it, chastising them in this life: let then those who suffer for His sake glorify Him for it, as apprehending their part in His family, and as mindful of the terrible lot of those whom His judgment shall find impenitent and unchastised. It is this latter thought, the escape from the weight of God's hand (ch. v. 6), and not (Gerh.) the thought of the terrible vengeance which God will take on their persecutors, which is adduced as the second ground of comfort to the persecuted Christians. 17.] **Because** (grounds the *δοξαζέτω*, and the whole behaviour implied in it) **it is the season** (now: "the time is come," as E. V.) **of the judgment** (nouns in *-μα* and *-σις* became very much confounded in later Greek: witness *καύχημα*, sometimes hardly distinguishable from *καύχησις*, even in the passages where we have maintained the concrete meaning, 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3. And *κρῖμα* must very often be simply rendered "judgment," "act of judging:" cf. reff.) **beginning at** (*ἀπό*, reff.: and proceeding onward from) **the house of God** (explained in the next clause (*ἀφ' ἡμῶν*) to mean the church, the temple of living stones, the *οἶκος πνευματικός* of ch. ii. 5. The reference is to prophecies like Jer. xxv. 15 ff., especially ver. 29: xlix. 12: Ezek. ix. 6: Amos iii. 2. "Hanc sententiam ex trita et perpetua Scripturæ doctrina sumpsit Petrus: idque mihi probabilius est, quam quod alii putant, certum aliquem locum notari." Calv. Wiesinger reminds us that it is hardly possible that the destruction of Jerusalem was *past*, when these words were written: if that had been so, it would hardly have been said, *ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι*): **but if first** (it begin) **at us** (= *τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ*, cf. Heb. iii. 6. The argument, 'a minori ad majus,' see expanded above. Cf. our Lord's question, Luke xxiii. 31, *εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται;*), **what** (will be) **the end of them that disobey** (reff.) **the gospel of God** (*τοῦ θεοῦ* prefixed to *εὐαγγ.* for emphasis: q. d. "the blessed tidings of the very God who is to judge them." Bengel's summary is excellent: "Judicium, initio tolerabilius,

v Acts xiv. 18. xxvii. 7, 8, 16. Rom. v. 7 only †. Wisd. ix. 16 BC. (μόγις, AN.) Sir. xxi. 20 al. w pres., see ch. iii. 21 reff. x Jude 4 reff. y 1 Tim. i. 9. l. c. (Jude 15.) z = 1 Cor. iii. 7, 21. Phil. ii. 12. iv. 1 al. a see ch. iii. 18. b see ch. iii. 17. c = 1 Cor. i. 9. x. 13. 2 Cor. i. 18. 1 Thess. v. 24. 2 Thess. iii. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 13 al. d here only. 2 Kings xxii. 32. Judith ix. 12. Sir. xxiv. 8. 2 Macc. i. 24 only. e Psa. xxx. 5. Luke xxiii. 46. = Acts xiv. 23. xx. 32. f here only †. (-ποιός, ch. ii. 14.) g = Acts xi. 30. 1 Tim. v. 17, 19. Tit. i. 5. James v. 14. h = Heb. xiii. 19, 22 al. i here only.

δίκαιος [v] μόλις [w] σώζεται, ὁ [xy] ἀσεβὴς καὶ [y] ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται; [19] [z] ὥςτε καὶ οἱ [a] πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ [b] θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ [c] πιστῷ [d] κτίστῃ [e] παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν [f] ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

V. [1] [g] Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν [h] παρακαλῶ ὁ [i] συμ-

18. ins δε bef ασεβης B[1] 137 syr. ins ο bef αμαρτωλος Aℵ 1 3. 95[1]-6.

19. rec ins ως bef πιστω, with KL[P] rel syr Thl Œc Hil$_1$: om ABℵ d 13 vulg copt [æth arm] Ath$_1$. rec εαυτων, with m [(before ψυχ.) 13(e sil)]: om B: txt AKL[P]ℵ rel Thl Œc. αγαθοποιιαις A b[1] d o 13 vulg syrr [arm].

Chap. V. 1. rec om ουν, with KL[P]rel copt Thl Œc: ins ABℵ a o 36. 69. 137 vulg syr-w-ast [arm Cyr$_1$] Jer$_1$.—in ℵ the ο is written over the traces of a τ. rec ins τους bef εν υμιν, with KL[P]ℵ rel [vulg spec syrr copt Cyr-p$_1$ Thl Œc]: om AB a c

sensim ingravescit. Pii sua parte perfuncti cum immunitate spectant miserias impiorum: impii dum pios affligunt, suam mensuram implent et discunt quæ sua ipsorum portio futura sit: sed id melius sciunt pii, quare patientes sunt")? **18.**] **and** (the question of the last verse is again repeated under a well-known form, taken from the O. T., which however casts solemn light on both members of the interrogation: explaining what is meant by judgment on God's people and also by the end of the disobedient. The citation is verbatim from the LXX, except that μέν is omitted between ὁ and δίκαιος. The LXX departs from the Heb. text, which is as the E. V., "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner") **if the righteous is** (*is being*, see reff.: or rather perhaps the pres., of that which is to be) **with difficulty saved** (on account of the sharpness of the trial, and his own weakness. "Hoc μόλις temperatur 2 Pet. i. 11 prolixe." Bengel. Cf. Rev. v. 4, 5. The μόλις does not induce any *doubt* as to the issue, only *wonder*: if we be δίκαιοι by faith in Christ, our salvation, however difficult and apparently impossible, is as certain as Christ's own triumph), **the ungodly** (ἀσεβής, 'impius,' the man who in his innermost heart cares not for God and turns not to Him) **and sinner** (he that is devoted to sin. The absence of a second article, and the singular verb, both shew, that the same person is meant by both), **where shall he appear** (so in Ps. i. 5: where shall he stand and find an abiding place in the judgment?)? **19.**] **Wherefore** (*general conclusion* from vv. 17, 18. If the sufferings of Christians as Christians are a sign of God's favour towards them, in subjecting them to His judgments, with a view to their not perishing with the ungodly world, then have they every reason to trust Him in those sufferings, and to take comfort: continuing in that same well-doing which is their very element and condition) **let also them who suffer** (καί, as well as all other persons: not as Bengel, καί, concessive: "καί, etiam, cum participio, idem quod εἰ καί, et si, cum verbo:" for it is on this very εἰ καί hypothesis that the Apostle has been long proceeding; so that it would be unnatural for him to introduce it here again with a climax:—nor as De Wette and Huther, is it to be taken with ὥστε) **according to** (in pursuit of, along the course of) **the will of God** (see on ch. iii. 17: here especially in reference to our ver. 17, seeing that it is God's will that judgment should begin at His house), **commit** (reff. deliver (subjectively) into the hands of, and confidently leave there) **their souls** (their personal safety and ultimate σώζεσθαι, ver. 18) **in** (ἐν, as clad in, accompanied with, subsisting and employed in) **well-doing** (as contrasted with the opposite characters in ver. 15. Huther says well: "This addition, ἐν ἀγαθοπ., shews that the confident surrender to God is to be joined, not with careless indolence, but with active practice of good") **to a faithful Creator** (in God being our *Creator*, without whom not a hair falls to the ground, we have an assurance that we are not overlooked by Him: in His being a *faithful* Creator (ἀσφαλὴς κ. ἀψευδὴς κατὰ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ, Œc.), whose covenant truth is pledged to us, it is implied that we are within that covenant, suffering according to His will and as His children. κτίστης must not be understood of the second creation in the new birth, nor must it be rendered *possessor*, as Calvin).

πρεσβύτερος καὶ [k] μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ χριστοῦ [l] παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς [m] μελλούσης [mn] ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι [n] δόξης [o] κοινωνός, [2] [p] ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν [q] ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ[, [r] ἐπισκοποῦντες] μὴ [s] ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ [t] ἑκουσίως, μηδὲ [u] αἰσ-

k = Luke xxiv. 48. Isa. xliii. 10.
l = ch. i. 11. iv. 13 al.†
m Rom. viii. 18. Gal. iii. 23. see ch. i. 5 reff.
n see ch. iv. 13.
o 1 Cor. x. 18. 2 Cor. i. 7. 2 Pet. i. 4 al. Isa. i. 23. Sir. vi. 10.
p Matt. ii. 6. John xxi. 16. Acts xx. 28 al. 1 Kings xxv. 16. Isa. xl. 11.
q here bis. Luke xii. 32. Acts xx. 28, 29. Zech. x. 3 al.
r Heb. xii. 15 only. 2 Chron. xxiv. 12 al.
s here only †.
t = here only. (Heb. x. 26 only.) Ps. liii. 6 (8).
u here only †. (see Tit. i. 7, 11.)

69. 137. δοξης bef αποκαλυπτεσθαι A arm.

2. for υμιν ποιμνιον, υμνιον ℵ[1]. om επισκοπουντες Bℵ[1] 27-9 [Ps Chr, Anton$_1$] Jer$_1$ [Vig$_1$]. (αλλα, so Bℵ 13.) aft εκουσιως ins κατα θεον A[P]ℵ a m 13 vulg syr copt [æth arm Thl] Antch$_1$; και κατα θν b o. for μηδε, μη AL c[3] Syr æth Œc [Anton$_1$].

Chap. V. 1—11.] *Last hortatory portion of the Epistle;* in which the word ending the former portion, ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ, is taken up and spread over various classes among the readers: thus vv. 1—4, he exhorts the *leaders of the church;* ver. 5, the *younger members* (see note there); vv. 6—9, *all in common.* Then, vv. 10, 11, follows his general *parting wish* and *ascription of praise to God.* 1.] **Elders therefore among you I exhort** (any who are in the situation of πρεσβύτεροι, anarthrous: the omission of τούς after πρεσβ. is not surprising in St. Peter's style, but has apparently led to the insertion of the art. by those who did not advert to this peculiarity. The designation here is evidently an official one (ver. 2), but at the same time reference to age is included: cf. νεώτεροι, ver. 5. The οὖν takes up the above exhortation, ch. iv. 19) **who am a fellow-elder** (with you: "Hortatio mutua inter æquales et collegas inprimis valet," Beng.), **and witness of the sufferings of Christ** (μάρτυς, not in the sense of Acts i. 8, 22, ii. 32, x. 39, al. (De Wette, al.),—a witness to testify to by words,—nor as Heb. xii. 1; Acts xxii. 20; Rev. ii. 13, xvii. 6, a witness, in bearing about in his own person (Luth., Calv., Huther),—nor both of these together ("Petrus et viderat ipsum Dominum patientem, et nunc passiones sustinebat," Bengel);—but in the sense of an *eye-witness,* on the ground of which his apostolic testimony rested: q. d. I who say to you χριστὸς ἔπαθεν σαρκί, say this of sufferings which my own eyes saw. Thus this clause links on the following exhortation to the preceding portion of the Epistle concerning Christian suffering, and tends to justify the οὖν. Observe that it is not ὁ καὶ μάρτυς, but συμπρεσβ. κ. μάρτυς are under the same art.: q. d. "the one among the συμπρεσβύτεροι who witnessed the sufferings of Christ"), **who am also a partaker of the glory which is about to be revealed** (I prefer to take this as an allusion to our Lord's own words John xiii. 36, ὕστερον ἀκολουθήσεις μοι, rather than regard it as alluding to the Transfiguration, as some (e. g. Dr. Burton), or to the certainty that those who suffer with Him will be glorified with Him (see above on this view of μάρτυς). As bearing that promise, he came to them with great weight of authority as an exhorter—having seen the sufferings of which he speaks, and being himself an heir of that glory to which he points onwards),—

2.] **tend** ([or **keep**] the aor. stronger than the pres. in the imperative: gathering together the whole ποιμαίνειν into one ποίμαναι as the act of the life) **the flock** (compare the injunction given to St. Peter himself in John xxi. 16, ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου. "Quam ergo ovium pascendarum curam a Christo sibi noverat commendatam, in ejus societatem presbyteros vocat," Gerhard. The verb includes in one word the various offices of a shepherd; the leading, feeding, heeding: "pasce mente, pasce ore, pasce opere, pasce animi oratione, verbi exhortatione, exempli exhibitione," Bernard, in Wiesinger. Our only, but not sufficient, word is, 'tending') **of God** (cf. Acts xx. 28. The similitude is among the commonest in Scripture: cf. Jer. iii. 15, xxiii. 1—4; Ezek. xxxiv. 2 ff.; John x. 11 ff.) **which is among you** (τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν is taken by Erasm. and Calvin to mean "quantum in vobis est:" and no doubt this is possible; yet it sounds more Latin than Greek, which would rather perhaps be τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς, or τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, as Wies. observes. But the sense is the greatest objection: "Petrus noverat sibi a Christo non esse dictum, pasce quantum in te est, oves meas, sed absolute et simpliciter, pasce," as Gerhard. And the ἐν ὑμῖν above seems decisive against this meaning. But even then we find various renderings: as "vobis pro vestra parte commissum," Bengel, as εἶναι or κεῖσθαι ἔν τινι, and so Luther (die Heerde, so euch befohlen ist), Steiger, al.: Huther says, ἐν signifies here, as elsewhere also, inner communion, not merely local presence: "the

χροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ [v] προθύμως, [3] μηδ' ὡς [w] κατακυριεύοντες τῶν [x] κλήρων ἀλλὰ [y] τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ [q] ποιμνίου· [4] καὶ

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

v here only. 2 Chron. xxix. 34. Tobit vii. 8 al2. w = Matt. xx. 25 || Mk. (Acts xix. 6) only. Num. xxi. 24 al. x = here only. see note, and Deut. ix. 29. y = Phil. iii. 17. 1 Thess. i. 7. 2 Thess. iii. 9. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Tit. ii. 7.

3. om ver. B.

flock which is under your charge." Gerhard gives "qui vobiscum est, videlicet cum quo unum corpus, una ecclesia estis," to which I do not see that Huther has any right to object, as he does. But the mere local meaning is by far the best. He orders them to feed the flock of God, not generally, nor œcumenically, but locally, as far as concerned that part of it found among them) [, **overseeing (it)** (the word ἐπισκοποῦντες, which tallies very much with St. Peter's participial style, has perhaps been removed for ecclesiastical reasons, for fear πρεσβύτεροι should be supposed to be, as they really were, ἐπίσκοποι: "ipsum episcopatus nomen et officium exprimere voluit," Calv.)] **not constrainedly** ('coacte:' as Bengel, "necessitas incumbit, 1 Cor. ix. 16, sed hujus sensum absorbet lubentia. Id valet et in suscipiendo et in gerendo munere. Non sine reprehensione sunt pastores qui, si res integra esset, mallent quidvis potius esse:" Bede, "Coacte pascit gregem Dei, qui propter rerum temporalium penuriam non habens unde vivat, idcirco prædicat Evangelium ut de Evangelio vivere possit." And then, as Calv., "Dum agimus ad necessitatis præscriptum, lente et frigide in opere progredimur") **but willingly** (not exactly, as Bede, "supernæ mercedis intuitu," but out of love to the great Shepherd, and to the flock. The addition in Aℵ al., κατὰ θεόν, is curious, and not easily accounted for. It certainly does not, as Huther says, clear up the thought, but rather obscures it. The expression is seldom found; and never in the sense here required. Cf. Rom. viii. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 9 ff.), **nor yet** (μηδέ brings in a climax each time) **with a view to base gain** ("propter quæstum et terrena commoda," as Bede. Cf. Isa. lvi. 11; Jer. vi. 13, viii. 10; Ezek. xxxiv. 2, 3, &c.; and Tit. i. 7) **but earnestly** (as 2 Cor. xii. 14 (cf. προθυμία, 2 Cor. viii. 11, ix. 2), prompted by a desire not of gain, but of good to the flock;—ready and enthusiastic, as (the illustration is Bede's) the children of Israel, and even the workmen, gave their services eagerly and gratuitously to build the tabernacle of old): 3.] **nor yet as lording it over** (the κατα as in reff. and in καταδυναστεύω James ii. 6, κατακαυχάομαι Rom. xi. 18, James ii. 13, καταμαρτυρέω Matt. xxvi. 62, carries the idea of hostility, and therefore, when joined with κυριεύω, of oppression; of using the rights of a κύριος for the diminution of the ruled and the exaltation of self. Christian rulers of the church are προϊστάμενοι (1 Thess. v. 12; Rom. xii. 8), ἡγούμενοι (Luke xxii. 26), but not κυριεύοντες (Luke xxii. 25, 26). One is their κύριος, and they are His διάκονοι) **the portions (entrusted to you)** (so is κλῆρος understood by (not Cyril, as commonly cited: see below) Bede apparently, Erasm. ("gregem qui cuique forte contigit gubernandus"), Estius ("gregis Dominici portiones, quæ singulis episcopis pascendæ et regendæ velut sortito obtigerunt"), Calov., Bengel, Wolf, Steiger, De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger, al. And so Theophanes, Homil. xii. p. 70 (in Suicer), addresses his hearers, ἡμεῖς δέ, ὦ κλῆρος ἐμός: cf. also Acts xvii. 4 (of which I do not see why De Wette should say that it has nothing to do with the present consideration). On the other hand, 2. '*the heritage of God*' is taken as the meaning by Cyril (on Isa. iii. 12 (vol. iii. p. 63), not i. 6, as commonly cited by all, copying one from another. But the passage is not satisfactory. In the Latin, we read "non ut dominentur in clero, *id est, populo qui sors Domini est:*" but the words in italics have no representatives in the Greek, which simply quotes this verse without comment), Calv. ("quum universum ecclesiæ corpus hæreditas sit domini, totidem sunt veluti prædia, quorum culturam singulis presbyteris assignat"), Beza (and consequently E. V.), Grot., Benson, al. But the objections to this are, that κλῆροι could not be taken for portions of κλῆρος,—and that θεοῦ could in this case hardly be wanting. Again, 3. some, principally R.-Cath. expositors, have anachronistically supposed κλῆροι to mean the *clergy:* so even Œc.,—κλῆρον τὸ ἱερὸν σύστημα καλεῖ, ὥσπερ καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς, and Jer., Epist. ad Nepot. (lii. 7, vol. i. p. 262): so Corn. a-Lap. ("jubet ergo S. Petrus Episcopis et Pastoribus, ne inferioribus clericis imperiose dominari velint"), Justiniani (doubtfully: "sive P. de fideli populo universo, sive de ordine ecclesiastico loquatur"), Feuardentius, al. 4. Dodwell understood it of the *church-goods:* which view has nothing to recommend it, and is refuted by Wolf, Curæ, h. l. That the first meaning is the right one, is decided by τοῦ ποιμνίου below: see there), **but becoming** (it is well, where it

[z] φανερωθέντος τοῦ [a] ἀρχιποίμενος [b] κομιεῖσθε τὸν [c] ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης [d] στέφανον. [5] Ὁμοίως νεώτεροι [e] ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις, πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν [f] ταπεινο-

z = 2 Cor. v. 10. Col. iii. 4. 1 John ii. 28. a here only †. 4 Kings iii. 4 Incert. in Hex. see Heb. xiii. 20 reff. b = ch. i. 8 reff. c here only †. d 1 Cor. ix. 25. 2 Tim. iv. 8. James i. 12. Rev. ii. 10. Prov. iv. 9. e Heb. xii. 9 reff. f Acts xx. 19. Eph. iv. 2. Phil. ii. 3. Col. ii. 18, 23. iii. 12. Paul only, exc. here †. (-φρων, ch. iii. 8. -φρονῶν, Ps. cxxx. 2.)

5. aft *ομοιως* ins *δε* ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving) [syr]: *δε οι* b o: *δε και οι* a c: *και οι* m. ins *τοις* bef *πρεσβυτεροις* ℵ g. rec aft *αλληλοις* ins *υποτασσομενοι*, with KL[P] rel syr [æth] Thl Œc: om ABℵ 13 vulg Syr copt arm [Ephr$_1$] Antch$_1$.

can be done, to keep the distinctive meaning of *γίνομαι*. This more frequently happens in affirmative than in negative sentences: cf. *μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός*, John xx. 27, where this distinctive meaning can be well brought out in the latter clause, but not in the former) **patterns of the flock** (the tyrannizing could only apply to the portion over which their authority extended, but the good example would be seen and followed by the whole church: hence *τῶν κλήρων* in the prohibition, but *τοῦ ποιμνίου* in the exhortation. **τύποι**, because the flock will look to you: "pastor ante oves vadit." Gerh. The Commentators quote from Bernard, "Monstrosa res est gradus summus et animus infimus, sedes prima et vita ima, lingua magniloqua et vita otiosa, sermo multus et fructus nullus:" and from Gregory the Great, "Informis est vita pastoris, qui modo calicem Domini signat, modo talos agitat: qui in avibus cœli ludit, canes instigat," &c.); **4.**] **and (then)** (**καί** of the result of something previously treated, as Matt. xxvi. 55; John x. 16 al. fr.: see Winer, § 53. 3) **when the chief Shepherd** (see ch. ii. 25; Heb. xiii. 20: and compare Ezek. xxxiv. 15, 16, 23; Matt. xxv. 32) **is manifested** (used by St. Peter, as *ἀποκαλύπτω*, in a double reference, to Christ's first coming, and His second also: cf. ch. i. 20: so also by St. Paul, Col. iii. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16: by St. John, 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2, 5, 8. Here, clearly of the second coming. It would not be clear, from this passage alone, whether St. Peter regarded the coming of the Lord as likely to occur in the life of these his readers, or not: but as interpreted by the analogy of his other expressions on the same subject, it would appear that he did), **ye shall receive** (reff.) **the amarantine** (**ἀμαράντινος** is adj. from *ἀμάραντος*, the everlasting, or unfading, flower. Most Commentators have assumed without reason that it = *ἀμάραντος*, ch. i. 4, unfading. Philostr. in Heroicis, p. 741, cited in Wolf, has *ὅθεν καὶ στεφάνους ἀμαραντίνους εἰς τὰ κήδη πρῶτοι Θετταλοὶ ἐνόμισαν*: see also Palm and Rost, sub voce. In the sense, there will be no difference: but the Apostle would hardly have used two derivatives of the same word, to express one and the same quality) **crown** (reff.) **of His glory** (or, of glory: but I prefer the other. That we shall share His glory, is a point constantly insisted on by St. Peter: cf. ver. 1, ch. iv. 13, i. 7: and above all, ver. 10 below. This idea reaches its highest in St. John, with whom the inner unity of the divine life with the life of Christ is all in all. Cf. especially 1 John iii. 2 f.).

5—7.] *Exhortation to the younger, and to all, to humility and trust in God.* **5.**] **In like manner** (i. e. 'mutatis mutandis,' in your turn: see ch. iii. 7: with the same recognition of your position and duties), **ye younger, be subject to the elders** (in what sense are we to take **νεώτεροι** and **πρεσβύτεροι** here? One part of our answer will be very clear: that *πρεσβύτεροι* must be in the same sense as above, viz., in its official historical sense of presbyters in the church. This being so, we have now some clue to the meaning of *νεώτεροι*: viz. that it cannot mean younger in age merely, though this, as regarded *men*, would generally be so, but that as the name *πρεσβύτεροι* had an official sense, of superintendents of the church, so *νεώτεροι* likewise, of those who were the ruled, the disciples, of the *πρεσβύτεροι*. Thus taken, it will mean here, the rest of the church, as opposed to the *πρεσβύτεροι*. Nor will this meaning, as Weiss maintains, p. 344, be at all impugned by **πάντες δέ** which follows, inasmuch as that clearly embraces both classes, *πρεσβύτεροι* and *νεώτεροι*. As Wiesinger well says, The Apostle is teaching what the *πρεσβ.* owe to the church, what the church to them, what all without distinction to one another. Weiss would understand these *νεώτεροι* as he does in Acts v. 6, and *νεανίσκοι* ib. ver. 10 (but see note there), young persons, who were to subserve the ordinary wants of the elders in the ministration. Luther, Calv., Gerhard, al., and more recently De Wette and Huther, take *νεώτεροι* for the younger members of the congregation: in which case, as most of these confess, we must enlarge the sense of *πρεσβυτέροις* here,

φροσύνην [g] ἐγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι [h] ὁ θεὸς [i] ὑπερηφάνοις [k] ἀντιτάσσεται, [l] ταπεινοῖς δὲ [m] δίδωσιν [m] χάριν. [6] [n] ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν [o] κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς [p] ὑψώσῃ [q] ἐν [q] καιρῷ, [7] πᾶσαν τὴν [r] μέριμναν ὑμῶν [s] ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ [t] μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν.

g (see note) here only †. (-βωμα, Isa. iii. 20 Theod.)
h Prov. iii. 34. James iv. 6.
i James iv. 6 reff.
k Acts xviii. 6. Rom. xiii. 2. James iv. 6 (from l. c.). v. 6 only. 3 Kings xi. 34 bis. Hos. ii. 6 bis only.
l = Matt. xi. 29. Eph. vi. 13. James iv. 6. Ps. xxxiii. 18.
m James iv. 6 (bis) reff.
n Luke xviii. 14 ‖. 2 Cor. xi. 7. Gen. xvi. 9. Isa. xl. 4.
o here only. Exod. iii. 19. Deut. iii. 24. Job xxx. 21.
p James iv. 10 reff.
q Matt. xxiv. 45. Luke xx. 10. Ps. i. 3.
r Matt. xiii. 22 ‖. Luke xxi. 34. 2 Cor. xi. 28 only. Ps. lv. 22.
s Luke xix. 35 only. l. c. Numbers xxxv. 20, 22.
t & constr., Matt. xxii. 16 ‖. John x. 13. xii. 6. Wisd. xii. 13.

ABK N A' [fg] [la].

om ὁ B 177[1](Clem$_1$).

6. χειραν [A]ℵ. aft εν καιρω ins επισκοπης A[P] 13 vulg spec syr-w-ast copt [æth arm] Ephr.

7. rec επιρριψαντες, with B[2]KL[P] rel: txt AB[1]ℵ. for 2nd υμων, ημων ℵ[1] [13].

which in my mind is a fatal objection to the view. The above interpretation, that νεώτεροι are the rest of the congregation as distinguished from the πρεσβύτεροι, is that of Bede, Est., Benson, Pott, al., and of Wiesinger): **yea** (the E. V. happily thus gives the sense of the δέ: q. d. Why should I go on giving these specific injunctions, when one will cover them all?) **all gird on humility to one another** (an allusion to our Lord's action of girding Himself with a napkin in the servile ministration of washing the disciples' feet: of which He himself said, καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας. ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιῆτε. The impression made on St. Peter by this proof of his Master's love is thus beautifully shewn. As to the details: the ὑποτασσόμενοι of the rec. has probably been a clumsy gloss to help out the construction of the dat. commodi ἀλλήλοις. ἐγκομβώσασθε is variously interpreted. Its derivation is from κόμβος, a string or band attached to a garment to tie it with: hence κόμβωμα, an apron, through κομβόω, to gird or tie round; and thus ἐγκομβόω, to gird on, and -όομαι, to gird on one's self. ἐγκόμβωμα is used for a kind of girdle by Longus, Pastoralia ii. 33, and Pollux iv. 119. See in Wetst. The Schol. in ms. 16 says, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνειλήσασθε, περιβάλεσθε, ἢ ἀναστείλασθε. In Hesych., the κομβολύτης is explained to be a βαλαντιοτόμος. There is a very complete and learned dissertation on this passage in the Fritzschiorum Opuscula, pp. 259—275, containing all the literature of the subject. The result there is, "omnes lectores, oratione in eos conversa, admonet, ut quemadmodum servi heris se modeste submittunt (the ἐγκόμβωμα being a servile garment or apron), ita unus alteri tanquam minor majori cedens obsequiosum modestumque se præbeat: 'omnes autem lubenter alter alteri cedentes modestiam vobis pro servorum encombomate incingite.'" This is perhaps going too far, to seek the meaning of the verb altogether in its derivative: but the reference is at least possible. For more particulars consult the dissertation itself, and Wetstein's note. Some put a comma after ἀλλήλοις, and join πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις to the preceding, 'yea, all of you (be subject) to one another.' But this is unnecessary, the dative being in this sense abundantly justified: cf. Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 13. Winer, § 31. 4. *b*): **because** (reason why you should gird on humility) **God** (the citation agrees verbatim with James iv. 6) **opposeth Himself to the proud** ("reliqua peccata fugiunt Deum, sola superbia se opponit Deo; reliqua peccata deprimunt hominem, sola superbia erigit eum contra Deum. Inde etiam Deus superbis vicissim se opponit," Gerhard. The student will remember the saying of Artabanus to Xerxes, Herod. vii. 10, ὁρᾷς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα ζῶα ὡς κεραυνοῖ ὁ θεός, οὐδὲ ἐᾷ φαντάζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ σμικρὰ οὐδέν μιν κνίζει; . . . φιλέει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν), **but giveth grace to the humble** (ταπεινοῖς here in a subjective sense, the lowly-minded, those who by their humility are low. "Humilitas est vas gratiarum," Aug. in Gerh.).

6.] **Humble yourselves** (on the medial signification of some verbs in the aor. 1 pass. in the N. T., see Winer, § 39. 2. The commonest example is ἀποκριθείς. Cf. also διεκρίθη, Matt. xxi. 21; Rom. iv. 20, &c.) **therefore** (the same spirit as before continues through this and the following verses: the μέριμνα here, and the παθήματα, ver. 9, keeping in mind their persecutions and anxieties, as also does κραταιὰν χεῖρα, see below) **under the mighty hand of God** (on the expression, see reff., LXX. The strong hand of God is laid on the afflicted and suffering, and it is for them to acknowledge it in lowliness of mind), **that He may exalt you** (the Apostle

8 [u] Νήψατε, [v] γρηγορήσατε· ὁ [w] ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς [x] λέων [y] ὠρυόμενος περιπατεῖ [z] ζητῶν τίνα [a] καταπιεῖν, 9 ᾧ [b] ἀντίστητε [c] στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει, [d] εἰδότες [e] τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν

u ch. iv. 7 reff. v Matt. xxiv. 42 al. Jer. i. 13. 1 Macc. xii. 27. w Matt. v. 25 bis. Luke xii. 58. xviii. 3 only. 1 Kings ii. 10. x Rev. iv. 7 reff. y here only. Judg. xiv. 5. Ps. xxi. 13. Zech. xi. 3. z Matt. xii 46, 47. Acts xiii. 8. Gal. i 10 al. a Matt. xxiii. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 54. 2 Cor. ii. 7. v. 4. Heb. xi. 29. Rev. xii. 16 only. Num. xvi. 32. b James iv. 7 reff. c 2 Tim. ii. 19. Heb. v. 13, 14 only. Deut. xxxii. 13. d so ch. i. 18. e see 1 Cor. xi. 5.

8. rec ins οτι bef ο αντιδικος, with L ℵ[3] a c h m 13 [vss Antch$_1$ Damasc$_1$] Œc [Orig-int$_2$ Cypr$_1$ Cassiod$_1$]: om ABK[P ℵ[1]] rel 36 Thl [Orig$_1$(-int$_1$) Eus$_1$ Lucif$_1$]. om τινα B: καταπ. bef τινα m. rec for (καταπιειν) καταπιη, with A rel: καταπιει (d[1] ?) j k l 13. 180 Ps-Ath: txt BKL[P] ℵ[3](-πιν ℵ[1]) c h m copt [Orig-ms$_1$ Damasc-ms] Cypr Hil$_1$.

refers to the often repeated saying of our Lord, Matt. xxiii. 13, Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14. The same is also found in the O. T., Ps. xviii. 27; Prov. xxix. 23) **in (the) time (appointed)** (ἐν καιρῷ is one of those phrases in which the article is constantly omitted: see reff., and Winer, § 19. 1. This humility implies patience, waiting God's time: "ut nimiæ festinationi simul obviam eat," Calv. The καιρός need not necessarily be understood as Bengel ("Petrus sæpe spectat diem judicii") of the end; it is more general: cf. ἐν καιροῖς ἰδίοις, 1 Tim. vi. 15): **7.] casting** (aor., once for all, by an act which includes the life) **all your anxiety** (πᾶσαν τήν, 'the whole of;' not, every anxiety as it arises: for none will arise if this transference has been effectually made. This again is an O. T. citation (ref. Ps.), ἐπίῤῥιψον ἐπὶ κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου. The art. also shews that the μέριμνα was not a possible, but a present one; that the exhortation is addressed to men under sufferings. As to the connexion, we may remark, that this participial clause is explanatory of the former imperative one, inasmuch as all anxiety is a contradiction of true humility: μέριμνα, by which the spirit μερίζεται, part for God, part for unbelief, is in fact an exalting self against Him) **upon Him, because** (seeing that: the justifying reason for the ἐπιῤῥίψαι) **He careth** (αὐτῷ prefixed for emphasis, to take up the ἐπ' αὐτόν) **for** (about: the distinction between περί and ὑπέρ after verbs of caring is thus given by Weber, Demosth. p. 130 (see Winer, § 47. *l*): "περί solam mentis circumspectionem vel respectum rei, ὑπέρ simul animi propensionem significat." But perhaps it must not be too much pressed) **you.** 8, 9.] *Other necessary exhortations under their afflictions;* and now with reference to the great spiritual adversary, as before to God and their own hearts. "Ne consolatione illa, quod Deo sit cura de vobis, ad securitatem abutamur, præmonet nos Apostolus de Satanæ insidiis," gloss. interlin. **8.] Be sober** (see ch. iv. 7, and Luke xxi. 34, 36. This sobriety of mind, as opposed to intoxication with μέριμναι βιωτικαί, is necessary to the ἀντιστῆναι στερεοί: only he who is sober stands firm), **be watchful** (can it be that Peter thought of his Lord's οὕτως οὐκ ἰσχύσατε μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ, on the fatal night when he denied Him?

Bengel says, "νήψατε, vigilate, *anima:* γρηγορήσατε, vigilate, *corpore:*" but the distinction is not borne out: both words are far better taken as applying to the mind; as Aug. in Wies.: "corde vigila, fide vigila, spe vigila, caritate vigila, operibus vigila"): **your adversary** (the omission of any causal particle, as ὅτι, inserted in the rec., makes the appeal livelier and more forcible, leaving the obvious connexion to be filled up by the reader. ὁ ἀντίδ. ὑμ., *your great and well-known adversary:* "ut sciant, hac lege se Christi fidem profiteri, ut cum diabolo continuum bellum habeant. Neque enim membris parcet, qui cum capite prœliatur," Calv. ἀντίδικος properly, and in reff. an adversary in a suit at law: but here = שָׂטָן, an enemy in general) **the devil** (anarthrous as a proper name, as in Acts xiii. 10; Rev. xx. 2) **as a roaring lion** ("comparatur diabolus leoni famelico et præ impatientia famis rugienti, quia perniciem nostram inexplebiliter appetit, nec ulla præda ei sufficit," Gerh.) **walketh about** (cf. Job i. 7, ii. 2) **seeking whom to devour** ("incorporando sibi per mortalem culpam," Lyra: see reff.): **9.] whom resist** (see ref. James) **firm in the faith** (dat. of reference, as σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος Phil. ii 8, τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς Eph. ii. 3, &c.), **knowing** (*being aware:* it is an encouragement against their giving way under Satan's attacks, to remember that they do not stand alone against him; that others are, as Gerhard expresses it, not only παθημάτων συμμέτοχοι, but in "precibus et pugna contra Satanam σύμμαχοι") **that the very same sufferings** (this construction, a gen. after ὁ αὐτός, is not elsewhere found in N. T. In it, as in the dat. construction in reff., the adj. is made into a subst. to express more completely the identity. It

f ch. ii. 17 only †. 1 Macc. xii. 10, 17 only. g Heb. viii. 5 reff. h see 2 Cor. i. 3. ix. 8. i ch. ii. 9 reff. k 2 Tim. ii. 10. see 2 Cor. iv. 7.

παθημάτων τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ὑμῶν [f] ἀδελφότητι [g] ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. 10 ὁ δὲ θεὸς [h] πάσης χάριτος ὁ [i] καλέσας ὑμᾶς [i] εἰς τὴν [k] αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ [k] δόξαν ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [l] ὀλίγον παθόντας αὐτὸς [m] καταρτίσει, [n] στηρίξει, [o] σθενώσει, [p] θεμελιώσει· 11 αὐτῷ τὸ [q] κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

l = ch. i. 6 reff. m Heb. xiii. 21 reff. n = Luke xxii. 32. Rom. i. 11. xvi. 25 al. Ps. l. 12. o here only †. (-νος, Job xvi. 16.) p = Eph. iii. 18. Col. i. 23 (Heb. i. 10 reff.) only. q = 1 Tim. vi. 16. ch. iv. 11. Jude 25. Rev. i. 6. v. 13.

9. for 2nd τη, την ℵ[1] (but corrd). ins τω bef κοσμω B[ℵ].
10. rec ημας, with K c g k vulg Syr Did$_1$ Œc Vocat: txt ABL[P]ℵ rel demid syr copt [æth arm] Thl. ins τω bef χριστω B. om ιησου Bℵ a c, insd in syr with ast. rec καταρτισαι, with KL[P] rel (Syr) syr Thl Œc: txt ABℵ d 13 vulg æth arm Vocat. rec aft καταρτισ. ins υμας, with KL[P] rel syr-w-ast copt [æth] Thl Œc: om ABℵ a 13 vulg arm Vocat. rec στηριξαι σθενωσαι, with b[2] c g syr Thl Œc: txt ABKL[P]ℵ rel vulg copt æth arm Vocat. rec θεμελιωσαι, with b[2] c g [syr copt]: om (*homœotel*) AB vulg [Syr] æth Vocat: txt KL[P]ℵ rel [arm] Thl Œc.
11. rec ins η δοξα και bef το κρατος, with L[P]ℵ vulg-ed(with demid harl [tol]) æth-pl Thl: η δοξα κρατος, omg και το, K j l: το κρ. κ. η δοξ. a c[1] m 13 syrr copt arm: txt AB am(and fuld) æth-rom. om των αιωνων B 36 copt arm.

is (see Winer, § 34. 2) much as when an adj. is made into a subst. governing a gen.: e. g. τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς Heb. vi. 17, τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως Phil. iii. 8, τὸ πιστὸν τῆς πολιτείας Thuc. i. 68, τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς λύπης Plato, Phædr. 240 A) **are being accomplished in** (*the case of*: the dat. of reference, as in γίνεσθαι ὑμῖν and similar phrases. Much unnecessary difficulty has been found in the word ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. It has its usual N. T. meaning of 'accomplish,' 'complete,' as in reff. and Phil. i. 6, al.; these sufferings were being accomplished, their full measure attained, according to the will of God, and by the appointment of God, in, with reference to, in the case of, the ἀδελφότης. The Dative must not be regarded as = a gen. with ὑπό: but there is another way of taking it, viz. as dependent on τὰ αὐτά, making ἐπιτελεῖσθαι middle: "knowing that ye are accomplishing the same sufferings with" &c. This is defended by Harless; but in this case we should certainly expect ὑμᾶς to be inserted, as αὐτόν in Luke iv. 41, and σεαυτόν in Rom. ii. 19) **your brotherhood** (ref.) **in the world** (ἐν κόσμῳ, not to direct attention to another brotherhood not in the world, as Huther; but as identifying their state with yours: who, like yourselves, are in the world, and thence have, like yourselves, to expect such trials). 10, 11.] *Final assurance of God's help and ultimate perfecting of them after and by means of these sufferings.* 10.] **But** (q. d. however you may be able to apprehend the consolation which I have last propounded to you, one thing is sure: or as Bengel, "vos tantum vigilate et resistite hosti: cætera Deus præstabit") **the God of all grace** (who is the Source of all spiritual help for every occasion: see reff.) **who called you** (which was the first proof of His grace towards you) **unto** (with a view to; 'consolationis argumentum:' He who has begun grace with a view to glory, will not cut off grace till it be perfected in glory. Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14) **His eternal glory in Christ Jesus** (ἐν χρ. Ἰησ. belongs to καλέσας, which has since been defined by ὑμᾶς εἰς τ. αἰ. αὐ. δόξ. Christ Jesus is the element in which that calling took place. The words cannot, as Calov., al., be joined with what follows), **when ye have suffered a little while** (these words belong to what has gone before, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ., not to what follows, as is decisively shewn by the consideration that all four verbs must belong to acts of God on them *in this life*, while these sufferings would be still going on. The ὀλίγον παθόντας expresses the *condition* of their calling to glory in Christ, viz. after having suffered for a short time. παθόντας, as in all cases of an aor. part. connected with a future verb, is to be taken in the strictness of its aoristic meaning as a futurus exactus: the παθήματα are over when the δόξα comes in), **shall Himself** (αὐτός, solemn and emphatic: "ostendit enim Apostolus ex eodem gratiæ fonte et primam ad gloriam cœlestem vocationem et ultimam hujus beneficii consummationem provenire," Gerhard) **perfect (you)** (see ref. Heb. and note: "ne remaneat in vobis defectus," Beng.), **shall confirm** (establish you firmly, so as to be στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει: "ne quid vos labefactet," Beng.), **shall strengthen** (the word σθενόω belongs to later Greek), **shall ground (you)** (fix you as on a foundation, "ut superetis omnem vim adversam. Digna *Petro* oratio. Con-

[12] Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ὡς [r] λογίζομαι [s] δι' [s] ὀλίγων [t] ἔγραψα [u] παρακαλῶν καὶ [v] ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ· [w] εἰς ἣν [x] στῆτε. [13] [y] ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι [z] συνεκλεκτή,

r — Rom. viii. 18. Phil. iii. 13. Heb. xi. 19. Wisd. xv. 12.
s here only. see Eph. iii. 3.
t so Gal. vi. 11. Philem. 19, 21.
u absol., Luke iii. 18. 1 Cor. iv. 13. 2 Tim. iv. 2 al.
v here only †. (-ρεσθαι, Neh. ix. 30.)
w constr., Matt. ii. 23. Mark i. 39. xiii. 16. John i. 18 al.
x = Rom. v. 2. 1 Cor. xv. 1.
y = Rom. xvi. 3, 16, &c. Col. iv. 10, 15 al.
z here only †.

12. σιλβανου B. ins και bef ταυτην ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving). rec (for στητε) εστηκατε, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: txt ABℵ j 13.
13. aft βαβυλωνι ins εκκλησια ℵ 4-marg 33-marg vulg Syr arm Œc.

firmat fratres suos," Bengel. Cf. Luke xxii. 32, *σὺ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου*: and 2 Tim. ii. 19, *ὁ στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ θεοῦ ἕστηκεν*):

11.] **to Him** (again emphatic: "ne quidquam laudis et gloriæ sibi vindicent," Gerh.) **be** (i. e. *be ascribed*: or, as ch. iv. 11, *ἐστιν*, *is*, i. e. is due) **the might** (which has been shewn in this perfecting, confirming, strengthening, grounding you, and in all that those words imply as their ultimate result,—of victory and glory) **to the ages of the ages. Amen.**

12—14.] CONCLUSION. **By Silvanus the faithful brother** (there seems to be no reason for distinguishing this Silvanus from the companion of St. Paul and Timotheus, mentioned in 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19, and known by the name of Silas in the Acts. See further in Prolegomena, § iv. 19), **as I reckon** (*ὡς λογίζομαι* belongs most naturally to *τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*, not to *δι' ὀλίγων* which follows: and indicates the Apostle's judgment concerning Silvanus, given, not in any disparagement of him, nor indicating, as De W. and Bengel, that he was not known to St. Peter, but as fortifying him, in his mission to the churches addressed, with the Apostle's recommendation, over and above the acquaintance which the readers may already have had with him), **I have written** (the epistolary aor. See reff.) **to you** (*ὑμῖν* is taken by some, as E. V., Luther, Steiger, al., as dependent on *πιστοῦ*, which is harsh, and leaves *ἔγραψα* without any object of address) **in** (by means of, as my vehicle of conveying my meaning) **few words** (Erasm., Grot., Pott, al. fancy that this *ἔγρ. δι' ὀλίγων* refers to the second Epistle: but see 2 Pet. iii. 1. On *δι' ὀλίγων*, cf. Heb. xiii. 22. It perhaps may here refer to some more copious instructions which Silvanus was to give them by word of mouth: or may serve to fix their attention more pointedly on that which had been thus concisely said), **exhorting** (such in the main is the character of the Epistle) **and giving my testimony** (the *ἐπί* in *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν* indicates merely the direction of the testimony, not as Bengel, "testimonium jam per Paulum et Silam audierant pridem: Petrus *insuper testatur*") **that this** (of which I have written to you; see below) **is** (the inf. *εἶναι* belongs to both *παρακαλῶν* and *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν*) **the true grace** (not "doctrina evangelii" as Gerh., nor "state of grace" as De Wette, but simply "grace" ch. i. 2, as testified by the preaching of the Apostles to be covenanted and granted to them by God. This identification of the preached and written message with the true mind of God towards man, is not uncommon with our Apostle: e. g., ch. i. 12, 25 (ii. 10, 25). The reason of this was not any difference, as some would have us believe, between the teachings of St. Peter and St. Paul, but the difficulty presented to the readers in the fact of the fiery trial of sufferings which they were passing through) **of God, in which stand ye** (the construction is pregnant; into which being admitted, stand in it. On every account, we are bound to read *στῆτε*, not *ἑστήκατε*, which has apparently come in from the similar *ἐν ᾗ* (*ᾧ*) *ἑστήκατε* in reff. Every reason which Wiesinger gives against *στῆτε*, is in fact a reason for it. *στῆτε εἰς* is, he says, evidently wrong, because the readers were already in the grace:—I answer,—and consequently it was corrected to what seemed right: *εἰς ἣν στῆτε*, he says further, would not fit the context:—and consequently, we may reply, the temptation would be stronger to correct it. The idea of its having been an emendation to suit *παρακαλῶν* is simply absurd; that participle referring back to the contents of the Epistle, not requiring any justification in this sentence; as any, even the dullest copyist, must see. As it stands, it is a short and earnest exhortation, containing in it in fact the pith of what has been said by way of exhortation in the whole Epistle).

13.] **She that is elected together with you in Babylon salutes you** (*who*, or *what is this?* The great majority of Commentators understand it to mean a *sister congregation*, elect like yourselves, ch. i. 1. So ℵ al.

καὶ Μάρκος ὁ [a] υἱός μου. 14 ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους [b] ἐν [bcd] φιλήματι [d] ἀγάπης. [e] εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς [f] ἐν χριστῷ.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Α.

a (see note) = (?) here only. see 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2. b (ἁγίῳ) Rom. xvi. 16. 1 Cor. xvi. 20. 2 Cor. xiii. 12. 1 Thess. v. 26. c as above (b). Luke vii. 45. xxii. 48. Prov. xxvii. 6. Cant. i. 2 only. d here only. e 3 John 15. f Rom. viii. 1. xvi. 7. 2 Cor. v. 17.

14. ειρηνης (but ς erased) ℵ. rec aft χριστω ins ιησου, with KL[P]ℵ rel vulg-ed(with am [tol]) syr copt [arm] Thl Œc: om AB 13(appy) 36 fuld(with demid harl) Syr æth. rec adds αμην, with KL[P]ℵ rel vulg-ed(with demid fuld [tol]) syrr [arm] Thl Œc: om AB 13 am(with harl) copt æth.

Subscription. om (K?) rel: εγραφη απο ρωμης f h: η πρωτη πετρου επιστολη εγραφη απο ρωμης j: τελος της πρωτης επιστολης καθολικης πετρου 36: του αγιου αποστολου πετρου καθολικη επιστολη α′ L: [πετρ. επ. α′ P:] txt ABℵ.

in digest, E. V., Luth., Calv., Gerhard, Steiger, &c., and the more recent interpreters, De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger. And this perhaps may be a legitimate interpretation. Still it seems hardly probable, that there should be joined together in the same sending of salutation, an *abstraction*, spoken of thus enigmatically, and a *man*, Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου, by name. No mention has occurred in the Epistle of the word ἐκκλησία, to which reference might be made: if such reference be sought for, διασπορά, in ch. i. 1, is the only word suitable, and that could hardly be used of the congregation in any particular place. Finally, it seems to be required by the rules of analogy, that in an Epistle addressed to ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι, individually, not gregatim, ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή must be an individual person also. These considerations induce me to accede to the opinion of those, who recognize here the ἀδελφὴ γυνή whom St. Peter περιῆγεν, 1 Cor. ix. 5: and to find, in the somewhat unusual periphrastic way of speaking of her, a confirmation of this view. Bengel, who defends it, adduces ch. iii. 7, where the wives are called συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς. Still, I own, the words ἐν Βαβυλῶνι a little stagger me in this view. But it seems less forced than the other. On the question, *what Babylon* is intended, whether Rome, or the Chaldæan capital, or some village in Egypt, see Prolegomena, § iv. 10 ff.), **and Marcus my son** (perhaps, and so most have thought, the well-known Evangelist (see Eus. H. E. ii. 15: Orig. in Eus. vi. 25: Œc. al.): perhaps the *actual son* of St. Peter, bearing this name (Œc.-altern., Bengel, al.). The fact of Peter taking refuge in the house of Mary the mother of John Mark (Acts xii. 2), casts hardly any weight on the side of the former interpretation: but it derives some probability from the circumstance that St. Mark is reported by Eus. l. c., and iii. 39, v. 8, vi. 14, 25, to have been the ἀκόλουθος and μαθητής and ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, on the authority of Papias and Clement of Alexandria: and that Irenæus (Hær. iii. 11, p. 174, Eus. v. 8) reports the same. The **υἱός** is understood either spiritually or literally, according as one or other of the above views is taken).

14.] **Salute one another in** (as the medium of salutation) **a kiss of love** (see on ref. Rom. where, as every where except here, φίλημα ἅγιον is the expression. For a full account of the custom, see Winer, Realw. art. Kuß). **Peace be to you all that are in Christ** (the concluding blessing of St. Paul is usually χάρις, not εἰρήνη: cf. (Rom. xvi. 24) 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Gal. vi. 18; Eph. vi. 24 (where however εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς κ.τ.λ. precedes); Phil. iv. 23; Col. iv. 18; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15; Philem. 25 (Heb. xiii. 25). "Formula petita," says Gerhard, "ex salutatione Christi præsertim post resurrectionem usitata." The blessing differs also from those in St. Paul, in the limitation implied by ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν χριστῷ, whereas St. Paul has ever μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Here it is, "peace to you, I mean, all that are, and in as far as they are, in Christ;" in union and communion with Him. **τοῖς ἐν χριστῷ** is quite in St. Paul's manner, cf. reff. See also our ch. iii. 16, v. 10).

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Β.

I. [1] Συμεὼν Πέτρος [a] δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῖς [b] ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν [c] λαχοῦσιν πίστιν [d] ἐν [e] δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ [e] θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ [f] σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

a James i. 1 reff. b here only †. ἰσοτίμους ἀπέδειξε, Jos. Antt. xii. 3. 1. Xen. Hier. viii. 10. c = Acts i. 17 (Luke i. 9. John xix. 24) only. 3 Macc. vi. 1. (1 Kings xiv. 47. Wisd. viii. 19 only.) d see Rom. v. 9. xv. 13. e Rom i. 17. iii. 5, 21, 22. x. 3. James i. 20. f ver. 11. ch. ii. 20. iii. 2, 18. so 2 Tim. i. 10. Tit. i. 4. ii. 13. iii. 6.

TITLE. Steph *επιστολη πετρου καθολικη δευτερα*: elz *πετρ. του αποστ. επιστ. καθ. δευτερα*: *επιστολη καθολικη δευτ. του αγιου αποστολου πετρου* L: *πετρου επιστ. β′* CK [P(appy)] j l m o 13. 36 (*δευτερα* K j l m o): txt ABℵ.

CHAP. I. 1. *σιμων* B a[1] c l m Œc (*σειμων* B[3](Tischdf, expr)). (In C the 3 lines following the title are almost totally illegible; Tischdf however thinks that he can distinguish a Π at the beg of the 1st line, and hence conjectures that the ms omitted *συμεων*.) *εις δικαιοσυνην* ℵ. for *θεου*, *κ̅υ̅* ℵ [syr-pk sah].

CHAP. I. 1, 2.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. **Symeon** (see var. readd. The form, as belonging to our Apostle, is found, besides here, only in Acts xv. 14. Its occurrence is at all events a testimony in favour of the independence of the second Epistle. It was not *adapted* to the first; which, considering that it *refers to* the first, is a note, however slight, on the side of its genuineness) **Peter, a servant** (Rom. i. 1) **and apostle** (an ingenious reason is given by De Wette for the occurrence of both these designations: that the Writer combined 1 Pet. i. 1, with Jude 1) **of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained** (λαγχάνειν (with acc. as reff. Acts, 3 Macc.) shews, as Beng., that "non ipsi sibi pararunt:" as Huss in Huther, "sicut sors non respicit personam, ita nec divina electio acceptatrix est personarum") **like precious faith** (*faith*,—i. e. substance of truth believed: faith objective, not subjective,—*of equal value*: not, as De W., which confers equal right to God's kingdom, equal honour and glory: such a meaning would be unexampled. The E. V. has hit the meaning very happily by *like precious*. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 7. Huther quotes from Horneius (similarly Estius); "dicitur fides æque pretiosa, non quod omnium credentium æque magna sit, sed quod per fidem illam eadem mysteria et eadem beneficia divina nobis proponantur") **with us** (apparently, in the first place, the Apostles: but more probably, in a wider sense, the Jewish Christians, with whom the Gentiles had been admitted into the same covenant, and the inheritance of the like precious promises) **in the righteousness of our God and (our) Saviour Jesus Christ** (first, concerning **ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ**. Some Commentators, as Beza, Grot., Piscator, al., take δικ. for an attribute of God, and ἐν as instrumental, by the righteousness, goodness, truth, of God: others, as Estius, Horneius, al., understand δικ. as "justitia quam Deus nobis dat et Christus peperit" (Horn.), explaining ἐν as 'cum' or 'per:' but, as Huther well replies, this is objectionable, seeing that righteousness comes by faith, not faith by righteousness. De Wette would give two different meanings to δικ. as applied to the Father and to the Son, in the former case making it mean *grace*, in the latter *love*: but this is evidently quite arbitrary. Gerhard would confine it altogether to the "obedientia et satisfactio Christi," against which is τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. The best explanation seems to me that of Huther, that δικαιοσύνη here betokens the righteous dealing of God, corresponding to His attribute of righteousness, as opposed to προσωποληψία: and that the words are to be taken in close connexion with the foregoing, τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, ἐν being used of the conditional element, in which the λαχεῖν πίστιν ἰσότιμον is

2 [g] χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ [g] εἰρήνη [g] πληθυνθείη ἐν [h] ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

3 [i] Ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς [k] θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ [l] τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ [m] εὐσέβειαν [n] δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς [h] ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ [o] καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ [p] ἀρετῇ,

C χαρις ... ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

g = 1 Pet. i. 2 (reff.). h Heb. x. 26 reff. i w. gen. abs., 1 Cor. iv. 18. 2 Cor. v. 20. k = here bis (Acts xvii. 29) only. Job xxvii. 3. 2 Macc. iii. 29. l Luke xiv. 32. xix. 42. Acts xxviii. 10. Heb. ii. 17. m Acts iii. 12. 1 Tim. ii. 2 al7. 2 Tim. iii. 5. Tit. i. 1. vv. 6, 7. ch. iii. 11 only. Isa. xi. 2. (-βεῖν, Acts xvii. 23. -βής, ch. ii. 9. -βῶς, Tit. ii. 12.) n here bis. Mark xv. 45 only. Gen. xxx. 20. o Heb. ix. 15 reff. p = 1 Pet. ii. 9. (ver. 5.)

2. aft *ιησου* ins *χριστου* ALℵ (a c) 36 [syrr] copt æth arm; bef *ιησ.*, d g[2] 13 vulg [-ed(with tol)] Aug$_1$.—*του κυ ημων ιυ χυ*, omg *του θυ και*, a c 69. 137-63 spec syrr: *του κυ και θυ ημων*, omg *ιησου*, j: om *τ. θεου κ. ιησ.* [P] am(with demid fuld harl).

3. ins *τα* bef *παντα* Aℵ c 13 Did$_2$. aft *προς* ins *τον θεον και* ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving).
rec (for *ιδια δοξη κ. αρετη*) *δια δοξης κ. αρετης*, with BKL rel Thl Œc., *δοξης κ. αρετης*, omg *δια*, l: txt ACℵ[P a e] 13. 36 vulg spec Did$_2$ [Cæs$_1$] Bede$_1$, *δοξη κ. αρετη*, omg *ιδια*, a c.

grounded: so that the sense is, in His righteousness, which makes no difference between the one party and the other, God has given to you the like precious faith, as to us. De W.'s objection to this, that thus the Epistle must be regarded as written to Gentile Christians, is not valid, or proves too much: for at all events there must be *two* parties in view in the words *ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν*, whatever these parties be. Next, as to the words **τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ**. Undoubtedly, as in Titus ii. 13, in strict grammatical propriety, both *θεοῦ* and *σωτῆρος* would be predicates of *Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*. But here, as there, considerations interpose, which seem to remove the strict grammatical rendering out of the range of probable meaning. I have fully discussed the question in the note on that passage, to which I would refer the reader as my justification for interpreting here, as there, *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν* of the Father, and *σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* of the Son. Here, there is the additional consideration in favour of this view, that the Two are distinguished most plainly in the next verse): **2.**] **grace to you and peace be multiplied** (so in ref.: but further specified here by what follows) **in** (as the vehicle, or conditional element of the multiplication) **knowledge** (**ἐπίγνωσις**, "cognitio maturior:" but this can hardly be given in English without too strong a phrase) **of God, and of Jesus our Lord** (every unusual expression, like *Ἰησ. τοῦ κυρ. ὑμῶν*, occurring only Rom. iv. 24, should be noticed as a morsel of evidence to the independence of the Epistle).

3—11.] *Exhortation to advance in the graces of the spiritual life:* introduced (vv. 3, 4) by a consideration of the rich bestowal from God of all things belonging to that life by the knowledge of Him, and the aim of His promises, viz. that we should partake in the divine nature. **3.**] **Seeing that** (the connexion with the greeting which precedes must not be broken: it is characteristic of this Epistle, to dilate further when the sense seems to have come to a close. The sense of **ὡς** with a gen. absolute is, "assuming that," "seeing that;" cf. Plato, Alcib. i. p. 10, *οὐκοῦν ὡς διανοουμένου σου ταῦτα ἐρωτῶ, ἀφίημί σε διανοεῖσθαι*: Xen. Cyr. iii. 1. 9, *ἀλλ' ἐρώτα, ἔφη, ὦ Κῦρε, ὅτι βούλει, ὡς τἀληθῆ ἐροῦντος*. See Matthiæ, § 568. 2. Winer, § 65. 9. The latter explains the usage thus, "*ὡς* with a participle in the gen. absolute construction, gives to the idea of the verb a subjective character, of assumption, or intention") **His divine** (**θεῖος**, a word peculiar in N. T., as an adjective, to this Epistle: see reff.) **power hath given** (**δεδωρημένης**, middle in signification, as perfect passives so often: so *προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς*, Acts xiii. 2, xvi. 10, xxv. 12: *ὃ ἐπήγγελται*, Rom. iv. 21; Heb. xii. 26: see Winer, § 39. 3) **us all things** (**πάντα** is prefixed by way of emphasis) **which are** (**requisite**) **for** (reff.) **life and godliness** (**εὐσέβεια** is a mark of the later apostolic period: reff.), **through** (by means of, as the medium of attainment: "Dei cognitio principium est vitæ (John xvii. 3) et primus in pietatem ingressus." Calv.) **the knowledge** (**ἐπιγν.** see above) **of Him that called us** (i. e. of God, who is ever the Caller in the N. T.: see e. g. 1 Pet. ii. 9) **by** (dat. of the instrument, as in Acts ii. 33, v. 31; James iii. 7) **His own glory and virtue** (*αἱ ἀρεταί* are predicated of God in ref. 1 Pet. However these words be read, whether as in text, or *διὰ δόξης κ. ἀρετῆς*, both substantives belong to God, not to us: still less must we render, as in E. V., "called us to glory and virtue," of which meaning there is not a trace in either reading. Bengel seems to give the meaning well, "ad gloriam referuntur attributa Dei naturalia, ad virtutem ea quæ dicuntur moralia: intime

[4] δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα καὶ [q] τίμια ἡμῖν [r] ἐπαγγέλματα [n] δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε [k] θείας [s] κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, [t] ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν κόσμῳ [u] ἐν [v] ἐπιθυμίᾳ [w] φθορᾶς. [5] [x] καὶ [y] αὐτὸ τοῦτο [x] δὲ [z] σπουδὴν [a] πᾶσαν [b] παρεισ-

q 1 Pet. i. 19 reff. r ch. iii. 13 only †. Demosth. 397. 3. s 1 Pet. v. 1 reff. t ch. ii. 18, 20 only †. Sir. xxii. 22 only. u = Tit. iii. 5 al. v absol., Rom. vii. 7, 8. 1 Thess. iv. 5. James i. 14, 15. (see ch. ii. 10, 18.) w Rom. viii. 21. 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50. Gal. vi. 8. Col. ii. 22. ch. ii. 12 bis, 19 only. Ps. cii. 4. x Matt. x. 18. John vi. 51. viii. 16, 17. xv. 27. Acts iii. 24 al. y = here only. (Rom. ix. 17 al.) Winer, § 21. 3, Remark 2. z Rom. xii. 8, 11. Jude 3 al. Exod. xii. 11. a = Acts xx. 19. Phil. ii. 29 al. b here only †. Demosth. 464. 1, 12.

4. transp *μεγιστα* and *τιμια* BKLℵ rel spec syr Thl Œc: txt AC[P] m 13. 36 vulg syr-pk coptt Did$_1$ Jer$_1$.—rec *ημιν* bef *και*, with KLℵ rel Œc: txt (A)BC[P] a c m 13 vulg spec syr[-txt] Did Thl.—for *ημιν*, *υμιν* A 66-8 syr-pk syr-mg. *φυσεως* bef *κοινωνοι* ℵ. ins *τω* bef *κοσμω* ABLℵ. for *εν επιθ.*, *επιθυμιας και* C 69. 137-68 syr arm [*και* (only) P]: *επιθυμιας* 13 vulg lat-ff.—*την εν τω κ. επιθυμιαν* ℵ [Jer$_1$].

5. *αυτοι* A 13 vulg spec æth. *δε* bef *τουτο* C²ℵ a c d h 13. 36 [syrr arm] Thl: om *τουτο* A. om *πασαν* C a c am¹(but added by origl scribe) Thl, insd in syr

unum sunt utraque." Cf. Gal. i. 15, *καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*), **4.] through which** (His attributes and energies) **He hath given to us** (**δεδώρηται** again middle in sense, see above: not as E. V., passive: the subject is *ὁ καλέσας*) **the** [or, **His**] **greatest and precious promises** (**ἐπαγγέλματα**, as in ch. iii. 13, *promises*: not, *things promised* (Est., Beng., al.), still less, as Dietlein, proclamations of Christian doctrine, which the word cannot mean. Benson's idea, that by *ἡμῖν* are meant the Apostles, and that the second person *γένησθε* refers to the Gentile Christians, seems quite beside the purpose), **that by means of these** (promises: i. e. their fulfilment: not to be referred, as Calv., Benson, De Wette, to *τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν κ.τ.λ.* as the antecedent: nor, as Beng., to *δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ*: **τούτων** shews pointedly that the last-mentioned noun is the antecedent) **ye may become** (aor., but not on that account to be rendered, as Huther, würdet, *that ye might be*, adding, that the Writer assumes the participation to have already taken place: for the aor. is continually thus used of future contingencies without any such intent: e. g. *πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε*, John xii. 36. The account of this usage of the aor. has not been any where, that I have seen, sufficiently given. It is untranslateable in most cases, but seems to serve in the Greek to express that the aim was not the procedure, but the completion, of that indicated: not the *γίνεσθαι*, the carrying on of the process, but the *γενέσθαι*, its accomplishment) **partakers of the divine nature** (i. e. of that holiness, and truth, and love, and, in a word, perfection, which dwells in God, and in you, by God dwelling in you: "vocat hic divinam naturam id quod divina præsentia efficit in nobis, i. e. conformitatem nostri cum Deo, seu imaginem Dei quæ in nobis reformatur per divinam præsentiam in nobis." Hemming in Huther: which is only so far wrong, that it confounds our *κοινωνία* in the divine nature, of which the above would be a right description, with that nature itself), **having escaped** (not a conditional participial clause, but like *ὀλίγον παθόντας* in 1 Pet. v. 10, merely a note of matter of fact, bringing out in this case the negative side of the Christian life, as the former clause did the positive:—'when ye have escaped') **from** (the construction, of *ἀποφεύγω* with a gen. is not very usual. Matthiæ gives a similar instance from Xen. An. i. 3. 2, *ἐξέφυγε τοῦ μὴ καταπετρωθῆναι*, and another from Soph. Antig. 488, *οὐκ ἀλύξετον μόρου κακίστου*. In Philoct. 1034 we have *δοκοῖμ' ἂν τῆς νόσου πεφευγέναι*. These last instances shew that the gen. here is due, not to the preposition *ἀπο*, but to the idea of separation and distance implied in the sense of the verbs) **the corruption** (= destruction, of soul and body) **which is in the world in** (consisting in, as its element and ground) **lust** (Calvin: "hanc non in elementis quæ nos circumstant, sed in corde nostro esse ostendit, quia illic regnant vitiosi et pravi affectus, quorum fontem vel radicem voce concupiscentiæ notat. Ergo ita locatur in mundo corruptio, ut sciamus in nobis esse mundum").

5—7.] *Direct exhortation*, consequent on vv. 3, 4, *to progress in the spiritual life*. **5.] And on this very account** (**αὐτὸ τοῦτο**, lit. "*this very thing*:" but just as *τί*, "*what*," has come to mean "*why?*" "*for what reason?*" so **αὐτό**, or **τοῦτο**, or the strengthened demonstrative produced by the juxtaposition of both, has come to mean, "*wherefore*," "*for this reason*." See Winer in reff.: and cf. Xen. Anab. i. 9. 21, *αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὗπερ αὐτὸς ἕνεκα φίλων ᾤετο δεῖσθαι, ... καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπειρᾶτο συνεργὸς τοῖς φίλοις κράτιστος εἶναι*,—'for the very reason, for which he thought that he himself wanted

ενέγκαντες [c] ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν [d] ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ [d] ἀρετῇ τὴν [e] γνῶσιν, [6] ἐν δὲ τῇ [e] γνώσει τὴν [f] ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ [f] ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν [g] ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ [g] ὑπομονῇ τὴν [h] εὐσέβειαν, [7] ἐν δὲ τῇ [h] εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν [i] φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ [i] φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην. [8] ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν [k] ὑπάρχοντα καὶ [l] πλεονάζοντα οὐκ [m] ἀργοὺς

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

c 2 Cor. ix. 10. Gal. iii. 5. Col. ii. 19. ver. 11 only †. Sir. xxv. 23 only. (-γία, Phil. i. 19.)
d = here bis. Phil. iv. 8 only. (1 Pet. ii. 9. ver. 3 only.) Wisd. viii. 7.
e = 1 Pet. iii. 7.
f here bis. Acts xxiv. 25. Gal. v. 23 only †. Sir. xviii. 30 (title) only.
g James i. 3, 4 reff.
h ver. 3 reff.
i Rom. xii. 10. 1 Thess. iv. 9. Heb. xiii. 1. 1 Pet. i. 22 only †. (-φος, 1 Pet. iii. 8.)
k Acts iii. 6. iv. 37. xxviii. 7. Sir. xx. 16.
l elsw. Paul only. = Rom. v. 20 bis. vi. 1. 2 Cor. iv. 15. Phil. iv. 17 al. 2 Chron. xxiv. 11.
m Matt. xii. 36. xx. 3, 6. 1 Tim. v. 13 bis. Tit. i. 12. James ii. 20 only. Wisd. xv. 15.

with ast. in ℵ the επι of επιχορηγησατε is written over the line appy by the original scribe. ημων C: om spec.

7. for 1st τη, την (sic) ℵ.

8. for υπαρχοντα, παροντα A 5. 9. 73 vulg sah [syr-pk and æth, appy] Cyr[?] Ps-Chr$_1$.

friends . . . . he also tried to be' &c.: and Plato, Protag. p. 310 E, αὐτὰ ταῦτα νῦν ἥκω παρά σε. The reason here being, ὡς . . . . δεδωρημένης κ.τ.λ., above: so that this forms a sort of apodosis to that sentence. The E. V. '*beside this*' is entirely at fault. Nor can we, as Dietlein, make αὐτὸ τοῦτο the object after ἐπιχορηγήσατε) **giving on your part** (παρεισενέγκαντες, lit. *introducing by the side of*: i. e. besides those precious promises on God's part, bringing in on your part) **all diligence** (so σπουδὴν εἰσενέγκαι or εἰσενέγκασθαι in Libanius, Josephus, Antt. xx. 9. 2, Diod. Sic. p. 554, in Wetst.), **furnish** (from the original meaning of the verb, to *provide expenses for a chorus*, it easily gets this of *furnishing forth*; see reff. And the construction and meaning of the following clauses is not as Horneius and the E. V., "adjicite fidei virtutem &c.," but the ἐν is each time used of that which is assumed to be theirs, and the exhortation is, to take care that, in the exercise of that, the next step is developed: "præsens quisque gradus subsequentem parit et facilem reddit: subsequens priorem temperat ac perficit," Bengel) **in your faith** (Bengel remarks, "fides, Dei donum: ideo non jubemur subministrare fidem, sed in fide fructus illos, qui septem enumerantur: fide chorum ducente, amore concludente") **virtue** (best perhaps understood with Bengel as "strenuus animi tonus ac vigor." Œc. gives it τὰ ἔργα; but this seems too general: it is indeed that which *produces* τὰ ἔργα, without which faith is dead: and hence the connexion), **and in your virtue, knowledge** (probably that practical discriminating knowledge, of which it is said Eph. v. 17, μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνίετε τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου: "quæ malum a bono secernit, et mali fugam docet," Beng.: not as Œc., ἡ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποκρύφων μυστηρίων εἴδησις), 6.] **and in your knowledge, self-restraint** (ἐγκράτεια, τὸ μηδενὶ ἀποσύρεσθαι πάθει, as Œc. "Temperance" is now too much used of one sort only of self-restraint, fully to express the word. The Commentators compare Sir. xviii. 30, where under the head ἐγκράτεια ψυχῆς is said, ὀπίσω τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν σου μὴ πορεύου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέξεών σου κωλύου. The connexion is; let such discriminating knowledge not be without its fruit, of steady holding in hand of the passions and tempers), **and in your self-restraint, patient endurance** (in afflictions and trials), **and in your patient endurance, godliness** (i. e. it is not to be mere brute Stoical endurance, but united with God-fearing and God-trusting. Or it *may* perhaps be used without direct reference to God, as in Dio Cass. xlviii. 5, διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐσέβειαν: but the other is much more likely in the N. T.: especially as the social virtues follow),

7.] **and in your godliness, brotherly kindness** (not suffering your godliness to be moroseness, nor a sullen solitary habit of life, but kind and generous and courteous), **and in your brotherly kindness, love** (universal kindness of thought, word, and act towards all: a catholic large-heartedness, not confining the spirit of φιλαδελφία to ἀδελφοί only, Matt. v. 46, 47. So that these two last correspond to the ἀγάπη εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας of 1 Thess. iii. 12.

8, 9.] *Reasons for the foregoing exhortations*: 1. *positive*, the advantage of these Christian graces in bringing forth fruit towards the mature knowledge of Christ: 2. *negative*, the disadvantage of their absence from the character. 8.] **For these things** (the above-mentioned graces) **being in you** (ὑπάρχειν of previous subsistence, εἶναι of mere matter-of-fact being: see note on Acts xvi. 20) **and multiplying** (not merely as E. V. "*abounding*:" see reff.) **render you** (not pres. for

οὐδὲ [n] ἀκάρπους [o] καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [p] ἐπίγνωσιν. [9] ᾧ γὰρ μὴ [q] πάρεστιν ταῦτα, τυφλός ἐστιν, [r] μυωπάζων, [s] λήθην [t] λαβὼν τοῦ [u] καθαρισμοῦ τῶν [v] πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. [10] Διὸ μᾶλλον,

n Matt. xiii. 22 | Mk. 1 Cor. xiv. 14. Eph. v. 11. Tit. iii. 14. Jude 12 only. Jer. ii. 6. Wisd. xv. 4 only.

o James iii. 6 reff. p ver. 2. q = here only. (see Heb. xiii. 5.) Wisd. xiii. 1. r here only +. (see note.) s here only. Jos. Antt. ii. 9. 1, διὰ χρόνου μῆκος λήθην λαβόντες. Deut. viii. 19. Wisd. xvi. 11. t so 2 Tim. i. 5. Heb. xi. 29. u Heb. i. 3 (reff.). Job vii. 21. v Heb. i. 1 reff. w. art., here only. Gr. freq.

aft *ακαρπους*, *ουδ* is written but marked for erasure by ℵ[1].

9. for *αμαρτιων*, *αμαρτηματων* AKℵ d 36(sic) [arm Marc$_1$] Damasc$_1$ Ps-Chr$_1$ [*delictorum* vulg spec].

future, but as expressing the habitual character and function of these virtues) **not idle** (ἀργός = ἀεργος) **nor yet** (οὐδέ introduces a slight climax: a man may be in some sense not unworkful, but yet unfruitful) **unfruitful towards** (εἰς not = ἐν as E. V. after Luth., Calv., Grot., al.: these virtues are all regarded as so many steps in advancing towards the ἐπίγνωσις of Christ, which is the great complex end of the Christian life) **the perfect knowledge** (here, considering the place which it holds, it is well to give the full sense of ἐπίγνωσις) **of our Lord Jesus Christ** (in Him are hid, ethically as well as doctrinally, all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge: the knowledge of Him is the imitation of Him: for as it is true that hereafter the seeing Him as He is will ensure our being perfectly like Him, so it is true that here the only way in any degree increasingly to see Him as He is, is to become increasingly like Him. He only can declare Christ, who reflects Christ). 9.] **For** (*negative reason*: see above: and that, with reference not only to the exhortations of vv. 5, 6, 7, but by this γάρ connected also with ver. 8: the advantage of the presence is great, for the disadvantage of the absence indicates no less than spiritual blindness and oblivion) **he to whom these are not present** (contrast to ταῦτα ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα κ. πλεονάζοντα, ver. 8) **is blind** (lacks discernment altogether of his own state as a member of Christ and inheritor of heaven), **short-sighted** (μυωπάζειν λέγονται οἱ ἐκ γενετῆς τὰ μὲν ἐγγὺς βλέποντες, τὰ δὲ ἐξ ἀποστάσεως οὐχ ὁρῶντες· ἐναντία δὲ πάσχουσιν οἱ γέροντες τοῖς μυωπάζουσιν, τὰ γὰρ ἐγγὺς μὴ ὁρῶντες τὰ πόῤῥωθεν βλέπουσιν, Aristot. Probl. § 31. Hence some, e. g. Beza, Grot., Est., De W., Huther, interpret the word of not being able to see the heavenly things, which are distant, only earthly, which are close at hand. Perhaps, however, Horneius is right in characterizing this as an "interpretatio argutior quam ut Apostolo proposita fuisse videri possit." The vulg. "manu tentans" (Luth., und tappet mit der Hand: "manu viam tentans," Erasm.) seems to have come from the gloss ψηλαφῶν. Thl. explains it by τυφλώττειν, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν μυῶν τυφλῶν εἰς ἅπαν διατελούντων: but thus we should have a mere tautology. Wolf adopts the interpretation "shutting the eyes," seeing that Hesych. and Suidas explain it by καμμύειν, and that μυωπάζειν is only μύειν τὰς ὦπας. "Itaque," he proceeds, "τυφλὸς μυωπάζων is dicitur qui ideo cæcus est, quia sponte claudit oculos, ut ne videat, aut qui videre se dissimulat, quod vel invitus cernit." This was also the opinion of Bochart, Hieroz. i. 4, whose arguments will be found reproduced in Suicer sub voce. On the whole I prefer the interpretation "*short-sighted*," without endorsing the ingenious explanation of Beza al. above), **having incurred forgetfulness** (reff. and Athen. xii. 5, p. 523, λήθην λαβόντες τῆς Κρητῶν περὶ τὸν βίον εὐκοσμίας. See more examples in Kypke, Krebs, and Loesner, h. l. Bengel says, "participio *nactus* exprimitur quod homo volens patitur." But surely this is very doubtful; certainly not upheld by the usage of the phrase) **of the purification of his former sins** (i. e. of the fact of his ancient, pre-Christian, sins having been purged away in his baptism. This, and not the purification of the sins of the world, and of his among them, by the cross of Christ, is evidently the sense, by the πάλαι and αὐτοῦ. And thus almost all the Commentators. καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτος ἐπιγνοὺς ἑαυτὸν διὰ τὸ καθαρθῆναι τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι, ὅτι πλήθους ἁμαρτιῶν ἐξεπλύθη, δέον εἰδέναι ὅτι καθαρθεὶς καὶ ἁγιότητα ἔλαβε, νήφειν ἵνα διαπαντὸς τηρῇ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον, ὁ δὲ ἐπελάθετο. Œc. and so Thl.).

10, 11.] The *exhortation is resumed*, and *further pressed*, both on the preceding grounds, and on account of its blessed ultimate results, if followed. 10.] **Wherefore the rather** ("quæ cum ita sint, impensius." διό referring to the two considerations urged in vv. 8, 9, and μᾶλλον making them reasons for increased zeal in complying with the exhortation), **brethren**

ἀδελφοί, [w] σπουδάσατε [x] βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν [y] κλῆσιν καὶ [z] ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι· ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ [a] πταίσητέ ποτε. 11 [b] οὕτως γὰρ [c] πλουσίως [d] ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ [e] εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ [f] κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ [f] σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ [f] χριστοῦ.

12 Διὸ [g] μελλήσω ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς [h] ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων,

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

w Gal. ii. 10. Eph. iv. 3. 1 Thess. ii. 17. 2 Tim. ii. 15 al. Isa. xxi. 3. x Heb. ii. 2 reff. y Rom. xi. 29. Eph. i. 18. Phil. iii. 14. Heb. iii. 1 al. Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 6. Judith xii. 10 A compl. Ald. only. z Acts ix. 15. Rom. ix. 11. xi. 5, 7, 28. 1 Thess. i. 4 only †. Isa. xxii. 7 Aq. a (=) Rom. xi. 11. James ii. 10. iii. 2 (bis) only. 1 Kings iv. 2, 3. b = Acts vii. 8. xvii. 33. xxviii. 14. 1 Thess. iv. 17 al. c Col. iii. 16. 1 Tim. vi. 17. Titus iii. 6 only †. d ver. 5 reff. e Acts xiii. 24. 1 Thess. i. 9. ii. 1. Heb. x. 19 only. 1 Kings xvi. 4. f ch. i. 1 reff. g fut., Matt. xxiv. 6 only. h Luke xxii. 61. John xiv. 26. 2 Tim. ii. 14. Tit. iii. 1. 3 John 10. Jude 5 only †. Wisd. xviii. 22 only.

10. aft *σπουδασατε* ins *ινα δια των καλων υμων εργων* A 25 syr-pk æth: *ινα δια των καλων εργων* ℵ a c 5. 15. 36. 69. 73. 99 vulg syr coptt [arm]: *δι' αγαθων εργων υμων* 13. *παρακλησιν* A. [ins *την* bef *εκλογην* P.] *ποιεισθε* A a c 5. 25. 36. om *ποτε* A 73 æth Ambr$_1$.

11. om *η* ℵ b[1]. *αιωνιαν* C[1]. *και σωτηρος* bef *ημων* A 106 æth: om *και σωτηρος* a k 32: *ημ.* [twice] syr-pk coptt.

12. rec (for *μελλησω*) *ουκ αμελησω*, with KL rel syrr Thl Œc: txt ABC[P]ℵ vulg coptt [æth] arm Bede. (13 defective.) rec *υμας* bef *αει*, with A a c k vulg [syrr copt æth] Œc [om *αει* P sah]: *περι τουτων υπομιμνησκειν* bef *υμας* ℵ: txt BCKL rel

(making the appeal more close and affectionate), **give diligence** (so the E. V. admirably. 'Be earnest' would express rather *σπουδάζετε* pres., whereas the aor. includes the whole *σπουδάσαι* in one lifelong effort) **to make** (not *ποιεῖν*, which lay beyond their power, but **ποιεῖσθαι**, on their side, for their part. But the verb must not be explained away into a pure subjectivity, 'to make sure to yourselves:' it carries the reflective force, but only in so far as the act is and must be done for and quoad a man's own self, the absolute and final determination resting with Another. Calvin's "studete ut re ipsa testatum fiat, vos non frustra vocatos esse" (**βεβαίαν ποιεῖσθαι**?) is a very weak dilution of the sense. We must take the passage as we find it: and as it stands its simple and irrefragable sense is that by *σπουδὴν παρεισενέγκαι ἐπιχορηγῆσαι ἐν κ.τ.λ.* is the way *βεβαίαν ποιεῖσθαι* our *κλῆσιν* and *ἐκλογήν*. How this is to be reconciled with the fact, that our *κλῆσις* and *ἐκλογή* proceed entirely and freely from God, would not be difficult to shew: but it must not be done, as Calvin attempts it, by wresting plain words and context) **your calling and election** (as Grot., al., "vocatio quæ vobis contigit per evangelium, et electio eam secuta, qua facti estis Dei populus." Both these were God's acts, cf. ver. 3 and 1 Pet. i. 1, 2) **secure** (*'ratæ,'* as Grot.: for both, in as far as we look on them from the lower side, not able to penetrate into the counsels of God, are insecure unless established by holiness of life. In His foreknowledge and purpose, there is no insecurity, no uncertainty: but in our vision and apprehension of them as they exist in and for us, much, until they are made secure in the way here pointed out): **for, doing these things** (act., **ποιοῦντες**, now, because these are works done. And the participle is conditional, carrying with it an hypothesis: as E. V. *'if ye do these things'*), **ye shall never offend** (reff. stumble and fall): **11.**] **for thus** (i. e. *ταῦτα ποιοῦντες*) **shall be richly** (the adverb **πλουσίως** is not, as Huther, surprising, but most natural and obvious with the verb *ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται*, which is one of furnishing and ministering; therefore of quantity. The adverb belongs to the figure latent in the verb: and must therefore be interpreted in and with the interpretation of the verb: in which case it will indicate high degrees and fulness of glory) **furnished to you** (the verb seems expressly chosen in order to answer to *ἐπιχορηγήσατε*, ver. 5: "furnish forth your own lives with these Christian graces, so shall be furnished to you" &c.) **the** [or, **your**] **entrance** (which all Christians look for: not the fact of this entrance taking place, but the fact of its *πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθῆναι*, is that asserted) **into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.** **12—21.**] *The above exhortations confirmed* by the consideration of the *certainty of the power* and announced *coming of Christ*, as shewn, 1. by *apostolic testimony*, 2. by O. T. *prophecy*. **12—15.**] *The Apostle holds it necessary to remind them of this truth, and will do so up to his approaching end.* **12.**] **Wherefore** (namely, because *ταῦτα ποιοῦντες* is the only way to a rich participation in the blessings and glories of Christ's kingdom) **I will be sure** (**μελλήσω**, ref., is of very rare occurrence.

[i] καίπερ [k] εἰδότας καὶ [l] ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ [m] παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. [13] [n] δίκαιον δὲ [o] ἡγοῦμαι, [p] ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ [q] σκηνώματι, [r] διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν [s] ὑπομνήσει, [14] εἰδὼς ὅτι [t] ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ [u] ἀπόθεσις τοῦ [q] σκηνώματός μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς [v] ἐδήλωσέν μοι. [15] [w] σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ [x] ἑκάστοτε [y] ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν

i Heb. v. 8 reff.
k 1 Pet. i. 18. v. 9.
l 1 Pet. v. 10 reff.
m = Col. i. 6.
n = Phil. i. 7. Jos. Antt. iv. 8. 2.
o = Heb. x. 29 reff.
p = Matt. ix. 15. Xen. Cyr. v. 5. 8.
q here bis. Acts vii. 46 (from Ps. cxxxi. 5) only. (-νος, 2 Cor. v. 1, 4.)
r = ch. iii. 1 (Mark iv. 39. Luke viii. 24. vi. 18) only †. 2 Macc. vii. 21. xv. 10 only.
s 2 Tim. i. 5. ch. iii. 1 only †. Wisd. xvi. 11. 2 Macc. vi. 17 only.
t ch. ii. 1 only. Isa. lix. 7.
u 1 Pet. iii. 21 only †.
v Heb. ix. 8 reff. John xxi. 18, 19.
w ver. 10.
x here only †. Xen. Conv. i. 14.
y = Luke vii. 42. Eph. iv. 26.

Thl. (13 def.) om καιπερ to υμας next ver (*homœotel* υμας . . υμας) ℵ[1].
13. om τω C[1](appy). ins τη bef υπομνησει Aℵ 5.
14. om καθως to ημων ℵ.
15. σπουδαζω ℵ [m arm.

The expression is nearly equivalent to "I will take care" (σπουδάσω, Hesych.): for (see Lexx. and esp. Palm and Rost) the original idea of μέλλω (akin to μέλω and the Latin "velle") includes purpose; and the verb is very commonly used, by Homer, e. g., to signify intent: so Od. ν. 293, οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες λήξειν ἀπατάων, and in other examples in Palm and Rost. At the same time there is an objectivity in the word, of which it is not possible to divest it, implying that the thing intended is surely about to happen: and which I have tried to express as above) **always to remind you concerning these things** (τούτων, the things just now spoken of: in the widest sense: it does not merely take up the ταῦτα of ταῦτα ποιοῦντες, nor merely, as De W., refer to the kingdom of Christ and His coming), **although ye know them** (ἕκαστον ὑμῶν, καίπερ ἀκριβῶς εἰδότα, ὅμως ἐπαναμνῆσαι βούλομαι. Demosth. p. 74. 7) **and are confirmed** (firmly established) **in the truth which is present with you** (the words "*the present truth*," E. V., give a wrong idea to the English reader: seeming to mean, the truth at present under notice. The meaning is exactly as in ref., τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς:—'which is (known and professed) among you.' "Vos quidem, inquit, probe tenetis quænam sit evangelii veritas, neque vos quasi fluctuantes confirmo, sed in re tanta monitiones nunquam sunt supervacuæ, quare nunquam molestæ esse debent. Simili excusatione utitur Paulus ad Rom., xv. 14." Calvin).

13.] **But** (notwithstanding this previously conceded fact, that you know and stand firm in the truth) **I think it right** (*why*, follows, ver. 14) **as long as** (ἐφ' ὅσον, scil. χρόνον, see Rom. vii. 1 al.) **I am in this tabernacle** (see for the sense 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.: and below), **to stir you up in** (not, "*by:*" *in*, as the medium in which I strive towards the stirring up, and in using which it has place) **reminding** (the same phrase occurs in ch. iii. 1):

14.] **knowing** (as I do: reason for δίκαιον ἡγοῦμαι above) **that rapid is** (see below. ἔστιν, of that which is to be: the normal present) **the putting off** (the two figures, of a tabernacle or tent, and a garment, are intermingled, as in 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.) **of my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ declared to me** (the allusion is to John xxi. 18 ff., where a swift and sharp death is announced to St. Peter by our risen Lord. And the sentence does not mean to say, as commonly understood, that he must *soon* put off his tabernacle, but that the putting off, whenever it did come, would be sudden and quick; so vulg.: "certus quod velox est depositio tabernaculi mei" (which can hardly be interpreted with Estius, "id est, brevi futura est"): so Bengel, "*repentina est;* præsens. Qui diu ægrotant, possunt alios adhuc pascere. Crux id Petro non erat permissura. Ideo prius agit quod agendum est." So Eur. Hippol. 1044, ταχὺς γὰρ ᾅδης ῥᾷστος ἀνδρὶ δυστυχεῖ: Soph. Ajax 833, σὺν ἀσφαδάστῳ καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι πλευρὰν διαῤῥήξαντα: Mosch. iii. 26, σεῖο, Βίων, ἔκλαυσε ταχὺν μόρον αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων. Missing this point, some have imagined that some other special revelation to St. Peter is implied: and such revelations are related by Hegesippus de excid. Hierosol. iii. 2, Ambros. Sermo de bas. trad. Ep. 21 (32), vol. iii., p. 867: see especially Corn. a-Lapide h. l. But even if ταχινή be understood '*soon*,' '*not far off*,' no such inference need be drawn. For it might well be that advancing old age might lead the Apostle to the conclusion that the end prophesied to him ὅταν γηράσῃς could not be far off. The Commentators quote Jos. Antt. iv. 8. 2, where Moses says, ἐπεὶ . . . δεῖ με τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθεῖν . . . . δίκαιον ἡγησάμην μηδὲ νῦν ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τὸ ἐμὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐδαιμονίας πρόθυμον).

15.] **Moreover** (δὲ καί both serve for con-

ἐμὴν [z] ἔξοδον τὴν τούτων [a] μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι. [16] οὐ γὰρ [b] σεσοφισμένοις [c] μύθοις [d] ἐξακολουθήσαντες [e] ἐγνω-

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

z = Luke ix. 31 (Heb. xi. 22) only. Wisd. iii. 2. a here only. Ps. xxix. 4. μν. ποι., Thuc. ii. 54. b = here (2 Tim. iii. 15) only. Herod. ii. 66, πρὸς ταῦτα σοφίζονται τάδε. c 1 Tim. i. 4. iv. 7. 2 Tim. iv. 4. Tit. i. 14 only †. Sir. xx. 19 only. d ch. ii. 2, 15 only. Isa. lvi. 11. Sir. v. 2 (see note). e = 1 Cor. xii. 3. xv. 1. 2 Cor. viii. 1 al. Jer. xvi. 20.

μνειαν P 13 Œc.

nexion with the foregoing) **I will endeavour that ye may on every occasion have it in your power** (reff.) **after my decease** (it is at least remarkable that, with the recollection of the scene on the mount of transfiguration floating in his mind, the Apostle should use so close together the words which were there also associated, viz. **σκήνωμα** and **ἔξοδος**: see Luke ix. 28 ff. The coincidence should not be forgotten in treating of the question of the genuineness of the Epistle) **to exercise the memory of these things** (**μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι** is almost always used for *to make mention of:* so Herodot. vi. 19, 55, vit. Hom. 14, and other examples in Wetst.: but such evidently is not its sense here. In Thucyd. (ref.) the sense is ambiguous, but from *οὕτως ᾄσονται* following, it would appear that *to quote* or *make mention* is also the sense there, though Palm and Rost give it as here. An interpretation has been given to this latter clause which the very position of the Greek words, *μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον*, after *ἔχειν ὑμᾶς*, ought sufficiently to have guarded against: viz. that St. Peter says *σπουδάσω καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον*, meaning, as Œc. and Thl. mentioning this view, *ὅτι καὶ μετὰ θάνατον οἱ ἅγιοι μέμνηνται τῶν τῇδε, καὶ πρεσβεύουσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ζώντων* (but not with approval, merely stating that *τοῦτό τινες ἐν ὑπερβάτῳ ἀκούοντες* (per hyperbaton intelligentes) *βούλονται παριστᾷν ἀπὸ τούτου ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*), Many of the R.-Catholic interpreters take this view; so Corn. a-Lap., *ἔχειν*, "habere scilicet in mente et memoria mea (?) ut crebro vestri sim memor apud Deum, eumque pro vobis orem, ut horum monitorum meorum memoriam vobis refricet. Ita Œcumenius (compare above. The more candid Estius confesses, "Œc. etiam hujus meminit interpretationis, sed alteram præfert ut simpliciorem"), &c." and he concludes: "Hinc patet S. Petrum et Sanctos vita functos curare res mortalium, ideoque esse invocandos." And so Justiniani, but not so confidently: Feuardentius, doubtingly at first, but "vires acquirens eundo," and ending with a vehement invective against the heretics who hold the interpretation which he himself had previously given. Estius, on the other hand, impugns this view, supporting the ordinary one, and ending "Jam quid attinet, statuere velle doctrinam certissimam argumento incerto, cum alia certissima nequaquam desint?" It is most instructive, especially in our days, to take up any of the texts, by which the abuses of Rome are supposed to be sanctioned, and to trace their interpretations through the R.-Cath. Commentators themselves. It will be most frequently found, as here, that the confident allegation of them has arisen at first out of some merely conjectural sense, impugned by the very authorities which they quote for it, or supported, as in this case (compare the citations in Corn. a-Lap. and Estius), by spurious writings attributed to the Fathers.

16–18.] *Corroboration of the certainty of the facts announced by apostolic eye-witness.*

16.] **For** (reason for the zeal which he had just predicated of himself) **not in pursuance of** (**ἐξακολ.**, see reff. The preposition must not perhaps be pressed: certainly not as Bengel, "*τὸ ἐξ* errorem notat, cap. ii. 2, 15." If it is to be rendered, its sense may be much as in our expression, "following out," i.e. "in pursuance of," as given above) **cunningly-devised fables** (add to reff., Aristoph. Nub. 543, *ἀεὶ καινὰς ἰδέας σοφίζομαι*. They are, as Pott (in Huther), "fabulæ ad decipiendos hominum animos artificiose excogitatæ atque exornatæ." The Commentators quote from the procemium of Josephus, *οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες κ.τ.λ.* Such cunningly-devised fables would be the mythologies of the heathen, the cabalistic stories of the Jews; and these may be alluded to, and perhaps also the fables of the Gnostics, which could, it is true, only be in their infancy, but still might be pointed at by St. Peter, as by St. Paul in reff.: see Prolegomena, Vol. III. ch. vii. § i. 34) **did we make known to you** (the Writer of this Epistle, says De Wette, wishes to appear to stand in closer relation to his readers, than the writer of 1 Peter: cf. 1 Pet. i. 12. But why so? May not the same Apostle in one place mean the actual preachers who delivered the Gospel to them, in the other, the Apostles, who were its first witnesses? For observe, that first Epistle is addressed to certain definite churches; this, to all Christians generally. Or again, why should it be regarded as absolutely impossible that

ρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ [f] παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' [g] ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου [h] μεγαλειότητος. 17 [i] λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς [k] ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ [l] τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ τῆς [m] μεγαλοπρεποῦς [n] δόξης [o] Ὁ υἱός μου ὁ [o] ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός

f James v. 7, 8 reff. Pet., ch. iii. 4, 12 only.
g here only †. (2 Macc. iii. 39. vii. 35. 3 Macc. ii. 21.)
h Luke ix. 43. Acts xix. 27 only. Jer. xl. (xxxiii.) 9. Dan. vii. 27 LXX. Esdr. i. 5 only.
i particip. constr., 2 Cor. v. 6. vii. 5 al. Lev. iv. 5. Winer, § 45. 6. b.
k = 1 Pet. i. 13. ver. 21.
l here only.
m here only. Deut. xxxiii. 26. (-πεια, Ps. xx. 5.)
n = (see note) δυνάμεως, Matt. xxvi. 64 ;'.
o Matt. (iii. 17 ‖) xvii. 5. Gen. xxii. 2.

16. om χριστου P. aft δυν. ins τε P 13.]
17. ins του bef θεου Cℵ a c 69. ανεχθεισης C[3]. τοιασδε bef αυτω C[1] 13 Thl [om αυτω P]. rec ουτος εστιν bef ο υι. μ. ο αγαπ., omg 2nd μου (*as elsewhere*), with ACKLℵ rel [vss: P has ουτος εστιν in both places]: txt. B.

the publication of some one or more of the existing Gospels may have taken place, and may be alluded to in these words ?) **the power** (viz., that conferred on Him by the Father at His glorification, of which the following scene testified, and the actuality of which He himself asserted, when He said, Matt. xxviii. 18, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς: in the strength of which He will come to judge the world) **and coming** (i. e., as ever, second and glorious coming: not, as Erasm. and many others, His first coming. Nor must the two words be made by hendiadys into "præsentissima majestas," as Bengel) **of our Lord Jesus Christ, but** (in virtue of) **having been admitted** (the part., as so often, renders the reason,—the enabling cause of the act. The **γενηθέντες** *may here* be pressed to its passive sense, 'having been admitted as:' seeing that γενόμενοι would have been the more natural word, were no such meaning intended) **eye-witnesses** (**ἐπόπτης** is a technical word, used of those who were admitted to the highest degree of initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries: and, considering the occasion to which allusion is made, there seems no reason for letting go altogether this reference here: "admitted as initiated spectators." Still, in English, we have no other way of expressing this than as above. Any attempt to introduce the allusion would overcharge the language. The word "admitted" gives a faint hint of it) **of His majesty** (viz. on the occasion to be mentioned. The words must not be generalized, to reach to all occasions of such witnessing: but it is obvious that neither must the Transfiguration be regarded as standing altogether alone in such an assertion. It is indeed here that incident which marked, to the Apostle's mind, most certainly the reality of Christ's future glory: but it was not the only occasion when he had seen the exhibition of divine power by Him as a foretaste of His power at his return to judgment: cf. John v. 25—28, with John xi. 40—44).

17.] **For** (justification of the above assertion that we were admitted witnesses of His majesty) **having received** (the construction is an interrupted one, and seems rightly explained by Winer, as in reff.: "the construction is broken off by the parenthetical clause φωνῆς .... εὐδόκησα, and the Apostle continues, ver. 18, καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, instead, as he would have said, ἡμᾶς εἶχε ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούσαντας (-οντας ?), or the like." So that the participle does not want supplying by ἦν or ἐτύγχανε, nor is it put for the finite verb) **from God the Father** (not τοῦ πατρός, or τοῦ π. αὐτοῦ, because θεὸς πατήρ was a term well known: cf. the same in Gal. i. 3; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 John 3; Jude 1) **honour and glory** (honour, in the voice which spoke to him: glory, in the light which shone from Him), **when a voice was borne to Him** (the occurrence of a similar expression in ref. 1 Pet. is to be noticed. The dative is purely local) **of such a kind** (viz. as is stated in what follows: "purporting as follows") **by** (uttered by: the ὑπό of agency after a passive verb. As Winer remarks, § 47, all other renderings are arbitrary) **the sublime glory** (the words seem to be a periphrasis of God Himself. In ref. Deut., God is called ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς τοῦ στερεώματος. So Gerh., De Wette, Huther. Others understand them of the bright cloud which overshadowed the company: others of the heaven: but ὑπό, in its only admissible meaning (see above), will not suit either interpretation), **This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased** (the words are as in Matt. xvii. 5, where however we have ἐν ᾧ for εἰς ὅν, and αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε is added. In Mark and Luke the words εἰς ὃν κ.τ.λ. are wanting [and in the critical text of St. Luke it is ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος]. It is worth notice, that the words are in

ἐστιν, ᵖ εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ ᵖ εὐδόκησα. [18] καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ᵏ ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ᵠʳ ἁγίῳ ᵠ ὄρει. [19] καὶ ἔχομεν ˢ βεβαιότερον τὸν ᵗ προφητικὸν λόγον, ᾧ ᵘ καλῶς ᵘ ποιεῖτε ᵛ προσέχοντες

ABCKБ Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

p here (Matt. xii. 18 v. r.) only. (Heb. x. 6, 8, 38 al.) q Ps. ii. 6. r Matt. iv. 5. Rev. xi. 2. xxi. 2, 10. Exod. iii. 5. s Heb. ii. 2 reff. comp., here only. t Rom. xvi. 26 only †. u James ii. 8 reff. οἷς ποιήσετε καλῶς μὴ προσέχοντες, Jos. Antt. xi. 6. 12. v = Heb. ii. 1 reff.

ηυδοκησα A m 13. 40 Thl.

18. [ταυτης της φωνης . . ενεχθησις(sic) 13. Steph ημεις (misprint).] for εξ, εκ του Aℵ. for συν, ουν ℵ[1]. rec τω ορει τω αγιω, with AC[3]KL[P]ℵ rel vulg Œc Aug: txt BC[1] 13 [arm] Thl Promiss.

an independent form here. εἰς ὃν is a pregnant construction,—"on whom my pleasure has lighted and abides." εὐδόκησα, aor., but only to be given in Eng. by the present. If an account is to be given of the aoristic sense, it must be "my pleasure rested from eternity").

18.] Substantiation of the personal testimony above adduced by reference to the fact. **And this voice we** (Apostles: Peter, James, and John) **heard borne from heaven** (not, as E. V. ungrammatically, "*this voice which came from heaven*" (τὴν ἐξ οὐρ. ἐν.): we heard it borne, witnessed its coming, from heaven), **being with Him in the holy mount** (De Wette is partly right, when he says that this epithet "holy" shews a later view of the fact than that given us in the evangelistic narrative: but not right when he designates that later view wunderglaübigere. The epithet would naturally arise when the gospel history was known, as marking a place where a manifestation of this divine presence and glory had taken place. The place whereon Moses stood is said, ref. Exod., to be *holy ground*. So that really all we can infer from it is, that the history was assumed to be already well known: which is one entirely consistent with the probable date of the Epistle: see Prolegg. It is hardly necessary to refute Grotius's idea, that Mount Sion is meant, and that the voice referred to is that related in John xii. 28).

19—21.] *The same*—i. e. the certainty of the coming of Christ, before spoken of,—*is further confirmed by reference to* O. T. *prophecy*. 19.] **And we have more sure the prophetic word** (first, for the construction: βεβαιότερον is predicative after ἔχομεν: '*we have more sure*:' either in the sense of, a. we *hold faster*, making βεβαιότερον quasi-adverbial: or, b. we *possess, more secure*. . . . . Of these, the latter (see below) is the only one which suits the interpretation of the comparative which we prefer. And thus a double explanation is possible: 1. that the comparative alludes to what has gone before as its *reason*, as if it had been said διὸ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον, or καὶ νῦν ἔχ. . . . or καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἔχ.: i. e. 'on account of this voice from heaven which we heard, we have firmer hold of, or esteem (possess) more sure, the prophetic word, as now having in our own ears begun its fulfilment.' So Œc., ἐπεὶ δὲ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἔγνωμεν διὰ τῆς πείρας τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν προκατηγγελμένα, βεβαιότεραν κρίνομεν φησι διὰ τούτων τὴν προφητείαν αὐτῶν: the scholia, Grot., Bengel ("firmior fit sermo propheticus ex implemento"), al., and hesitatingly, De Wette. The great objection to such a view is, the omission of any such connecting particles as those above supplied. It is true the Apostle may have omitted them: but even supposing that, it is further against the view, that if such be the force of the comparative, the thought is not at all followed up in the ensuing verses. We come then to the other possible force of the comparative: 2. that it is used as comparing the prophetic word with something which has been mentioned before, as being firmer, more secure than that other. And if so, what is that other? The most obvious answer is, the voice from heaven: and this is at first sight confirmed by the consideration that one *word* would thus be compared with another, the φωνή with the λόγος. But then comes in the great difficulty, How could the Apostle designate the written word of God, inspired into and transmitted through men, as something firmer, more secure, than the uttered voice of God Himself? And our reply must be, that only in one sense of βεβαιότερος can this be so, viz. as being of wider and larger reference, embracing not only a single testimony to Christ as that divine voice did, but τὰ εἰς χριστὸν παθήματα, κ. τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας: as presenting a broader basis for the Christian's trust, and not only one fact, however important. This is a modification of Huther's view, which takes the comparison to be, that the testimony of the Transfiguration presented only the glory of Christ in the days of His flesh, whereas the prophetic word substantiates His future glory also. But this is in-

ὡς [wx] λύχνῳ [wy] φαίνοντι ἐν [z] αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ [a] ἡμέρα [b] διαυγάσῃ καὶ [c] φωσφόρος [d] ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις

w John v. 35. x John, as above. Matt. v. 15. vi. 22. Mark iv. 21. Luke viii. 16 al5. Rev. xviii. 23 al2. only. Ps. cxviii. 105. y = John i. 5. v. 35. 1 John ii. 8. Rev. i. 16. viii. 12. xxi. 23 only. Gen. i. 17. z here only †. Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 31. a = Rom. xiii. 13. 1 Thess. v. 5, 8. b here only †. Polyb. iii. 104. 5, ἅμα τῷ διαυγάζειν. (-γής, Rev. xxi. 21. see 1 Kings xiv. 36.) c here only (see note) †. d intr., Matt. iv. 16 ‖ Mk. Mark xvi. 2. Heb. vii. 14. James i. 11 al. Gen. xix. 25.

19. αχμηρω A 26. 33. ins η bef ημερα [P]א m [13].

sufficient, or rather is not strictly correct: for the Apostle clearly does regard the voice at the Transfiguration as a pledge of Christ's future glory. Either of these is better than Calvin's view:—"non difficilis est hujusmodi solutio, quia hic respectum habet gentis suæ Apostolus: . . . . quum apud Judæos indubium esset, a Domino profectum quicquid Prophetæ docuerant, non mirum est si dicat Petrus, firmiorem esse eorum sermonem: jam vetustas quoque ipsa semper aliquid reverentiæ secum trahit." Bede's view is worth quoting: "si enim quispiam (inquit) nostro testimonio discredendum putaverit, quod in secreto gloriam Redemptoris nostri conspeximus divinam, quod vocem Patris ad eum factam audierimus, certe sermoni prophetico nemo contradicere, nullus de hoc ambigere audebit, quem divinis Scripturis jam olim insertum omnes verum esse testantur." And so nearly, Estius. But in this case we should have expected ἔχομεν δὲ καὶ . . . . . A modification of this view is found in Augustine, in Joh. Tract. xxxv. 8, vol. iii. pt. ii., "quia *nos* non ibi fuimus, et istam vocem de cœlo tunc non audivimus, ait ad nos ipse Petrus, Et habemus certiorem propheticum sermonem. Non audistis vocem de cœlo delatam, sed certiorem habetis propheticum sermonem" (see the same more fully expanded in his Serm. de Scripturis xliii. (xxvii.) 3, 4 (5), vol. v. p. 256). But then we should have expected ἔχετε. Of course, all attempts to shelve the comparative by making it into a positive (Wir haben ein festes prophetisches Wort, Luth.), or a superlative ("habemus firmissimum sermonem propheticum," Beza), are out of the question. **τὸν λόγον προφητικόν** cannot be as Sherlock, Griesb., N. T. prophecies,—nor as Benson, al., O. and N. T. prophecies combined, on account of the subsequent expression in ch. ii. 1, which confines it to O. T. times), **to which ye do well in paying attention** (cf. Joseph. in reff. **προσέχοντες**, sc. τὸν νοῦν, gives the idea of adherence, not merely of notice: compare Heb. ii. 1), **as to a candle** (the figure is taken from the lighting of a candle at night, and the imagery is as in Rom. xiii. 12, ἡ νὺξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν) **shining in a dark place** (**αὐχμηρὸς** (αὔω), lit. *dry, arid*: hence neglected, dirty, dark: "Aristoteles de coloribus opponit τὸ στίλβον κ. λαμπρὸν τῷ αὐχμηρῷ καὶ ἀλαμπεῖ." Wetst. (which seems to answer Kypke, who questions if the sense "dark" can be proved except from Suidas and the grammarians). Suidas gives αὐχμηρόν, στυγνόν, ἢ σκοτεινόν: and so Hesych., ξηρόν, σκοτῶδες) **until day shall dawn** (aor. in the sense of 'futurus exactus:' the fact involved in the διαυγάσαι coming in upon and putting an end to the state indicated by the pres. participles above. The ἕως οὗ belongs more naturally to προσέχοντες than to φαίνοντι, because that which follows ἕως οὗ relates to the readers, not to the word of prophecy. For **διαυγάζειν** in the sense of dawning, see ref. Polyb. Plut. moral., p. 893 E, uses it of lightning, τῇ πληγῇ καὶ τῷ σχισμῷ διαυγάζει) **and the morning-star shall rise in your hearts** (it is said by the Commentators quoting from one another, that **φωσφόρος** is taken by Hesych. for the sun. But he merely says, φωσφόρος, φωτοδότης, λαμπρὸς ἀστήρ. And as there is no precedent, so also is there no occasion, for thus understanding it here. The dawn of the day is accompanied by the rising of the morning-star. It is not quite clear, *what time* is here pointed out by the ἕως οὗ. Gerhard says, "Petrus h. l. docet, scripta prophetica lucem quandam tenuem tempore V. T. exhibuisse, donec per verbum evangelii et operationem Spiritus sancti uberior, clarior et perfectior lux divinæ notitiæ in N. T. fuerit secuta." But it is entirely against this view, that the pres. ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες makes it necessary, as indeed does the whole context, that the time spoken of, which the ἕως οὗ is to put an end to, should be *present*. De Wette modifies this last view by saying, that this O. T. darkness of the pre-Christian time still endures for those who have not yet embraced the Christian faith. But this would make the readers, who are said, ver. 12, to be ἐστηριγμένοι ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ, to be still unconverted to Christianity. Bede, Calvin, al., understand it of the glorious day which is to come when the Lord shall be manifested. So Bede: "ad lucernam nocturnam pertinet quod 'filii Dei sumus et nondum apparuit quid erimus.' Et in comparatione quidem impiorum, dies sumus, Paulo di-

ὑμῶν, 20 τοῦτο πρῶτον [e] γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πᾶσα [f] προφητεία [g] γραφῆς [h] ἰδίας [i] ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται. 21 οὐ

ABCKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

e so Heb. x. 34. James i. 3. ch. iii. 3. f = Matt. xiii. 14. epp., here only. Rev. i. 3 (xi. 6) al[3]. g = 1 Tim. v. 18. ch. iii. 16 al. h προφήτης ἴδιον οὐδὲν ἀποφθέγγεται, Philo, Quis rer. div. hær. 52, vol. i. p. 510. i here only †. Gen. xl. 8 Aq.

cente, Fuistis aliquando tenebræ, nunc autem lux in Domino. Sed si comparemur illi vitæ in qua futuri sumus, adhuc nox sumus, et lucerna indigemus." So Calvin, "Ego hanc caliginem ad totum vitæ stadium extendo, ac diem tunc nobis illucere interpretor, quum facie ad faciem videbimus quod nunc cernimus per speculum et ænigmate:" so Dietlein, al. Others, as Grot., al., De Wette, Huther, think that some state *in the readers themselves* is pointed at, which is to supervene upon their present less perfect state: Grot. interpreting it of their attainment of the gift of prophecy: De Wette of their arriving at full conviction of the certainty of the coming of Christ: Huther, much the same, adding, "The writer distinguishes between two degrees of the Christian life: in the first, faith rests upon outward evidences, in the second, on inward revelations of the Spirit: in the first, each detail is believed separately as such: in the second, each is recognized as a necessary part of the whole. And hence the being in the former is naturally called a walking ἐν τόπῳ αὐχμηρῷ, in the light of a λύχνος, while the being in the latter is a walking in the light of the morning." And this latter I believe to be nearly the true account. That which refers the words to the time of the Lord's coming is objectionable, because thus, 1. the time of the Christian's walk here, in which he is said to be light in the Lord, would, not comparatively (as Bede above), but absolutely, be described as a walking in darkness by the slender light of O. T. prophecy: 2. the morning-star arising *in men's hearts* is not a description which can apply to the Lord's coming. So that, whatever apparent analogy there may be with the comparison used in Rom. xiii. 11 ff., the matters treated of seem to be different. At the same time it may well be, that the Apostle should have mingled both ideas together as he wrote the words; seeing that even in our hearts the fulness of the spiritual day will not have arisen, until that time when we see face to face, and know even as God knew us).

20.] *Caution as to the interpretation of O. T. prophecy:* to be borne in mind, while taking heed to it. **This first knowing** (τοῦτο, viz. what follows, introduced by ὅτι. πρῶτον, not as Bengel, "prius quam ego dico," but first and as most important in applying yourselves to prophetic interpretation. γινώσκοντες, as in reff., *being aware of*, and bearing in mind: = εἰδότες, 1 Pet. i. 18), **that no prophecy of Scripture** (γραφή most probably here imports the O. T. only, from the ποτε, and indeed the aorists in the next verse. πᾶσα . . . οὐ, in the Hebr. manner for οὐδεμία: see Rom. iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 29 al.) **comes of private interpretation** (how are these words to be understood? Two references seem to be possible: 1. *to us*, who try to understand written prophecies: 2. *to the prophets themselves*, as they spoke them. And of these the former, maintained by Bede, Erasm., Aret., Gerhard, Pott, Steiger, al., seems precluded by the context, the next verse assigning as a reason for the position in this, that the prophets spoke not of themselves, but as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. And though this might have been alleged as a reason why private interpretation cannot solve those prophecies, yet in that case we should expect not οὐ γάρ, which simply assigns the direct reason, but οὐδὲ γάρ, which assigns an analogical or remote reason. So that we seem driven to the conclusion that the saying regards, not our interpretation of prophecy, but its *resolution*, or *interpretation, by the prophets themselves*. And so Œc.: τουτέστιν ὅτι λαμβάνουσι μὲν ἀπὸ θεοῦ οἱ προφῆται τὴν προφητείαν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι βούλονται, ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ κινοῦν αὐτοὺς ἐνεργεῖ πνεῦμα. καὶ ᾔδεσαν μὲν καὶ συνίεσαν τὸν καταπεμπόμενον αὐτοῖς προφητικὸν λόγον, οὐ μέντοι καὶ τὴν ἐπίλυσιν αὐτοῦ ἐποιοῦντο: and below, ... καίπερ εἰδότες οὐ χρείαν εἶχον ἑρμηνεύειν τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἑτέροις διηκόνουν ταῦτα, ἡμῖν γάρ. Similarly Thl.: and De Wette, adding, that this is said to excuse the difficulty of the interpretation of prophecy, and to remove occasion of unbelief and scoffing (ch. iii. 3). But as Huther well remarks, this last purpose is not only not indicated in the context, but is quite out of the question; the Apostle referring to prophecy not as difficult of interpretation, but as a candle shining in a dark place, nay, as being even more firm and secure than external proofs of the same truths. I believe Huther's view to be the true one: which arises from this consideration, that ἐπίλυσις is not the subsequent interpretation of a prophecy already given, but the intelligent apprehension of the meaning of the prophecy, out of which (but not ἰδίας on the part of those

γὰρ [k] θελήματι ἀνθρώπου [l] ἠνέχθη [l] προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου [m] φερόμενοι [n] ἐλάλησαν [o] ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι.

II. [1] Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ [p] ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται [q] ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, [r] οἵτινες [s] παρ-

k of man, Luke xxiii. 25. John i. 13. 1 Cor. vii. 37. xvi. 12. Eph. ii. 3. 3 Kings v. 8. dat., Acts ii. 23. l = ver. 17. see 2 John 10. m see Acts xxvii. 15, 17. Job xvii. 1. φερόμενοι τ. θυμοῖς, Jos. B. J. vi. 5. 2. n = Luke xxiv. 25. Acts iii. 21, 24. xxviii. 25. Jer. i. 7. o John v. 30. vii. 17, 18. p Matt. vii. 15. xxiv. 11, 24 ‖ Mk. Luke vi. 26. Acts xiii. 6. 1 John iv. 1. Rev. xvi. 13 al[3]. Jer. vi. 13. Zech xiii. 2. q here only †. r = Heb. viii. 5 reff. s here only. Polyb. iv. 20. 5 & freq. οἱ προδόται τούτους παρεισαγαγόντες ἐντὸς τῶν τειχέων, Diod. Sic. xii. 41. (-ακτος, Gal. ii. 4.)

21. rec ποτε bef προφητεια, with ALℵ rel vulg [syr-pk arm] Œc Promiss Cassiod$_1$: txt BCK[P] a c m 13. 36 syr copt Did$_1$ Thl. (αλλα, so Bℵ g j.) rec (for απο) οι αγιοι, with vulg syr-pk Œc Fulg$_2$; αγιοι KLℵ rel; αγιοι του A: απο[. . .]αγιοι C 27-9 æth Did$_1$: txt B[P] a 66[2]-8-9. 137 syr (copt) [arm].

Chap. II. 1. om εν τω λαω ℵ[3] [arm Cyr$_1$].

by whom it is sent) the prophecy itself springs. And this is much confirmed by γίνεται, which with a gen. as here, is not = ἐστιν, but rather seems to denote *origin*. So that the sense will be, that prophecy *springs not out of human interpretation*, i. e. is not a prognostication made by a man knowing what he means when he utters it: but &c. Thus, and thus alone, the whole context coheres. And this appears to be Bengel's view, though he does not express himself very clearly: "ut callide concinnatis fabulis opponitur spectatio apostolica: sic propriæ interpretationi opponitur φορά, vectura prophetica. Itaque ἐπίλυσις dicitur interpretatio qua ipsi prophetæ res antea plane clausas aperuere mortalibus. Prophetia nec primo humana est, nec a se ipsa unquam ita desciscit ut incipiat esse verbum propriæ, i. e. humanæ ἐπιλύσεως, sed plane divinæ patefactionis est, et in rebus exituque talis cognoscitur, imo etiam firmior fit"). **21.**] *Reason of the above position.* **For prophecy was never** (at any time: ποτέ belongs to the negative, and though pointing, as do likewise the aorr., to a state of things passed away, and therefore not to be referred to N. T. prophecies, (see on ch. ii. 1,) must not be rendered as E. V. (after Beza, as usual) "*in old time*") **sent** ('*allata*,' vulg.: cf. above, vv. 17, 18) **after the will** (dat. of the cause; or rule, by or according to which: as in τίς στρατεύεται ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις ποτέ; 1 Cor. ix. 7: cf. 1 Cor. xi. 5; Heb. xii. 18) **of man: but men spoke from God** (spoke as with the voice of, as emissaries from, God: the ἀπο of ἀποστέλλω and ἀπόστολος. Besides critical considerations, probability seems against the reading ἅγιοι, in that, on account of the repetition, ἁγίου . . . . ἅγιοι, the stress, in the latter part of the sentence, would be laid on the fact of ἁγιότης, which does not form any logical contrast to ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, instead of on the fact of the φορά and the λαλιά coming from God, which *does*), **[being] borne** (borne along, carried onward, as a ship by the wind, reff. Acts. "Impulsos fuisse dicit, non quod mente alienati fuerint (qualem in suis prophetis ἐνθουσιασμὸν fingunt Gentiles) sed qui nihil a se ipsis ausi fuerint, tantum obedienter sequuti sint Spiritum ducem." Calv. See besides reff., Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 5, οὐκ ὢν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τῷ δὲ θείῳ πνεύματι κεκινημένος: Macrob. i. 23, speaking of the processions carrying the image of the Sun at Heliopolis,—"feruntarque divino spiritu, non suo arbitrio, sed quo deus propellit vehentes") **by the Holy Spirit.**

Chap. II. 1—22.] Description of erroneous teachers who should arise: their ungodly practices, and certain destruction. On the close parallelism with Jude 4—19, see in Prolegg. The fact will necessitate continual reference to that Epistle. **1.**] *Transition to the new subject.* **But** (contrast to last verse) **there were false prophets also** (as well as the true prophets, just spoken of) **among the people** (of Israel. These words, more than any that have preceded, define the prophecies spoken of before as O. T. prophecies), **as there shall be among you also** (καί with ἐν ὑμῖν. On ἔσονται, Bengel says "et jam esse cœperunt tunc." It was so, see vv. 9 ff.: still the future in ἔσονται is simple, and this first declaration a pure prophecy) **false teachers** (teachers of falsehood: cf. ψευδόλογος. In the case of ψευδοπροφῆται, the ψευδο- is ambiguous, whether subjective, pretenders to be prophets when they were not, or objective, prophesiers of false things: cf. for the latter Jer. xiv. 14, LXX, ψευδῆ οἱ προφῆται προφητεύουσιν . . .; ib. 15; xxiii. 25, al. fr.), **the which** (οἵτινες, of a class: not simply identifying the individuals) **shall introduce** (shall bring in by the side of that teaching which ye have received. There is a hint of secrecy and

εισάξουσιν [t] αἱρέσεις [u] ἀπωλείας, καὶ τον [v] ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς [w] δεσπότην [x] ἀρνούμενοι, [y] ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς [z] ταχινὴν [u] ἀπώλειαν, 2 καὶ πολλοὶ [a] ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς [b] ἀσελγείαις, δι' οὓς ἡ [c] ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας [d] βλασφημηθήσεται· 3 καὶ ἐν [e] πλεονεξίᾳ [f] πλαστοῖς λόγοις

t = (see note) here only. Acts v. 17 al5. 1 Cor. xi. 19. Gal. v. 20 only. 1 Macc. viii. 20.
u Matt. vii. 13. 2 Thess. ii. 3 al. Isa. lvii. 4. gen., ver. 10.
v = 1 Cor. vi. 20. vii. 23. Rev. v. 9. xv. 3, 4. (1 Pet. ii. 18 reff.) Job v. 8.
w of Christ, here only. see Luke ii. 29. Acts iv. 24. Jude 4. Rev. vi. 10.
x = Matt. x. 33. Acts iii. 13. 1 Tim. v. 8. 1 John ii. 22, 23. Jude 4 al.‡ (Gen. xviii. 15.)
y Acts v. 28. ver. 5 only. Gen. vi. 17.
z ch. i. 14.
a ch. i. 16 reff.
b Mark vii. 22 al.† Wisd. xiv. 26 only. plur., Rom. xiii. 13. 1 Pet. iv. 3. ver. 18.
c Acts ix. 2. xix. 9, 23 al. see Rom. iii. 16. vv. 15, 21.
d = James ii. 7 reff.
e Mark vii. 22. 2 Cor. ix. 5. Eph. iv. 19 al. Jer. xxii. 27.
f here only †. γράμματα πλαστὰ προσφέρειν, Plut. Thes. 20.

for εαυτ., αυτοις B[1] [m].

2. rec (for ασελγειαις) απωλειαις, with [copt] Œc-ed : txt ABCKL[P]ℵ rel vss [Thl]. for οδος, δοξα Aℵ[3] 9 sah [æth].

unobservedness, but not so strong as in E. V. "*shall privily bring in.*" It is stronger in the παρεισέδυσαν of Jude 4) **heresies** (**αἱρέσεις** here rather in the sense in which we now understand the word, new and self-chosen doctrines, alien from the truth: not sects (vulg.), which may be founded, but can hardly be said to be introduced) **of destruction** (whose end is destruction, Phil. iii. 19. The expression is not to be resolved as E. V. (after Beza, as usual) by an adjective, "*damnable heresies*," as it thereby loses its meaning, merely conveying the writer's own [judgment of] condemnation), **and denying** (a remarkable word from St. Peter) **the master** (compare τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι, Jude 4) **who bought them** (reff. No assertion of universal redemption can be plainer than this. "Ex hoc loco bene colligitur," says Estius, endeavouring to escape the inference, "Christum redemisse quosdam reprobos, nimirum illos, qui redemptionis ejus secundum aliquos effectus facti sunt participes: cujusmodi erant hi, de quibus Petrus loquitur: utpote per fidem in baptismo regenerati, et peccatorum veniam consecuti, licet postea in veterem peccati servitutem lapsi. . . . Sed ne hinc colligas, ad omnes omnino homines effectum redemptionis extendi." Calvin passes it without a word. It may be noted that by the use of this particular predication for Christ here, those heresies seem especially to be aimed at, which denied or explained away the virtue of the propitiatory sacrifice of our Lord, by which He has bought us to Himself), **bringing upon themselves** (the construction is not very plain. Of the two participial clauses, . . . **ἀρνούμενοι**, and **ἐπάγοντες** . . ., one must be taken as equivalent to a finite verb, corresponding to παρεισάξουσιν above: unless indeed we understand **καί** to mean "even," and make both participial clauses follow παρεισάξουσιν . . . as epexegetical of it. This, however, would leave the ἐπάγοντες awkwardly pendent, and requiring "*and*" to fill it up, as in E. V. As regards then the alternative before proposed, Huther thinks it most natural to regard ἐπάγοντες as a finite verb: "who, by denying &c., bring on themselves &c.:"—Winer, § 45. 6. *a*, prefers making both depend on παρεισάξουσιν, regarding them however not as co-ordinate, but ἐπάγοντες as a sequel added to the sentence οἵτινες . . . . ἀρνούμενοι. I much prefer taking **καί** as the simple copula, and regarding **ἀρνούμενοι** as standing in the place of a finite verb, co-ordinate with παρεισάξουσιν followed, as a consequence, by ἐπάγοντες κ.τ.λ.) **swift** (see note on ref., not *speedy*, but as Horneius in Huther, "inopinatam et inexspectatam") **destruction** [cf. αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας above]: **2. and many shall follow after** (see on ch. i. 16) **their licentiousnesses** (the connexion of depraved moral conduct with erroneous doctrine was in the early ages of the church almost universal: see the Pastoral Epistles passim, and below vv. 18, 19. In ‖ Jude, the two are expressed co-ordinately: τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, κ. τὸν μόνον δεσπότην κ. κύρ. ἡμ. Ἰ. χ. ἀρνούμενοι) **on whose account** (*by reason of whom*, i. e. from the ἀσέλγειαι of those who follow after the false teachers: for to these, and not to the false teachers themselves, is the **οὓς** most likely referable. It is those who, seeming to be in the way of truth, yet favour and follow false teachers, that cause most scandal to the way of truth itself) **the way of truth** (reff. and Ep. Barnab. 5, p. 734, "homo habens viam veritatis") **shall be evil spoken of** ("ab iis qui foris sunt, discrimen ignorantibus verorum et falsorum Christianorum." Bengel): **3.] and in** (i. e. living in, girt about with, as their element, not as E. V. "*through*") **covetousness with feigned speeches** (Wetstein quotes Artemid. i. 53, πλάσσειν δοκεῖ . . . ἀγαθὸν ῥήτορσι . . . καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπατεῶσι, διὰ τὸ τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα δεικνύειν τὰς

ὑμᾶς [g] ἐμπορεύσονται, οἷς τὸ [h] κρῖμα [i] ἔκπαλαι οὐκ [k] ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ [l] ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ [m] νυστάζει. [4] Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ [n] ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ [o] σειροῖς [p] ζόφου [q] ταρταρώσας [r] παρέδωκεν [s] εἰς [t] κρίσιν [s] τηρου-

n -μαρτησ-... ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

g = here (James iv. 13) only. ἐμπορεύεσθαι τ. ὥραν τ. σώματος, Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 8.

h = 1 Cor. xi. 29. (Gal. v. 10, w. gen.) 1 Tim. v. 12. James iii. 1. i ch. iii. 5 only †. k here only. see Eccl. xii. 3. Esdr. ii. 30 (25). l ver. 1. m Matt. xxv. 5 only. Ps. cxviii. 28 A B2ℵ (not F. B1 def.). cxx. 3, 4. n Acts xx. 29. Rom. viii. 32. xi. 21. 1 Cor. vii. 28 al. Jer. xiii. 14. o here only †. see note. p Heb. xii. 18 reff. q here only †. r = Luke xxiii. 25 al. s John xii. 17. Acts xxv. 21. 1 Pet. i. 4. t = Matt. x. 15. 2 Thess. i. 5 al. fr.

3. [*υμας* bef *λογοις* K: aft *εμπ.* m.] *εκπορευσονται* ℵ^1. *νυσταξει* KL h j k l m o Thl.

4. for *ει*, *η* (but corrd) ℵ^1. rec *σειραις*, with KL [P(appy)] rel [vulg-ed syrr copt arm Ephr$_1$ Did$_1$] Cyr[-p] Procop$_1$ [Damasc$_1$] Thl Œc: txt ABCℵ vulg syr-pk. *ζοφοις* Aℵ^1. rec *τετηρημενους*, with b [Ephr$_1$] Thl Œc: *κολαζομενους τηρειν* Aℵ syr[-pk syr-w-ast] copt: *κολαζομενους τηρεισθαι* 13: txt BC^{1}KL[P] rel [syr-txt arm] Procop [*τηρουμ. κολαζομ. τηρειν* C^2, *cruciandos in judicium* (*in jud. cruc.* am) *reservari* vulg].

τέχνας ταύτας) **they will make gain of you** ("quæstum ex vobis facient, ad quæstum suum vobis abutentur." Gerh. See ref., and Athenag. xiii. 569, Ἀσπασία ἐνεπορεύετο πλήθη γυναικῶν: Philo in Flacc. § 16, vol. ii. p. 536, ἐνεπορεύετο τὴν λήθην τῶν δικαστῶν (Huther). Pott tries to give the word the classic meaning of *lucrari*, 'to gain over:' "sectæ suæ conciliare conantur:" and this is borne out by Prov. iii. 14, LXX, κρεῖσσον αὐτὴν ἐμπορεύεσθαι, ἢ χρυσίου κ. ἀργυρίου θησαυρούς: but the other meaning seems better here. These false teachers would care not for their sect, but for their gain), **for whom** (**οἷς** is the dat. incommodi: its antecedents being the subjects of the verb ἐμπορεύσονται, viz. the false teachers) **the sentence** (of God, decreeing their ἀπώλεια) **from long since** (**ἔκπαλαι** cannot surely, as De Wette, be joined predicatively with **τὸ κρῖμα**, 'the sentence from of old decreed,' cf. οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα, Jude 4: in this case we should at all events expect τὸ κρῖμα τὸ ἔκπαλαι. Rather, with most Commentators, should ἔκπαλαι be taken adverbially with the following verb. The word is found, besides ref., in Arrian, Exp. Alex. i. 9, εἰς λογισμὸν τοῦ ἔκπαλαι: Jos. Antt. xvi. 8. 4, ἔκπαλαι μὲν συνεδρεύων αὐτῷ προσέκειτο: Plut. Aristid. p. 328 E, ἀνὴρ θυμοειδὴς κ. φιλοκίνδυνος, ἔκπαλαι πρὸς τὴν μάχην σπαργῶν. Phrynichus, p. 45, condemns it: ἀπόπαλαι, ἔκπαλαι· ἀμφοῖν δυσχέραινε, ἐκ παλαιοῦ γὰρ χρὴ λέγειν: where see Lobeck's note) **is not idle** (i. e. is working itself out, is living and in action), **and their destruction slumbereth not** (i. e. is awake, and ready to seize them: ἀπώλεια being personified: for the verb, see reff.). 4—11.] *Argument, enforced by three historical proofs, that God will assuredly punish these wicked persons.* The protases, εἰ γὰρ .... καὶ ἀρχ. κόσμ. .... καὶ πόλεις, have no single apodosis, properly so called, to answer to them, but the apodosis when it comes, is complicated with an additional protasis καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ κ.τ.λ. which causes it to consist of two members, the deliverance of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked. 4.] *First historical proof: the punishment of the apostate angels.* Cf. Jude 6. **For** (connect with the position immediately preceding, οἷς τὸ κρῖμα κ.τ.λ.) **if God spared not angels having sinned** (how, is not here specified; but Jude, ver. 6, is more particular: see note there. **ἁμαρτησάντων**, anarthrous, is not = τῶν ἁμ., "that sinned:" but carries a ratiocinative force, giving the reason of οὐκ ἐφείσατο: "for their sin"), **but casting them into hell** (the word is no where else found: but its meaning must be plain by analogy. Tartarus is no where else mentioned in the N. T. or LXX: there can be no doubt that it is used as equivalent to γέεννα. It seems best to take the verb absolutely, by itself, and join σειροῖς ζόφου to παρέδωκεν, as is done in E. V. So Huther after Calov., Pott, Wahl, al., against De Wette, Dietlein, al. The aor. participle is contemporary with the aor. verb παρέδωκεν, as in ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε) **delivered (them) over** ("**παρέδωκεν** is here, as often, used with an implied idea of punishment." Huther) **to dens** (so with the reading in txt: **σειρός**, the same as σίρος, or σιρρός, properly *a cave where corn is stored*, so Demosth. p. 100 ult., ὀλυρῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς Θρᾳκίοις σιροῖς, also p. 135. 5. The form σειρός is found (as a var. read. in Demosth. also) in Pollux ix. 49; Phot. p. 504. 23; Varro de re rust. i. 57. The word is used for a *wolf's den*, by Longus i. 11. The other reading, σειραῖς, has perhaps come from the δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις of ‖ Jude, and would seem to suit the sense better: see there)

μένους, [5] καὶ [u] ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ [n] ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ [v] ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης [w] κήρυκα [x] ἐφύλαξεν [y] κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ [z] ἀσεβῶν [a] ἐπάξας, [6] καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόῤῥας [b] τεφρώσας [c] καταστροφῇ [d] κατέκρινεν, [e] ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων [f] ἀσεβεῖν [g] τεθεικώς. [7] καὶ [h] δίκαιον

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

u Matt. v. 21. Acts xv. 21. Sir. xvi. 7. xxxix. 1.
v = here (Luke i. 59. Acts vii. 8. Rev. xvii. 11. xxi. 20) only. w. αὐτός, Thucyd. passim, & Gr. writers. see 2 Macc. v. 27.
w 1 Tim. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11 only. Gen. xli. 43. Dan. iii. 4. Sir. xx. 15 only.
x abs., John xvii. 12. Jude 24.
y Matt. xxiv. 38, 39. Luke xvii. 27. Gen. vi. 17, &c.
z Jude 4 reff.
a ver. 1.
b here only †. (-φρα, Tobit viii. 2.)
c 2 Tim. ii. 14 only. Gen. xix. 29.
d w. dat., Matt. xx. 18 ‖ Mk.
e Heb. iv. 11 reff.
f Jude 15 only. Dan. ix. 5 LXX & Theod.-AB (not Ed-vat.). Zeph. iii. 11.
g = Heb. i. 2 reff.
h so τ. πιστῷ Ἀβρ., Gal. iii. 9.

5. (αλλα, so ABCLℵ g j l.) for κοσμω, κοσμον ℵ[1].
6. om καταστροφη BC[1] copt [κατεστρεψεν (omg κατεκρινεν) P]. for ασεβειν, ασεβεσι B[P] a 69. 137.

of darkness (if the reading *σειραῖς* be retained, the expression is remarkably illustrated by Wisd. xvii. 17, ἁλύσει σκότους ἐδέθησαν: and will probably mean, as there, that darkness itself is the chain, gen. of apposition) **in custody** (pres.: "*being kept.*" The readings are in great confusion, from the combined influence of ‖ Jude, and our ver. 9) **unto** (with a view to: or merely temporal, *until:* but this is not probable here, as the want of *μεγάλης ἡμέρας*, Jude 6, removes all definite allusion to the *time* of the judgment) **judgment:** 5.] *Second historical proof—the flood.* Wanting in Jude—**and spared not the ancient world, but preserved** (here first comes in the idea of the preservation of the righteous, which is worked out further in the next verse) **Noah the eighth person** (i.e. with seven others: according to the well-known formula, generally found in Greek with *αὐτός*: so Thucyd. ii. 79, ἐστρατήγει δὲ Ξενοφῶν ὁ Εὐριπίδου τρίτος αὐτός, and passim. But the shorter phrase is not without classic example: e.g. Plato, Legg. iii. p. 695 c, λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἕβδομος, and other examples in Winer, § 37. 2: and in Wetstein. The numeral adj. must be taken with Νῶε, not with *κήρυκα*) **preacher of righteousness** (the obvious construction would be, "*as a preacher of righteousness:*" so Huther: but we should thus be introducing an element logically extraneous to the context, which treats not of the *purpose why* the righteous are preserved, but simply of their preservation. And in these later Epistles, all considerations based on stricter views of the usage of the article before substantives are exceedingly unsafe. The fact, that Noah was thus a preacher of (moral) righteousness to the depravity of his age, is found alluded to in Jos. Antt. i. 3. 1,—ὁ Νῶεος δέ, τοῖς πραττομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν δυσχεραίνων καὶ τοῖς βουλεύμασιν ἀηδῶς ἔχων, ἔπειθεν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον αὐτοὺς τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ τὰς πράξεις μεταφέρειν: Bereschith Rabba xxx. 6, in Wetst. "κῆρυξ generationis diluvii, id est, Noachus:" al. in De Wette), **bringing** (= "*when He brought,*" or, "*and brought:*" contemporary with the *ἐφύλαξεν* above) **the flood** (anarthrous, as well known; in the earlier written reff. Matt., Luke, the art. is expressed) **on the world** (again anarthrous) **of ungodly men** (Dietlein, in his commentary, attaching ver. 4 to ver. 5, and believing the crime of the angels to be that in Gen. vi. 2 (see note on Jude 6), holds that only one example is furnished by them both, as declaring God's dealings with the *old* world; vv. 7, 8 giving corresponding testimony with regard to the *new.* But his reasons, as Huther has shewn, will not hold: seeing that, 1. the sentences are strictly co-ordinate with each other, ver. 6 : ver. 5 :: ver. 5 : ver. 4, all being simply coupled by *καί*: 2. there is no mention of the *new* world at ver. 6, as there is none of the *old* at ver. 4: 3. the angels cannot be part of the *κόσμος ἀσεβῶν.* And Dietlein's idea, that if we take *three* examples, both members of the apodosis ver. 9, will not be represented in ver. 4, proves nothing, because that apodosis answers not to each of vv. 4, 5, 6, separately, but to vv. 4—7 generally: the idea of rescuing the righteous coming in as secondary, by the way. And the repetition of *οὐκ ἐφείσατο*, vv. 4, 5, by which Dietlein tries to strengthen his position, is in fact against him: marking off, as it does, expressly, ver. 5 from ver. 4, as a second example of God's unsparing vengeance): 6.] *Third historical proof: the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha,* Jude 7. **And burning to ashes** (Suidas, *τεφρώσας, ἐμπρήσας, σποδώσας.* The aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. following) **the cities of** (gen. of apposition) **Sodom and Gomorrha, condemned (them)** (*κατέκρινεν*, not imperf., but first aor. as *παρέδωκεν* and *ἐφύλαξεν* in the co-ordinate verses above) **to** (better than "*with:*" see reff.: not "eversione damnavit," "funditus evertendo punivit," as Gerh.: but "in cineres redigens damnavit ad ever-

Λὼτ [i] καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν [k] ἀθέσμων ἐν [l] ἀσελγείᾳ [m] ἀναστροφῆς [n] ἐρύσατο· 8 [o] βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ [p] ἀκοῇ [q] ὁ δίκαιος [r] ἐγκατοικῶν [s] ἐν αὐτοῖς [t] ἡμέραν [t] ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν [u] ἀνόμοις ἔργοις [v] ἐβασάνιζεν· 9 [w] οἶδεν κύριος [x] εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ [y] πειρασμοῦ [n] ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς [z] ἡμέραν [z] κρίσεως [a] κολαζομένους [b] τηρεῖν, 10 μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς [cd] ὀπίσω [c] σαρκὸς ἐν [e] ἐπιθυμίᾳ [f] μιασμοῦ [g] πορευομέ-

i Acts vii. 24 only †. 2 Macc. viii. 2 AB (not Ed-vat. F) only. k ch. iii. 17 only †. 3 Macc. v. 12. Diod. Sic. i. 14, τῆς ἀθέσμου βίας. l ver. 2 reff. m 1 Pet. i. 15 reff. n Luke i. 74. Rom. vii. 24. 2 Cor. i. 10 al. Exod. vi. 6. Ps. cxxxix. 1. o here only †. (Gr. freq. see Wetst.) p = 1 Cor. xii. 17. Xen. Mem. i. 4. 6. q so James v. 6. r here only †. Baruch ii. 17 (23) Ald. only. s = Acts ii. 29. Num. xxiii. 21. t here only. Gen. xxxix. 10. Esth. iii. 7. Isa. lviii. 2. Eurip. Rhes. 445. u of things, here only. (see Acts ii. 23 al.) Jer. vi. 13. v = here only. (Matt. xiv. 24 ‖ Mk.) w = Matt. vii. 11 ‖ L. Luke xii. 56. Phil. iv. 12 bis. 1 Tim. iii. 5. James iv. 17. Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 46. x Acts x. 2, 7 only. Isa. xxiv. 16. (see ch. i. 3 reff.) y = 1 Pet. i. 6 reff. z Matt. x. 15 al[3]. ch. iii. 7. 1 John iv. 17. see Rev. xiv. 7. Jude 6. a Acts iv. 21 only †. Wisd. xi. 16. pres. particip, see note, and Winer, § 45. 1. *b* (3rd). b = ver. 4. c Jude 7. d = 1 Tim. v. 15 al. Judg. ii. 19. e ch. i. 4 reff. f here only (-μα, ver. 20). Wisd. xiv. 26, 1 Macc. iv. 43 only. g = ch. iii. 3. Jude 16, 18. Jer. vii. 9, 24.

7. λωθ B[1] am(with fuld). αναστροφη A. (ερυσατο (one ρ), so B[1].)
8. om ο B.
9. πειρασμων ℵ[1] a h m [tol syr copt Ephr$_1$ Antch$_1$ Damasc$_1$ Œc-comm]. aft δε ins πεφυλακισμενους (so Tischdf, expr: περιφυλ. Treg) ℵ[1] (ℵ[3] disapproving). for ημεραν, ηραν ℵ.
10. επιθυμιαις C[P a] 5. 6. 9. 15-8. 26-7-9. 36-7 syrr copt Thl Jer$_1$: επιθυμιας ℵ[1].

sionem," as Pott, Wahl, Winer, De Wette, Huther) **overthrow** (καταστροφή is the word used (ref. Gen.) in the history), **laying down an example** (cf. πρόκεινται δεῖγμα, Jude 7) **of** (i. e. that which might shew forth the fate of) **those that should in after time live ungodly** (so the E. V. well, but with "*after*"): 7.] **and rescued** (the contrast, the deliverance of the righteous, is here brought out at more length. This contrast is wanting in Jude, where only the punitive dealings of God are treated) **righteous Lot** (δίκαιον, as repeating the δικαιοσύνη of ver. 5: see also again, ver. 8) **distressed** (καταπονέω, properly to *wear down* or tire out by toil, as τῇ ἐνδείᾳ τῆς τροφῆς τὴν ἀλκὴν τοῦ θηρίου καταπονεῖν, Diod. iii. 37: Ἡρακλῆς ὁ καταπονούμενος τῷ τῆς Δηϊανείρας χιτῶνι, Pol. xl. 7. 3: hence to *oppress*, as in ref. Acts, or *harass beyond bearing* as here) **by the behaviour of the lawless** (ἄθεσμοι, "homines nefarii, qui nec jus nec fas curant") **in licentiousness** (ἐν ἀσελγ. ἀναστροφή is to be taken together, as ἐν ἀσελγ. ἀναστρέφεσθαι; ἐν ἀσελγ. denoting the character of the behaviour or manner of life): 8.] *Explanation of* καταπονούμενον. **For by sight and hearing** (these datives belong to ἐβασάνιζεν below, not as vulg., Erasm., al., ungrammatically, to ὁ δίκαιος,—"*adspectu et auditu justus erat*," nor as Gerh. to ἐγκατοικῶν: nor again are they to be understood of the Sodomites, as Wetstein,—"Lotus vultu eorum meretricio conspecto, et audita fama impudicitiæ eorum ...." It was by his own sight and hearing of what went on around him, that he ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν. βλέμμα is more usually of the look of a man from without: so in Demosth. Mid. in Wetst. τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ, and in numerous other examples in Wetst. The transition from this to the subjective sense is obvious) **the righteous man, dwelling among them, day by day tormented his righteous soul with their lawless deeds** (the form of the sentence is peculiar: that being represented as a deliberate act of Lot on himself, which was in fact the impression made on him by the lawlessness around him. The same way of speaking is common among us, when we say that a man "distresses himself" at any occurrence: cf. Isa. lviii. 5, "a day for a man to afflict his soul,"—ἡμέραν ταπεινοῦν ἄνθρωπον τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. The older expositors have curiously and characteristically missed the right sense: so Œc., πρὸς ζῆλον τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτῶν πράξεων ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας παρακαλούμενον, εἶτα βασανίζοντα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν διὰ τῆς τούτων ἀποχῆς καὶ ἐγκρατείας (which he further expands afterwards): and similarly Thl.): 9.] (*Apodosis;* the last verse having been quasi-parenthetical, explanatory of καταπονούμενος. See above on ver. 4) **the Lord knoweth how** (reff. The expression indicates both the apprehension of the manner of the act and the power to perform it) **to rescue godly (men) out of temptation** (as in ref. 1 Pet., where see note,—trials, persecutions, and the like), **and to reserve unrighteous (men) under punishment** (not as most, *cruciandos*: "*to be punished*," E. V.: but as in ver. 4, actually in a penal state, and thus awaiting their final punishment) **to the day of judgment** (the great final doom: see reff.): 10.] **but chiefly** (cf. Jude 8) **those who go after the**

νους καὶ [h] κυριότητος [i] καταφρονοῦντας. [k] τολμηταί, [l] αὐθάδεις, [m] δόξας οὐ [n] τρέμουσιν [o] βλασφημοῦντες, 11 [p] ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ [q] φέρουσιν [q] κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ [r] βλάσφημον [s] κρίσιν. 12 οὗτοι

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

h Eph. i. 21. Col. i. 16. Jude 8 only †. i Heb. xii. 2 reff. k here only †. Jos. B. J. iii. 10. 2. l Tit. i. 7 only. Gen. xlix. 3. Prov. xxi. 24 only. m = Jude 8 only (see note). n Mark v. 33 ; L. only. Isa. lxvi. 2. o = ver. 2 al. fr. constr., ch. i. 19. p see Heb. ix. 16 reff. q = John xviii. 29. Acts xxv. 18 only. r Acts vi. 11 (13 rec.). 1 Tim. i. 13. 2 Tim. iii. 2. Rev. xiii. 5 only. Isa. lxvi. 3 only. Wisd. i. 6 al. s = Jude 9. John vii. 24. viii. 16. Deut. xix. 6.

καταφρονουντες A.

11. om παρα κυριω A a d 13 vulg syr-pk copt æth [$Ephr_1$] Bede [syr has it with ast].

flesh (more general here than in ‖ Jude, where ἑτέρας defines the particular sin. Here, all following after unlawful carnal lusts is meant) **in lust of pollution** (lust, hankering after unlawful and polluting use of the flesh. The gen. is not to be resolved into an adjective, "*cupiditas fœda*," as Wahl), **and despise lordship** (so in Jude 8, κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν: where see note). **Darers** (the construction suddenly alters to a description of the wicked persons who were the object in the former sentence. Cf. ref. and Thucyd. i. 70, where the Corinthians characterize the Athenians as καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταί, καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταί), **self-willed** (see note on ref. Tit., where the word is explained. Both these plurals are used as substantives, in apposition with each other and with 'they,' the understood subject of the following verb), **they tremble not (when) speaking evil of** (this participial construction, meaning much the same as an infinitive, is common: see ref. and Acts v. 42, xii. 16; and Winer, § 45. 4. *a*) **glories** (what is meant by this, is somewhat doubtful: see on ‖ Jude. We might take the word here, as there also, in its widest sense, as any dignities or glories, human or divine, were it not for the example there following. The vulg. has a curious rendering here: "sectas (δόξας) non metuunt introducere blasphemantes:" whereas in Jude it renders "majestatem autem blasphemant:" on which Estius, "cur autem interpres eandem vocem hic *sectas*, apud Judam *majestatem*,—seu *majestates* transtulerit in sententia simili, seu potius eadem, mihi non liquet"); **11.**] **where** (i. e. "in cases where:" nearly = *whereas:* so reff., and Thucyd. viii. 96, ὅπου γὰρ . . . . τοσαύτη ἡ ξυμφορὰ ἐπεγεγένητο, πῶς οὐκ εἰκότως ἠθύμουν;) **angels, being greater (than they) in strength and might** (such is of necessity the meaning, and not the curious and hardly grammatical interpretation of Huther, "angels who are greater in strength and might than the other angels," as, e. g., the archangel Michael in ‖ Jude. This meaning would require ἄγγελοι οἱ ἰσχ. κ. δυν. μείζ. ὄντες. As it is, the **ὄντες** carries a slight ratiocinative force with it: "being," i. e. "though they be:" and the thought is not, as Huther, a lame one, but shews forcibly the unbecomingness of their irreverence, seeing that even angels who are so far above them yet do not bring railing accusations against δόξαι), **bring not against them** (scil. δόξαι: in the interpretation, *bad angels*, fallen from their heavenly estate, but regarded here according to their essential condition as sons of glory. Cf. Milton's "excess of glory obscured," as descriptive of Satan,—an expression probably taken from the study of the original text in this place or in ‖ Jude. The vulg. rendering, 'adversum se,' is clearly wrong: see below) **before the Lord** ("apud Dominum, judicem, eumque præsentem, reveriti, abstinent judicio," Bengel. It is to me on the whole more probable that the words **παρὰ κυρίῳ** should have dropped out, as not occurring in ‖ Jude, than that they should have been inserted owing to any idea of a contention in the divine Presence being there intended: for no such intention is apparent there, but rather the contrary) **a railing judgment** (= κρίσιν βλασφημίας, Jude 9. **βλάσφημον**, in allusion to βλασφημοῦντες above.

As a curiosity in the way of erroneous rendering and more erroneous exegesis founded on it, we may notice the vulg. here:—"ubi angeli fortitudine et virtute cum sint majores, non portant adversum se execrabile judicium:" and Lyra's comment, "*ubi*, i. e. in pœna inferni: *angeli*, scil. mali: *non portant*, i. e. vix sustinent: *execrabile judicium*, i. e. pœnam." Cf. Estius, h. l. and the extraordinary commentary of Feuardentius on this Epistle, in which he derives from this interpretation an argument *à fortiori*, "If angels cannot bear their punishment, how much less heretics, Luther, Calvin, Bucer, &c.").

12—22.] *Further description and denunciation of these persons.* **12.**] Cf. Jude 10. In words this verse is very similar to that, but in meaning quite different: and this fact, so often occurring in the passage, strongly confirms the view of the common matter taken in the Prolegg., [ch. iv. § iii., and specially par. 11, p. 147.] See the separate sense of this verse and of

δέ, ὡς [t] ἄλογα [u] ζῷα γεγεννημένα [v] φυσικὰ εἰς [w] ἅλωσιν καὶ [x] φθοράν, [y] ἐν οἷς [z] ἀγνοοῦσιν [a] βλασφημοῦντες, [b] ἐν τῇ [xc] φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ [b] φθαρήσονται [13] [de] κομιούμενοι [efg] μισθὸν [eg] ἀδικίας. [h] ἡδονὴν [i] ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν [j] ἡμέρᾳ [k] τρυφήν, [l] σπῖλοι καὶ [m] μῶμοι [n] ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς [o] ἀπάταις αὐτῶν

t = Jude 10 (Acts xxv. 27) only. (Exod. vi. 12. Num. vi. 12.) Wisd. xi. 15 only.
u Heb. xiii. 11. Jude 10 only, exc. Rev. iv. 6, & passim. Ezek. x. 20.
v Rom. i. 26, 27 only +. (-κῶς, Jude 10.) w here only. Jer. l. (xxvii.) 46 only. Job xxiv. 5 Aq. Jos. Antt. ii. 10. 2 al. x = here bis only. (ch. i. 4 reff.) y constr., Heb. v. 8 al. Winer, § 24. 2. a (2nd). z = 1 Cor. xiv. 38. Sir. v. 15. a w. ἐν, here only. w εἰς, Luke xii. 10 al. Bel and Dr. 9. b so Jude 10. c Isa. xxiv. 3. d = 1 Pet. i. 8 reff. e 2 Macc. viii. 33. f Jude 11. Mic. iii. 11. g ver. 15. h James iv. 1, 3 reff. i Heb. x. 29 reff. j = (& w. ἐν) here only. Cf. δάκτυλος ἀμέρα, Frag. Lyr. k Luke vii. 25 only. Gen. xlix. 20. Prov. xix. 10. (-φᾶν, James v. 5.) l Eph. v. 27 only +. Jos. Antt. xiii. 11. 3. (-λάς, Jude 12. -λοῦν, Jude 23.) m here only. Levit. xxi. 16—23 al. met., Sir. xviii. 15 al. (-μεῖσθαι, 2 Cor. vi. 3.) n here only. Isa. lv. 2. lvii. 4. o Heb. iii. 13 reff.

12. αυτοι ℵ. Steph γεγεννημενα, with A²KLℵ rel syrr Œc, γενημενα m: txt A¹BC[P] a [(spec æth)] Ephr$_1$ Thl. rec φυσικα bef γεγ., with KL rel Œc: om φυσικα 36: txt ABC[P]ℵ a d h m 13 syrr [arm] Ephr Thl. for αγνοουσιν βλασφημουντες, αγνοουντες βλασφημουσιν ℵ. rec (for και φθαρησονται) καταφθαρησονται, with C²KLℵ³ rel vulg[-ed(with demid tol)] spec syr-pk coptt [arm(?)] Thl Œc: txt AB[C¹P]ℵ¹ am(with fuld harl¹) syr æth[-rom] Jer$_1$.

13. for κομιουμενοι, αδικουμενοι Bℵ¹[P syr-pk (arm)]. for απαταις, αγαπαις A-corr B vulg spec syr-pk syr-mg sah æth [Ephr$_1$] Sing-cler. aft αυτων ins σπιλαδες C.

Jude 10, in the notes on each verse. **But** (contrast to the angels, just mentioned) **these, as irrational animals, born naturally** (thus vulg. rightly, '*naturaliter*,' according to the transposition in the text; **φυσικά** being nearly = ψυσικῶς. According to the other reading, **φυσικά** is a second epithet to ἄλογα ζῷα, as Œc.: κατ' αἴσθησιν μόνον ζῶντα, οὐ κατὰ νοῦν κ. τὴν νοερὰν ζωήν) **for** (with a view to) **capture and destruction** (i. e. not to take and to destroy, but to be taken and destroyed. Wetst. quotes from the Rabbinical Bava Mezia, p. 85. 1, "Quidam vitulus, cum ad mactandum adduceretur, R. Judam accessit, caputque in ejus gremium reponens flevit. Sed ille, Abi, inquit, in hunc finem creatus es"), **speaking evil** (as they do: the part. includes the ground of their perishing) **in the matter of things which they know not** (thus, viz., by ἐν τούτοις, ἃ ἀγνοοῦσι, βλασφ. and not by ταῦτα, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν, βλ., I prefer to resolve the attraction. We have βλασφημεῖν εἰς as analogous to βλασφ. ἐν: on the other hand ἀγνοεῖν ἐν might be tolerated, as ἀγνοεῖν περί, 1 Cor. xii. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 13. But the former construction seems better; because, it being almost necessary to suppose οἷς neuter, not masculine, it is not so natural to have a *neut.* accus. after βλασφημεῖν, as a neut. dative with ἐν), **in their corruption** (in their practising, and following out, of this corruption to which they have devoted themselves) **shall even perish** (shall go on till they perish; not only being found in it, living in it, advancing in it, but going on also to its final issue, viz. eternal perdition). 13 a.] **receiving as they shall** (fut. part.) **(the) reward of unrighteousness** (not, as Wolf, = μισθὸν ἄδικον, but exactly as in ver. 15, wages or retribution for unrighteousness: the only difference being that Balaam followed its temporal wages, they shall receive its eternal). 13 b, 14.] These verses most probably, as to construction, form an independent participial sentence, connected by apposition with what precedes. This is better than to consider them as all belonging to ἐπλανήθησαν in ver. 15, which clearly is confined in its reference to its own sentence,—or as giving the ground of φθαρήσονται above. **Imagining a pleasure delicate living for a day** (the interpretations of ἐν ἡμέρᾳ have been various. Œc. gives it, τὴν ἀληθῆ κ. ἐπέραστον εὐφροσύνην κ. ἡδονὴν ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμέραν τιθέμενοι τοῦ λαιμοῦ ἀπολαύσει. And similarly Thl., Beza, al. But this seems inadmissible for ἐν ἡμέρᾳ. Some, as Erasm., Benson, Morus, E. V., al., take it for "*in the daytime*," as implying absence of all shame; but this would give a very lame and frigid sense, and is inconsistent with τρυφήν, which is not revelling or rioting, but delicate living, which those who practise carry on as much in the daytime as by night, being the habit of their lives. Bede's explanation is remarkable: he understands 'voluptas *diei*' to mean true pleasure, "qua sancti quoque delectantur in Domino," and "voluptas *noctis*" to be the unlawful pleasure of the ungodly. Then he takes ἡδονὴν τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ together as predicate, understanding, "cum deliciis . . . vacent . . ., has tamen ipsi optimas et quasi lucifluas judicent." Few will accept this, though it is very ingenious. There can be little doubt that the true rendering is as vulg. "voluptatem existimantes diei delicias:" Grot., "in

p Jude 12 only †. Jos. Antt. iv. 8. 7. (εὐωχ., Judith i. 16.)
q James ii. 8 reff.
r James iv. 4 reff.
s here only †. Polyb. iv. 17. 4.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

[p] συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν, [14] ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες [q] μεστοὺς [r] μοιχαλίδος καὶ [s] ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, [t] δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς [u] ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν [v] γεγυμνασμένην [w] πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, [x] κατάρας [y] τέκνα, [15] [z] καταλιπόντες [ab] εὐθεῖαν [b] ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, [c] ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ [d] ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ

t James i. 14. ver. 18 only †. u ch. iii. 16 only †. v Heb. v. 14 reff. w ver. 3. gen., see note. x Heb. vi. 8 reff. gen., see 2 Thess. ii. 3. ver. 13. Isa. lvii. 4. y 1 Pet. i. 14 (note). z = Acts vi. 2. Gen. ii. 24 a Luke iii. 3 ||, 4 (from Isa. xl. 3, 4). Acts viii. 21. ix. 11. xiii. 10 only. b Acts xiii. 10. c ch. i. 16 reff. d — Jude 11.

14. for *μοιχαλιδος*, *μοιχαλιας* Aℵ 13. *ακαταπαστους* AB: *ακαταπαυστου* b k 13. 40 vulg syrr copt Thl Jer Sing-cler. *αμαρτιαις* ℵ [spec]. rec *πλεονεξιαις*, with a b f 36 sah: txt ABCKL[P]ℵ rel vulg syrr copt [arm] Thl Œc.

15. *καταλειποντες* A[B¹]ℵ 13. rec ins *την* bef *ευθειαν*, with Thl Œc: om

diem, id est ad breve tempus:" Calv., Est., "Felicitatem statuunt in præsentibus deliciis." And so Corn. a-Lap., De Wette, Huther, al. With this also agrees the article *τὴν* and its position: "that delicate living which is but for a day"), **spots** (but *σπιλάδες*, Jude 12, where see note) **and blemishes** (disgraces, disfigurements, causing shame: *ἐθέλεις δέ κε μῶμον ἀνάψαι*, Od. β. 86), **luxuriating in their deceits** (i. e. as explained by Huther, in those things or materials of luxury, which they have fraudulently gotten, the abstract for the concrete. But, granting that interpretation as the words stand, there seems to be considerable doubt and difficulty about both reading and meaning. In Jude 12 they stand *οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως*, instead of, as here, *σπῖλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν*. It seems hardly possible to imagine that there has not been some error in reading which has now become inveterate. And to this conclusion tends very much the testimony of C, which reads *ἀπάταις* in both places, and is thus nearly neutralized here. While therefore reading *ἀπάταις*, in deference to the weight of MSS. combined with critical principles, I have the strongest suspicion that *ἀγάπαις* is the original reading. The *αὐτῶν* is no witness against it, as De Wette thinks: the *ἀγάπαι* become *αὐτῶν* by their perversion of them while they *συνευωχοῦνται ὑμῖν*. And on this supposition, the meaning will be, that in their love-feasts (see on || Jude) they find occasion of luxuriating and delicate living, while feasting with you. This view is favoured also by the emphatic position of *ἐντρυφῶντες*. On the verb, Loesner says, "Philo de Jos. (34, vol. ii. p. 70), Josephum ait epulas quibus fratres exceperit jussisse fieri modicas, quod noluerit *ταῖς ἑτέρων ἀτυχίαις ἐντρυφᾷν*, inter aliorum penuriam deliciis uti") **while they feast with you** (this at all events refers to the love-feasts, whatever be read above. See on || Jude), 14.] **having eyes full of an adulteress** ("quasi dicat, tam libidinosos eos esse, ut in ipsorum oculis quasi adulteræ habitent, seu ut adulteras semper in oculis ferant." Horneius, in Huther) **and that cannot be made to cease from sin** (cf. *ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί, πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας*, 1 Pet. iv. 1. Kypke quotes from Jos. B. J. vii. 37 (10. 2), *ἀκατάπαυστον νεωτεροποιΐαν*), **laying baits for** (Demosth., p. 241. 2, speaks of *τῇ καθ' ἡμέραν ῥᾳστώνῃ κ. σχολῇ δελεαζόμενοι*) **unstable souls** (ref. The word occurs in Musæus, 295: *βένθεα δ' ἀστήρικτα καὶ ὑγρὰ θέμεθλα θαλάσσης*: the signification, as here, unstable, unfixed, "in fide et pietatis studio nondum satis fundatus et formatus"), **having a heart practised in covetousness** (this construction, a gen. after *γυμνάζεσθαι*, is not without example: see Thomas Magister sub voce, and Hemsterhuis's note. So some in Acts xxii. 3 (see note there), cf. Hom.-Clem. iv. 7 (vol. ii. p. 123, Migne), *πάσης Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐξησκημένος*. The phrases, *τόξων, οἰωνῶν, πολέμων, εἰδώς*, are common in Homer: so *οὐ πρὶν εἰδυῖα τόκοιο*, Il. ρ. 5: *διδασκόμενος πολέμοιο*, π. 811: *οὔτε τι ναυτιλίης σεσοφισμένος*, Hesiod. ἔργ. κ. ἡμ. 649. The true account of such genitives seems to be, not, as Hemst. that the participles are taken as nouns, but as in *ἀκούειν, αἰσθάνεσθαι, τινός*, that they are partitive genitives), **children of curse** (i. e. as in ref. 2 Thess., *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*, John xvii. 12, persons devoted to the curse, accursed. But the E. V., "*cursed children*," does not give the meaning, *τέκνα* being used in the original simply with reference to *κατάρας*. 15.] The last clauses, from *ὀφθαλμοὺς* to *τέκνα*, have no representatives in Jude. Now again the parallelism begins, cf. Jude 11: but the sentiment is more expanded here. The construction is altered, and becomes direct and regular, *καταλιπόντες . . . ἐπλανήθησαν*. **Which have forsaken the right way** (ref.) **and are gone astray** (the aor. part. and aor. verb are contemporary: and both require, as so often, to

τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς [e] μισθὸν [e] ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, [16] [f] ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας [g] παρανομίας· [h] ὑποζύγιον [i] ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ [k] φθεγξάμενον [l] ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου [m] παραφρονίαν. [17] οὗτοί εἰσι [n] πηγαὶ [o] ἄνυδροι καὶ [p] ὁμίχλαι

e ver. 13. f here only. Job xxi. 4. xxiii. 2 only. g here only. Prov. v. 22. h Matt. xxi. 5 (from Zech. ix. 9) only. Gen. xxxvi. 24 al. i Acts viii. 32 (from Isa. liii 7). 1 Cor. xii. 2. xiv. 10 only. Wisd. iv. 19 2 Macc. iii. 29 only. k ver. 18. Acts iv. 18 only. Job xiii. 7 al. l = Luke xxiii. 2 al. Ps. xxxix. 9. m here only † (not elsw.). (νεῖν, 2 Cor xi. 23.) n Mark v. 29. John iv. 6 bis, 14. James iii. 11 (12 v. r.). Rev. vii. 17 al⁴. Exod. xv 27. o Matt xii. 43 ‖ L. Jude 12 only. Ps. lxii. 1. Jer. ii. 6. p here only. Job xxxviii. 9.

ABCKL[P]ℵ rel. for βοσορ, βεωρ B 81 tol syr-pk sah arm: βεωορσορ ℵ[1]. om ος Bℵ[1] arm. ηγαπησαν B arm.

16. om εν ℵ[1] [vulg-ed(with demid harl) Eus, Orig-int,]. ανθρωπουν C[1]: ανθρωποις B.

17. rec (for και ομιχλαι) νεφελαι, with L rel syr-pk Thl: txt ABCℵ 13. 36 vulg syr coptt æth [και ομιχλη and ελαυνομενη below P m syr-mg-gr]. (om και ομιχλ. to end of ver K.)

be rendered by our English perfect; the English bare past not involving any present consequence, but rather leaving it to be inferred that the state predicated is over now), **following out** (this seems to be all that the ἐξ- implies; see on ch. i. 16. It is noticeable, that in ‖ Jude the expression is ἐξεχύθησαν) **the way of Balaam** (τῇ ὁδῷ, not merely figuratively, the way (of life), but literally, seeing that it was by a *journey* that Balaam displeased God: cf. the frequent repetition of the word in Num. xxii. 23, and the words of the angel in ib. 32, *οὐκ ἀστεία ἡ ὁδός σου ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ*) **(the son) of Bosor** (Grot. supposes Bosor to be a corruption of the name פְּתוֹר, "Pethor," Num. xxii. 5: Vitringa, Observ. Sacræ, vol. i. pp. 936 f., maintains rightly that *τοῦ Βοσόρ* rather signifies parentage than habitation, and that *Βοσόρ* is a way of writing בְּעוֹר, Beor, owing to a peculiar pronunciation of the ע, which he traces in the formation of *salio* from עָלָה, and in the case of other sibilants from aspirates, as *sal* from ἅλς, *septem* from ἑπτά, *sisto* from ἵστημι. And he conjectures that, coupled with an intimation that the Galileans gave a softer sound than others to the ע, this may have been connected with the Galilean dialect which betrayed Peter on a memorable occasion, Matt. xxvi. 73. So far well: but he goes on also to say, that the Apostle had a mystical reason for choosing this form, in allusion to the temptation which Balaam cast before Israel, because בָּשָׂר signifies *flesh*, "elegante hoc lusu subinnuens, Bileamum, suadendo voluptatum carnalium exercitium, merito dicendum esse filium *βοσόρ*, id est, carnis." It certainly is not beyond possibility that a Hebrew ear may have found such an allusion obvious: but the reference seems here rather to be to Balaam's attempt to curse Israel, than to his subsequent temptation of them), **who loved the wages of unrighteousness** (viz. which he vainly thought he might get by disobeying the command of God. See Bp. Butler's masterly sermon on the character of Balaam, in his well-known volume),

16.] **but had a rebuke for his own iniquity** (what sort of a reproof, is shewn below. If any force can be given to *ἰδίας*, it will be found in the fact that the reproof came from an animal which was part of his own substance: he himself furnished the conviction of his own iniquity, from the animal on which he rode): **a** (or, "*the*:" we are never sure of our ground with anarthrous substantives in these later Epistles) **dumb beast of burden** (*ὑποζύγιον* is apparently used as synonymous with *ὄνος* in ref. Matt. If so, the universal practice of riding on the ass in Palestine must be regarded as the reason) **speaking** (aor. part. contemporary with aor. verb following) **in man's voice** (not, "by speaking in man's voice:" the participial clause brings into notice the miraculous character of the incident) **hindered** (not in matter of fact, for Balaam went on his way: but subjectively, more as the *imperfect* is often used: "*withstood,*" or as E. V. "*forbade*") **the madness of the prophet** (a discrepancy has been discovered between this and the Mosaic account, seeing that it was the angel, and not the ass, from whom the rebuke came, the ass having merely deprecated ill-treatment at Balaam's hands. But the Apostle evidently regards not so much the words of rebuke uttered, as the miraculous fact, as being the hindrance. It was enough to have prevented his going onward, when the dumb animal on which he rode was gifted with speech to shew him his madness).

17, 18.] *Further designation of these false teachers, and justification of it.* Cf. Jude 12, 13, which is here much abridged. 17.] **These are wells without water** (in ‖ Jude, clouds without water. Œc. understands this, *ἀπεικάζει αὐτοὺς πηγαῖς ἀνύδροις, ὡς ἀπολωλεκότας τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ὕδωρ, τουτέστι, τὸ τοῦ κηρύγματος*

ὑπὸ [q] λαίλαπος [r] ἐλαυνόμεναι, οἷς ὁ [st] ζόφος τοῦ [t] σκότους [st] τετήρηται. [18] [u] ὑπέρογκα γὰρ [v] ματαιότητος [w] φθεγγόμενοι, [x] δελεάζουσιν ἐν [y] ἐπιθυμίαις [y] σαρκὸς [z] ἀσελγείαις τοὺς [a] ὀλίγως [b] ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν [c] πλάνῃ [d] ἀναστρεφομένους, [19] [e] ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς [f] ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ [g] δοῦλοι [h] ὑπάρχοντες τῆς [gl] φθορᾶς· ᾧ γάρ τις [k] ἥττηται, τούτῳ καὶ [l] δεδούλωται. [20] εἰ γὰρ [b] ἀποφυγόντες τὰ

ABCKL PN a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

q Mark iv. 37 || L. only. Jer. xxxii. (xxv.) 32. r = James iii. 4 reff. s ver. 4. t Jude 13. u Jude 16 only. Exod. xviii. 22 al. v Rom. viii. 20. Eph. iv. 17 only. Ps. xxx. 6. w ver. 16. x ver. 14. y Gal. v. 16. Eph. ii. 3. 1 John ii. 16. (Rom. xiii. 14. see 1 Pet. ii. 11.) z ver. 2. a here only †. b ch. i. 4 reff. c = Rom. i. 27. ch. iii. 17. Jude 11 al6. Prov. xiv. 8. d = Heb. xiii. 18 reff. e 1 Cor. x. 29. Gal. ii. 4. v. 1, 13 al. f constr., James i. 12 reff. g see Rom. viii. 21. h James ii. 15 reff. i ch. i. 4 reff. k here bis. 2 Cor. xii. 13 only. Isa. l v 17. John viii. 34. Rom. vi. 16. ἔρωτι τῆς παιδὸς ἡττηθείς, Jos. Antt. i. 19. 4. l Acts vii. 6 (from Gen. xv. 13). Rom. vi. 18, 22. 1 Cor. vii. 15. ix. 19. Gal. iv. 3. Tit. ii. 3 only. Wisd. xix. 13. 1 Macc. viii. 11 only.

rec ins εις αιωνα bef τετηρηται (*from* || *Jude*), with ACL[P] rel æth-pl Thl Œc: om BN vulg syrr coptt æth-rom Jer Aug Bede.

18. ματαιοτης B[1]: μαθηταιοτητος ℵ[1](but corrd). [ασελγειας (for -αις) P a vulg syrr copt Ephr$_1$ Aug Jer.] for [1st] τους, του ℵ[1]. rec οντως (ΟΛΙΓΩΣ *is easily mistaken for* ΟΝΤΩΣ), with CKL[P]ℵ[1] rel arm Thl Œc, οντας k: txt ABℵ[3] 13 vulg syrr coptt [æth] Jer Aug Bede, ολιγον a. rec αποφυγοντας, with KL[P] rel Œc Jer Aug: txt ABCℵ 13 vulg syrr Thl Bede.

19. ℵ[1] repeats ελευθεριαν. [ins και bef αυτοι B[2](appy).] aft υπαρχοντες ins οντες A 27. om και Bℵ[1] [coptt æth].

καθαρὸν κ. πότιμον ὕδωρ. But this is going too far into specialities: the comparison, in both Epistles, is simply to that which may be expected to yield water, and yields none. In this case the πηγή seems to be the spring itself, which ought to send forth water but does not), **and mists** (οὐκ εἴσι, φησί, διαυγεῖς ὥσπερ οἱ ἅγιοι οἱ ὄντες νεφέλαι, ἀλλ' ὀμίχλαι, τουτέστι σκότους καὶ γνόφου μεστοί, ὑπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ πνεύματος ἐλαυνόμενοι. Comm. in Catena) **driven along by a whirlwind** (**λαῖλαψ**, according to Aristotle de mundo, is πνεῦμα βίαιον καὶ ἐλούμενον κάτωθεν ἄνω), **for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved** (see || Jude. It is obvious that no just charge of inappropriateness can be brought against our passage because this clause occurs in a different connexion from that in Jude. There it is said of wandering stars, here of driven clouds: of each, with equal appropriateness: darkness being predicable of clouds, as well as of stars extinguished).

18.] *Justification of the description.* **For, speaking great swelling things** (**ὑπέρογκος** is a classical word, occurring in Plato and Demosth., generally signifying excessive magnitude, as in μεγάλαι οὐσίαι κ. ὑπέρογκοι, Plut. Ep. iii. p. 317 C. δύναμις ὑπέρογκος as opposed to ταπεινή, Dem. p. 46. 16. Xen. Hell. v. 4. 58, uses it in the literal sense, γενομένης δὲ τῆς κνήμης ὑπερόγκου: and Plut. Lucull. 21, in a figurative,—φρόνημα τραγικὸν κ. ὑπέρογκον ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις εὐτυχίαις) **of vanity** (whose *characteristic* is ματαιότης: as in the genitive σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. vi. 6, and the like: see Winer, § 30. 2. β) **they allure** (above, ver. 14) **in lusts** (**ἐν ἐπιθ.** describes the state of the tempters, and the element in which their laying of enticing baits is situated) **by licentiousnesses** (**ἀσελγ.** are the instrument, the bait itself. Far better so, with Huther, than with De Wette to regard ἐν as = διά, and ἀσελγ. as in apposition with ἐπιθυμίαις. Œc. inverts this construction, δελεάζουσι διὰ τῆς σαρκικῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις) **of the flesh those who are scarcely** (οὐκ ὀλίγως occurs in the Anthol. xii. 205, in the sense of "not a little:" and as a var. read. in Plato, Alcib. ii. p. 149 A. It may signify here, by degrees, = κατ' ὀλίγον: but the other, = ὀλίγου, seems more generally accepted as the sense [with very little space, or very little time, for such escape]) **escaping from them who live in error** (some take **τοὺς ἐν πλ. ἀναστρ.** as a clause co-ordinate and in apposition with τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας: but the other rendering is far better: these unhappy persons who are but just escaping from the influence of those who live in error (the heathen), are then laid hold of by these deceivers, enticing them with licentiousness), 19.] **promising them liberty** (these are the great swelling things which they speak; holding out a state of Christian liberty, which proves to be the bondage of corruption) **while they themselves are** (all the while: **ὑπάρχω**, of previous entity: see on Acts xvi. 20) **slaves of corruption** (cf. the same words occurring together in ref. Rom., αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ: which it is very likely St. Peter had in view: cf. ch. iii. 15. They promise that liberty of the sons of God, being themselves in the bondage of

[m] μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν [n] ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ [o] σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν [p] ἐμπλακέντες [k] ἡττῶνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ [q] ἔσχατα [qr] χείρονα τῶν [q] πρώτων. [21] [s] κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ [t] ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν [u] ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἢ [t] ἐπιγνοῦσιν [v] ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς [w] παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς [x] ἁγίας ἐντολῆς. [22] [y] συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς [z] τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς [a] παροιμίας, [b] Κύων [c] ἐπιστρέψας

m here only. Ezek. xxxiii. 31. (-μος, ver. 10.)
n ch. i. 2. Heb. x. 26 reff.
o ch. i. 1 reff.
p 2 Tim. ii. 4 only. Prov. xxviii. 18 only.
q Matt. xii. 45 ‖ L. also ib. xxvii. 64. see Rev. ii. 19. Ps. lxxii. 17.
r as above Mt. L. Matt. ix. 16. 1 Tim. v. 8. Heb. x. 29 al.+ Wisd. xv. 18 only.
s = 1 Pet. iii. 17 reff.
t = Col. i. 6. 1 Tim. iv. 3. Job xxxiv. 27.
u see ver. 2.
v Luke iii. 20. Acts viii. 25. Gal. i. 17. Heb. vii. 1 al. Josh. ii. 23.
w = Acts xvi. 4. 1 Cor. xi. 2. Jude 3.
x Rom. vii. 12.
y 1 Pet. iv. 12 reff.
z so Matt. viii. 33. xvi. 23. xxi. 21. Rom. viii. 5.
a John x. 6. xvi. 25 bis, 29 only. Prov. i. 1 al2. Sir. vi. 35 al4. only.
b Matt. vii. 6. Luke xvi. 21. Phil. ii. 22. Rev. xxii. 15 only. Prov. xxvi. 11 (freely, see note).
c = Matt. xii. 44. Gal. iv. 9. Jer. xi. 10.

20. aft *κυριου* ins *ημων* ACL[P]ℵ a d f vulg syrr coptt æth [arm] Ps-Chr$_1$ Thl Aug Fast Salv: aft *σωτηρος*, g. om *και σωτηρος* L f copt æth Ps-Chr$_1$: *σωτ. κ. κυρ.* o.
21. *κρεισσον* Aℵ 13 [Cyr$_2$ Damasc Max$_1$]. *αυτοις* bef *ην* A[P] m. rec *επιστρεψαι*, with KL rel [Max$_1$] Thl Œc: *ανακαμψαι* Aℵ 13 Cyr[-p$_3$] Ps-Chr$_1$: txt BC [P] Damasc$_1$.—pref *εις τα οπισω* Aℵ a 13 Cyr[-p$_3$] Ps-Chr$_1$: j adds. for *εκ*, *απο* Aℵ a 13 Cyr[-p$_3$] Thl.
22. rec aft *συμβεβηκεν* ins *δε*, with CKL[P]ℵ^3 rel [syrr Anton$_1$ Max$_1$] Thl Œc: om

corruption. **φθορά** here, moral decay of sin, ending in perdition): **for by what (ever) a man is overcome, by the same he is also enslaved** (cf. ref. John, πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας: and ref. Rom., ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε. These passages were certainly in the Apostle's mind. **ἡττάομαι**, generally found with a gen. of the agent, has here a dat. The classical rendering here would be "in whatever a man is overcome (by another), in that particular he is also enslaved (by that other)." But the context makes it clear that the datives are intended to designate the agent, not the mode). **20—22.**] *Further description of these deceivers as apostates from Christ, and designation of their terrible state as such.* **20.**] **For if, having escaped** (it might seem at first sight as if the ἀποφεύγοντας of ver. 18 were meant: but on close inspection it is plain that this is not so, but that we are continuing the description of the δοῦλοι τῆς φθορᾶς, viz. the deceivers themselves: the ἥττηται and ἡττῶνται marking the identity) **the pollutions** (reff.) **of the world, in** (element and condition of their escape) **knowledge** (**ἐπιγνώσει**, genuine and accurate knowledge: shewing that he is treating of men who have not been mere professors of spiritual grace, but real possessors of it) **of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ** (expressed at length, to set forth more solemnly that from which they fall), **but having again become entangled in these, they are overcome** (the construction is ordinarily regarded as broken by the δέ, placed as if ἀποφύγωσιν and not ἀποφυγόντες had preceded: "*if, after they have, &c., they are again entangled and overcome,*" as E. V. But it is better to regard ἡττῶνται as the apodosis to both the participial clauses, and δέ as coupling them to each other), **their last state is** (we cannot say in English "has become," for we thereby convey an idea that it was not always so, but has undergone a change) **worse than the first** (**αὐτοῖς**, dat. incommodi. The saying is our Lord's own: see reff. Matt. ‖ L.). **21.**] *Reason of these last words.* **For it were** (that use of the imperfect without ἄν, answering to the Latin "faciebam, ni:" see on Rom. ix. 3) **better for them not to have known the way of righteousness** (viz. the Christian life: cf. ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ver. 2) **than, having known it** (dat. instead of accus. by a very common attraction), **to turn back** (not perf., but aor.: now implying merely the final character of the act) **from** (out of, as out of a way) **the holy commandment** (the moral law of the gospel: here so designated, because it is of moral corruption that the Apostle is treating) **delivered to them** (cf. ref. Jude, τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει: where the arrangement of words is the same as here: παραδοθείσῃ being thrown forward and having the emphasis). **22.**] *Further description of their state by two proverbial expressions.* **There hath happened to them that of the true proverb** (for construction, see reff.: and Lucian, dial. mort. viii. 1, τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὁ νεβρὸς τὸν λέοντα), **The dog gone back** (i. e. "*which has gone back:*" **ἐπιστρέψας** is not a finite verb, but simply a predicate of **κύων**) **to his own vomit** (in ref. Prov. we have ὥσπερ κύων ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔμετον καὶ μισητὸς γένηται, οὕτως

ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον [d] ἐξέραμα· καί, [e] Ὗς [f] λουσαμένη εἰς [g] κυλισμὸν [h] βορβόρου.

III. [1] Ταύτην ἤδη, [i] ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς [k] διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν [k] ὑπομνήσει τὴν [l] εἰλικρινῆ [m] διάνοιαν [2] [n] μνησθῆναι τῶν [no] προειρημένων [n] ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν [p] ἁγίων [p] προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν [q] ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν [q] ἐντολῆς τοῦ [nq] κυρίου καὶ [r] σωτῆρος, [3] [s] τοῦτο πρῶτον [s] γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' [t] ἐσχάτων τῶν

ABCKL P ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

d here only †. (-ρᾶν, Lev. xviii. 28 Aq.) e here only. Prov. xi. 22 al3. f Heb. x. 22 reff. g here only †. Prov. ii. 18 Theod. (-λίειν, Mark ix. 20.) h here only. Jer. xlv. (xxxviii.) 6 bis only. i Heb. vi. 9 reff. k ch. i. 13 (reff.). l Phil. i. 10 only †. Wisd. vii. 25 only. (-εια, 1 Cor. v. 8.) m = 1 Pet. i. 13 reff. n Jude 17. o Heb. iv. 7 reff. p Luke i. 70. Acts iii. 21. q double gen., James ii. 1. Acts v. 32. r ch. i. 1. ii. 20. s ch. i. 20 (reff.). t plur. (w. ἡμ.), James v. 3 only. see Heb. i. 1 reff. Jude 18.

ABℵ[1] am spec sah Salv[1] Promiss. rec κυλισμα, with AKL[P]ℵ rel Cyr[-p[3] Damasc[1] Anton[1] Max[1]] Thl Œc: txt BC[1] a Ps-Chr [Ambr[1]].

Chap. III. 1. αγαπητοι bef ηδη K.

2. rec ημων, with k Œc: txt ABCKL[P]ℵ rel 36(sic) vulg arm Thl.

3. προγινωσκοντες C[1][appy]. rec εσχατου, with KL[P] rel syrr Œc Aug[1]: εσχατω

ἄφρων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ κακίᾳ ἀναστρέψας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίαν. It may seem however somewhat doubtful, whether the proverbs, as here cited, be meant to be taken from Scripture, or rather not both of them from the popular parlance, as here expressed. **ἐξέραμα** seems hardly to be found elsewhere than here (Schleusner cites Dioscorides vi. 19: adding "et alii," but qu.?): the verb ἐξεράω occurs in ref., and Aristoph. Vesp. 993, Hippocrates, al. See Lobeck on Phryn. p. 64: and Schleusner in voce): **and, The sow after washing** (the middle sense must not be pressed: it is the word commonly used of men, transferred to an animal) **to** (ἐπιστρέψασα is generally understood before **εἰς**. But it seems better, with Huther, to understand the proverb as self-contained, and elliptical, as in "Sweets to the sweet": so, "The washed sow to the mire") **wallowing in the mire** (if we read κύλισμα, we must render "the place of wallowing." In either case, the gen. **βορβόρου** imports that which characterizes the wallowing, and is a possessive gen. It is of, belongs to, mire).

Chap. III. The general subject: The certainty of Christ's coming established against certain scoffers who shall call it into doubt. Exhortations are intermingled, and follow as a conclusion.

1.] **This Epistle now, beloved, a second, write I unto you** (or, "This second Epistle now write I unto you:" but the position of **δευτέραν** seems rather to shew that the emphasis of the sentence is on it): **in which Epistles** (E. V. well, "*in both which:*" viz. this and the first, implied in δευτέραν) **I stir up your pure** (see ref. Phil., note) **mind** (**διάνοια** is that aspect of the spiritual being of man, in which it is turned towards the outer world; his mind for business and outer interests, guiding him in action: see Beck, Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre, p. 58. And this may be said to be **εἰλικρινής**, when the will and affection being turned to God, it is not obscured by fleshly and selfish regards: the opposite being ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ, Eph. iv. 18. It seems impossible to reproduce in English these distinctions; we can only give them a general rendering, and leave all besides for explanatory notes) **in reminding** (see the same expression and note, ch. i. 13); 2.] **that ye should remember** (= εἰς τὸ μνησθῆναι:—compare the infinitives ποιῆσαι and μνησθῆναι abruptly introduced in a similar manner in Luke i. 72) **the words spoken before by the holy prophets** (i. e. the O. T. prophets, as referred to above ch. i. 19 ff. The vulg. has curiously misrendered: "*eorum quæ prædixi verborum a sanctis prophetis*"), **and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour given by your apostles** (as commonly taken, this sentence is made to contain a violent inversion, τοῦ κυρ. κ. σωτ. being taken out of its place after ἐντολῆς and attached to τῶν ἀποστόλ. ὑμῶν. Any how, the construction is harsh, the double gen. being unavoidable: but it is surely much better to take ἐντολῆς in its most obvious connexion, and make τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν the second genitive—the command originating in our Lord, and given you by the Apostles who preached to you: τῶν ἀπ. ὑμῶν meaning "*your* Apostles" as we call St. Paul ἀπόστολον ἐθνῶν. It is quite impossible that ἡμῶν can stand: and difficult, even if it did, to render as E. V. "of us the Apostles." It is obvious, from the constant independence even in very similar sentences, of the two Epistles, that the ‖ place in St. Jude, where it

ἡμερῶν ἐν [u] ἐμπαιγμονῇ [v] ἐμπαῖκται [w] κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν [w] πορευόμενοι καὶ λέγοντες [4] [x] Ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς [y] παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀφ' [z] ἧς γὰρ οἱ [a] πατέρες [b] ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως [c] διαμένει [d] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς [de] κτίσεως. [5] [f] λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο [g] θέλοντας, ὅτι

u here only †.
v Jude 18 only. Isa. iii. 4 only. (-παίζειν, Matt. xxvii. 29 al. -παιγμός, Heb. xi. 36.)
w Jude 16, 18. 2 Chron. xxviii. 2.
x = Luke viii. 25. Gal. iv. 15. Ps. xli. 3. lxxviii. 10. Mal. ii. 17.
y = ch. i. 16. ver. 12.
z ellips. of ἡμ., Luke vii. 11, 45. John i. 29, 35. 1 Macc. i. 11.
a Heb. i. 1 reff.
b Matt. xxvii. 52. Acts vii. 60. 1 Thess. iv. 13 al. Isa. xiv. 8.
c Heb. i. 11 reff.
d Mark x. 6. xiii. 19. see Rom. i. 20.
e = Sir. xlix. 16.
f constr., Acts xxvi. 26. ver. 8. (Heb. xiii. 2 reff.) Levit. v. 3, 4.
g see Col. ii. 18.

C[1]: txt ABC[2]ℵ a d h k l vulg coptt [æth arm] Ps-Hip$_1$ Antch$_1$ Ps-Chr$_1$ Thl Jer$_1$. rec om *εν εμπαιγμονη*, with KL rel Ps-Hip Thl Œc: [om *εν* CP:] ins ABℵ 13 vulg syrr coptt æth Ps-Chr[-montf], *εν εμπαιγμων* 36. rec *αυτων* bef *επιθυμιας*, with Aℵ a[2] m[2] 36 Œc: om *αυτων* a[1] [vulg Ps-Chr$_1$]: txt BCKL[P] rel Ps-Hip Thl.

stands ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρ. ἡμ. Ἰησ. χριστοῦ, is no guide here, nor reason why the same words should be joined together):— 3.] **knowing this first** (cf. ref., where the same phrase occurs. The nom. **γινώσκοντες** is joined loosely with *μνησθῆναι*. Jude introduces the same prophetic fact with ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, ver. 18), **that there shall come in the last of the days** (see note on Heb. i. 1: and 1 Pet. i. 20. It slightly differs from ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμ., at the *end* of the days, as extending, by the plur., the expression, though perhaps not the meaning, over a wider space: = ἐπ' ἐσχάτου [τοῦ] χρόνου, Jude 18) **scoffers in (their) scoffing** (scoffers making use of scoffing: cf. Rev. xiv. 2, κιθαρῳδῶν κιθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις αὐτῶν: 2 Kings xx. 22, ἐλάλησεν (ἡ γυνὴ ἡ σοφὴ) ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτῆς: Dan. i. 4 Theod., συνιέντας ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, κ. γινώσκοντας γνῶσιν, κ. διανοουμένους φρόνησιν. On the sense, cf. Jude 18), **walking according to their own lusts** (so Jude 18 and 16, here combined),

4.] **and saying, Where is the promise of His coming** (**ποῦ ἐστιν**, implying that it is no where, has passed away and disappeared: cf. reff. **αὐτοῦ**, of Christ: whose name would be understood as of course)? **for from the day when** (**ἀφ' ἧς**, sc. ἡμέρας: reff.) **the fathers fell asleep, all things continue thus from the beginning of creation** (the assertion is not easy to apportion grammatically. One thing is certain and may be first cleared away, that we cannot after οὕτως supply ὡς ἦν, "as they were," E. V.: οὕτως simply referring to the present; as they are, as we now see them, and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως belonging only to the verb, διαμένει. This being so, we still have two predicatory clauses following the verb: ἀφ' ἧς οἱ πατ. ἐκοιμ., and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. The way of explaining this must be, that the time of waiting for the promise necessarily dates from the death of the πατέρες, and the duration of things continuing as they are now extends back beyond the death of the fathers: so that the meaning will be, ever since the death of those to whom the promise was made, things have continued as we now see them (and as they have ever continued even before those fathers) from the beginning of creation. So that πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως is a general proposition applicable to all time: ἀφ' ἧς οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, the 'terminus a quo' this general proposition is taken up and applied to the case in hand. And now we have cleared the way to enquiring, who are meant by **οἱ πατέρες**. And the answer is plain: largely and generally, those to whom the promise was made: the same as are indicated Rom. ix. 5, ὧν οἱ πατέρες: yet not exclusively these, but simultaneously with them any others who may be in the same category,—e. g. those who bear to the N. T. church the same relation as they to that of the O. T. The assertion, as coming from the ἐμπαῖκται, must not be pressed to any particular date, but given that wide reference which would naturally be in the mind of one making such a general charge). 5—10.] *Refutations of this their scoffing inference.*

5—7.] *First refutation:* from the biblical *history of the creation.* 5.] **For** (i. e. they speak thus, because) **this** (viz. this fact which follows) **escapes them** (passes unnoticed by them) **of their own will** (i. e. they shut their eyes to this fact. So we have **θέλων** in Od. γ. 272, of Paris and Helen, τὴν δ' ἐθέλων ἐθέλουσαν ἀνήγαγεν ὅνδε δόμονδε; Il. δ. 300, al. Some, among whom are Rosenmüller, Pott, Bretschneider, Huther, take τοῦτο to refer to the saying of ver. 4, and render θέλοντας '*meaning*,' 'supposing,' as in Herodian, v. 3. 11, εἰκόνα τε ἡλίου ἀνέργαστον εἶναι θέλουσι. But besides that this would introduce an unusual meaning for θέλω, and that meaning not in its usual application to an hypothesis or assumption, but to an asserted fact,—a stronger objection is, that thus the sentence becomes a very flat one, and quite out

οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν [h]ἔκπαλαι, καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος [i]συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ [k]λόγῳ, [6] δι' ὧν ὁ [l]τότε κόσμος ὕδατι [m]κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο, [7] οἱ δὲ [n]νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ [o]τῷ [o]αὐτοῦ [p]λόγῳ [q]τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν [r]πυρὶ

ABCKL[P]ℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 13

h ch. ii. 3 only †. i = Col. i. 17 only ‡. ἐκ γῆς... ὕδατος... ἀέρος...κ. πυρός, συνέστη ὅδε ὁ κόσμος. Philo de Plant. Noë, 2, vol. i. p. 330. k see Heb. xi. 3. l = here only. m here only. Ps. lxxviii. 20. n = 2 Cor. viii. 14. 1 Tim. iv. 8. o so (art. bef. αὐτ.) Heb. ii. 4. James i. 18. 1 John ii. 27. p Gen. ix. 11. q Matt. vi. 19, 20. Luke xii. 21. Rom. ii. 5. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. 2 Cor. xii. 14. James v. 3 only. Micah vi. 10. r dat., Jude 13.

5. ins η bef γη C[P. υδατων P.] δια ℵ. συνεστωσης B: συνεστωσαι K: συνεστατα ℵ¹.
7. Steph om τω, with Œc-ed: txt ABCKL[P]ℵ rel Thl. elz αυτω, with AB[P] a¹ vulg coptt Did-int₁ Aug₂ Jer: txt CKLℵ rel syrr æth Thl. ins εν bef

of place among the sharp and nervous denunciations of the passage. The other is the rendering of almost all Commentators and versions. The vulg. is ambiguous, "latet enim eos hoc volentes"), **that the heavens** (**οὐρανοί** = οἱ οὐρανοί, see Winer, § 19. 1) **were from of old** (ref.: "jam inde a primo rerum omnium initio," Gerh.) **and the earth** (ἦσαν, above, serves for γῆ also) **formed** (**συνεστῶσα**, 'consistens,' see reff.) **out of water and by means of water** (**ἐξ ὕδατος**, because the waters that were under the firmament were gathered together into one place and the dry land appeared: and thus water was the material, *out of* which the earth was made: **δι' ὕδατος**, because the waters above the firmament, being divided from the waters below the firmament, by furnishing moisture, and rain, and keeping moist the earth, are *the means by which* the earth συνίσταται. This is the simplest rendering, and very nearly that given by Huther. De Wette goes 'in omnia alia' after traces of far-fetched cosmogonical references, Indo-Ægyptian and Greek: but the whole interpretation of our passage lies in the book of Genesis. Œc., without mentioning the reference to the waters above and beneath the firmament, gives a similar explanation of the ἐκ and διά, ἐξ ὕδατος μέν, ὡς ἐξ ὑλικοῦ αἰτίου· δι' ὕδατος δέ, ὡς διατελικοῦ) **by the word of God** (not of its own will, nor by a fortuitous concurrence of atoms), 6.] **by means of which** (**two**) (viz. the waters under the firmament and the waters above the firmament: for in the flood (1) the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and (2) the windows of heaven were opened, Gen. vii. 11. The interpretations of **δι' ὧν** have been very various. Œc. understands **ὧν** to refer to the heavens and the earth, τῆς μὲν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπικλυσάσης, τῶν οὐρανῶν δὲ τοὺς καταῤῥάκτας αὐτῶν ἐπαφέντων: and so Bede (but giving a curious meaning to δι' ὧν: not, as Huther states, '*in quibus partibus*,' but grammatically, though strangely, '*by means of which* (its parts perishing), *the world, which was made up of heaven and earth, perished*:' "per hæc enim perdita mundus qui in his constiterat, periit"), Beza, Wolf, Horneius, De Wette, al. Again Grot., Piscator, Dietlein, al., take δι' ὧν for '*quamobrem*,' i. e. because the world was ἐξ ὕδ. κ. δι' ὕδ., or because it was τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ. Luther renders wrongly, dennoch, nevertheless. Calvin, Pott, al. and recently Huther, understand δι' ὧν of waters; and account for the plur. by the ὕδωρ as material and the ὕδωρ as medium, above, or as Gerhard by understanding "things," and taking in also the word of God as comprehended) **the then world** (i. e. the whole state of things then existing. The Apostle's argument is, as against the assertors of the world's endurance for ever, that it *has once been destroyed*, so that their assertion is thereby invalidated. The expression **ὁ τότε κόσμος** must neither be limited, as Œc., τὸ ἀπώλετο μὴ πρὸς πάντα τὸν κόσμον ἀκουστέον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς μόνα τὰ ζῶα, ἃ τὸν ἅπαντα κόσμον οἱονεὶ εἰδοποιεῖ: nor strictly pushed to its utmost extent, as Huther, who maintains that it must be exactly identical with οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ below. The analogy is not exactly, but is sufficiently close: and κόσμος, as an indefinite common term, takes in the οὐρανοὶ κ. γῆ, which were then instrumental in, and purified by, the destruction, if not altogether swept away by it. Nay the analogy is closer than this: for just as Noah stepped out of the Ark on a new world, the face of the heavens clear, and the face of the earth renewed, so we look for a new heavens and earth (ver. 13), yet like these others constructed out of the materials of the old) **being inundated with water, perished** (**ἀπώλετο**, see last note; not, *was annihilated*, but lost its then form and subsistence as a κόσμος, and passed into a new state. Only thus, as Huther observes, does the verse come in logically as a contradiction to the saying of the scoffers, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως):

7.] **but the new heavens and earth** (contrast to ὁ τότε κόσμος: the postdiluvian visible world) **by His** (God's: if αὐτῷ be read, it must not be pressed to signify any one saying, but must refer generally

[s] τηρούμενοι [s] εἰς [t] ἡμέραν [t] κρίσεως καὶ [u] ἀπωλείας τῶν [v] ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων. [8] ἓν δὲ [w] τοῦτο μὴ [x] λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι [y] μία ἡμέρα [z] παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη, καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. [9] οὐ [a] βραδύνει κύριος τῆς [b] ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες [c] βραδυτῆτα [d] ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ [e] μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς μὴ [f] βουλόμενός τινας [g] ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν [h] χωρῆσαι. [10] [i] ἥξει δὲ [k] ἡμέρα

s ch. ii. 4 reff.
t ch. ii. 9 reff.
u ver. 16. Rom. ix. 22. Phil. i. 28. iii. 19 al. Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 21.
v Jude 4 reff.
w see 1 Pet. ii. 19 reff.
x = ver. 5.
y Psa. lxxxix. 4.
z = James i. 17 reff.
a 1 Tim. iii. 15 only. Deut. vii. 10. Sir. xxxii. (xxxv.) 18.
b gen., see note and Winer, § 30. 6. *b*.
c here only †. Xen. Hell. iv. 6. 5.
d constr., Heb. x. 29 reff.
e Heb. vi. 15 reff. see note.
f of God, James i. 18 reff.
g = James iv. 12 reff.
h = & w. εἰς, Matt. xv. 17 only ‡. (2 Macc. xv. 37.) Æschyl. Pers. 379 (385). Jos. B. J. vi. 2. 5.
i = Luke xiii. 35. John ii. 4. Ps. xxxvi. 13.
k Acts ii. 20, from Joel ii. 31. 1 Thess. v. 2 (1 Cor. i. 8. 2 Cor. i. 14. 2 Thess. ii. 2) only. Isa. ii. 12.

πυρι C¹[P] 27-9. for απωλειας, ασεβειας A.
8. ημας C. κυριου ℵ. om και χιλια ετη (*homœotel*) ℵ.
9. rec ins ο bef κυριος, with KL rel Thl Œc: om ABC[P]ℵ h j n 13. 36 [arm]. for 1st εις, δι' Aℵ a 13 vulg spec syrr sah æth Aug Fulg Fast: εφ c. rec ημας, with KL rel copt Thl Œc: txt ABC[P]ℵ c m 13 vulg spec syrr sah Aug Fulg Fast. [τινα (for -νας) P 13 am(and tol) spec copt arm Thl Aug Fulg.] παντες ℵ.
10. rec ins η bef ημερα, with AKL[P]ℵ(Tischdf, expr) rel [Damasc$_1$] Thl Œc: om

(as with *αὐτοῦ*) to the prophetic word, which has announced that which comes to be mentioned) **word are treasured up** (perf. "have been, and are still," kept in store, put by, against a certain time: see especially ref. Rom. Dietlein fancies that the idea of *θησαυρός* must be kept hold of, the *οὐρανοὶ κ. γῆ* being the stored-up material for wrath to be exercised on: but this is mere fancy, and is contradicted by Rom. ii. 5, where the reference is the same), **being kept** (present, denoting that it is only God's constantly watchful Providence which holds together the present state of things till His time for ending it) **for fire** (**πυρί**, dat. commodi) **against the day of judgment and perdition of impious men** (**τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων** does not, as Dietlein imagines, import that *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*, mankind, are *ἀσεβεῖς*: but = *τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις*). 8—10.] *Second contradiction* to the scoffers: *we are not to judge God*, in the case of *delay, as we do men*, seeing that His thoughts are not as our thoughts. 8.] **But let this one thing not escape you, beloved** (**ἓν τοῦτο**, as especially important: **λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς**, in allusion to ver. 5), **that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day** (the saying is the completion of that in Ps. xc. (reff.), setting forth also in a wonderful way, that one day may be in God's sight as productive of events as a millennium: in other words, when both clauses are considered, placing Him far above all human limits of time. "Summa: Dei æonologium (sic appellare liceat) differt ab horologio mortalium. Illius gnomon omnes horas simul indicat in summa actione et in summa quiete. Ei nec tardius nec celerius labuntur tempora, quam Ipsi et œconomiæ ejus aptum sit. Nulla causa est cur finem rerum aut protelare aut accelerare necessum habeat. Qui hoc comprehendemus? Si comprehendere possemus, non opus foret a Mose et Petro addi, *apud Dominum*." Bengel). 9.] **The Lord** (i. e. God, the Father, as so often in this and in the first Epistle) **is not tardy** (**βραδύνειν**, not merely to *delay*, but to *be late*, beyond an appointed time; so Gerh.: "discrimen est inter tardare et differre: is demum tardat, qui ultra debitum tempus quod agendum est differt") **concerning his promise** (so, connecting the gen. with the verb, and not with *ὁ κύριος*, must the words be taken. The gen. is one of partition, as in *ὑστερεῖν τινος*, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11,—*παύεσθαί τινος*, 1 Pet. iv. 1,—&c., the being late implying a falling short) **as some** (viz. the scoffers in question, who are pointed at) **account** (His conduct) **tardiness** (better thus, making **βραδυτῆτα** predicate, than to render **νομίζουσιν** "think concerning," "define," "explain," and make *βραδυτῆτα* object only): **but He is long-suffering towards you** (**μακροθυμεῖν** with **εἰς** here only: with *ἐπί*, Matt. xviii. 26, 29; Luke xviii. 7; James v. 7; with *πρός*, 1 Thess. v. 14:—**ὑμᾶς**, the readers of the Epistle; not as a separate class, but as representing all, cf. *πάντας* below), **not willing that any should perish, but** (willing) **that all should go forward** (reff.) **to repentance** (Calvin is quite wrong in his rendering, "omnes ad pœnitentiam recipere:" equally wrong, in his alternatives, "aut colligi, vel aggregari." Plutarch has the very expression, De flum. p. 19 (Wetst.), *ὀλίγον δὲ σωφρονήσας, καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐπὶ τοῖς πραχθεῖσι χωρήσας*).

10.] *Assertion of the conclusion as against the scoffers—the certainty, suddenness, and effect of the day of the Lord.* **But** (notwithstanding the delay) **the day**

[k] κυρίου ὡς [l] κλέπτης, ἐν ᾗ οὐρανοὶ [m] ῥοιζηδὸν [n] παρελεύσονται, [o] στοιχεῖα δὲ [p] καυσούμενα [q] λυθήσονται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ [r] ἔργα [s] κατακαήσεται. 11 τούτων οὕτως πάντων

l 1 Thess. v. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 15 reff.
m here only †. (-ζεῖν, Cant. iv. 15. -ζος, Wisd. v. 11.)
n = Matt. v. 18. xxiv. 34, 35 ||. 2 Cor. v. 17. James i. 10. Ps. lxxxix. 5. Esdr. i. 55 (52).
o = ver. 12 only †. Wisd. xix. 18. (Heb. v. 12 reff.)
p ver. 12 only †.
q = John ii. 19. Eph. ii. 14. vv. 11, 12. 1 John iii. 8. plur., Rev. i. 19 reff.
r = Heb. i. 10. iv. 3.
s Matt. iii. 12. Ezek. xx. 47. form also, see 1 Cor. iii. 15. Rev. viii. 7. Isa. xlvii. 14 A.

BCℵ(Treg) k l 36 Cyr$_2$. rec aft κλεπτης ins εν νυκτι, with CKL rel syr Thl Œc: om AB[P]ℵ k 13 vulg spec syr-pk coptt [æth] arm *Cyr*[-p] Did-int$_1$ Aug Pelag. om οι KLℵ a d h j k l m [Cyr$_2$ Damasc-ms$_1$]. aft ουρανοι ins μεν ℵ d j. ρυζηδον [AK]ℵ. om 1st και ℵ [Cyr$_2$]. λυθησεται BCℵ Cyr$_2$[-p(txt$_2$)]. ins η bef γη C[P] m. for κατακαησεται, ευρεθησεται BK[P]ℵ syr-mg (sah) [arm]: αφανισθησονται C syr-pk.

11. ins δε bef ουτως C[P]. rec (for ουτως) ουν, with AKLℵ rel vulg [syr-pk copt arm(Treg)] Thl Œc [Pelag: ουν ουτως syr-mg sah arm(? Tischdf or as CP above)]: txt BC[P] a syr[-txt].—ουν παντων ουτως m [Aug$_1$]: om ουν παντων a. [απαντων

(the art. is not needed for definiteness in the later Epistles, cf. ver. 7; Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16) **of the Lord** (= τοῦ θεοῦ, below, ver. 12) **shall come** (ἥξει has the emphasis, as opposed to all the doubts of the scoffers. It is more than merely "shall come," though no one word will give the exact force in English: "shall be here," "shall be upon you") **as a thief** (ref. 1 Thess.: from which place probably the expression is taken, as reference is made below to the Epistles of St. Paul); **in which the heavens shall pass away** (reff. Matt.; and Rev. xxi. 1) **with a rushing noise** (ῥοιζηδόν, τὸ μετὰ ἤχου· ἴδιος δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος ἦχος πυρὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ πυρὸς καταβοσκομένοις, Œc. ῥοῖζος is the rush of a bird, ref. Wisd., of an arrow, Il. π. 361, of the music or a shepherd's pipe, Od. ι. 315: and, see Palm and Rost's Lex., of any thing rapidly moving. Some understand it of the actual noise of the flames which shall consume the heavens: others, as De W., of the 'ruina,' or crash with which they shall fall: "magno impetu," vulg.; "in modum procellæ," Calv.: "cum stridore," Beza: alii aliter), **and the heavenly bodies** (στοιχεῖα, according to Bede, *the four elements*, fire, air, earth, and water: but he is obliged to modify the meaning of λυθήσονται, inasmuch as fire cannot dissolve or consume fire: according to Bengel, *the sun, moon, and stars*, defending it by this word being often used in that sense by Theoph. of Antioch and others in Suicer sub voce. Certainly Justin Martyr so uses the word several times: cf. Apol. ii. 5, p. 92, τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα εἰς αὔξησιν καρπῶν κ. ὡρῶν μεταβολὰς κοσμήσας: and Dial. Tryph. 23, p. 122, Epist. ad Diognet. 7 (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. ii. p. 1177), and Otto's notes. And considering that this clause, on account of the δέ, followed presently by the καί when we come to speak of the earth, necessarily belongs to the heavens,—considering also that the mention of the heavenly bodies as affected by the great Day is constant in Scripture, cf. Matt. xxiv. 29; Isa. xiii. 9, 10, xxiv. 23, xxxiv. 4, &c., I should be inclined on the whole to accept this interpretation, feeling that the above-named reasons overbear the objection alleged by De Wette, that the word does not bear this sense in any other passage of Scripture. This objection is also weakened by remembering, 1. that it occurs in a physical sense here only: 2. that in Gal. iv. 3, where it is clearly not in a physical sense, the Greek interpreters give it this meaning: see in Suicer sub voce, and mine and Bishop Ellicott's notes on Gal. l. c., and note on Matt. xxiv. 29) **being scorched up** (καυσόομαι, classically, to suffer from excessive heat: to be in a burning fever. The pres. part. gives the ground and reason of the following verb) **shall be dissolved** (not literally, *melt* [that is expressed by τήκεται below]: cf. λυομένων next verse, and reff. here), **and the earth and the works in it** (ἔργα may mean either the works of men, buildings and the like,—or, the works of the Creator: perhaps both of these combined, "opera naturæ et artis," Bengel. Estius's sense, "opera peccatorum," is out of the question: nor does 1 Cor. iii. 15 &c. apply here, any further than that the same purifying fire is spoken of) **shall be burned up** (the var. readd. are very curious. That of BK[P]ℵ, εὑρεθήσεται, has plainly arisen from the Latin *urentur*. That it has so arisen, is a most instructive fact, and leads to inferences which cannot be here followed out).

11—18.] Exhortations with reference to the approach of the Day of God. 11—13.] In direct reference to what has just been said, *waiting and eager expectation is enjoined*. 11.] **These things being thus to be dissolved** (τούτων, this heaven and earth which surround us. According to the reading in the text, there is no particle of inference: but the inference is all the more vivid. οὕτως: viz. in the manner just described.

[q t]λυομένων, [u]ποταποὺς δεῖ [v]ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἁγίαις [w]ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ [x]εὐσεβείαις [12] [y z]προςδοκῶντας καὶ [a]σπεύδοντας τὴν [b]παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ [c]θεοῦ [y c]ἡμέρας, δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ [d]πυρούμενοι [e]λυθήσονται καὶ [e]στοιχεῖα [e]καυσούμενα [f]τήκεται. [13] [g]καινοὺς δὲ [g]οὐρανοὺς καὶ [g]γῆν [g]και-

t pres. part., = Matt. xxvii. 63. John xxi. 23. Gal. iii. 8. u Matt. viii. 27. Mark xiii. 1 bis. Luke i. 29. vii. 39. 1 John iii. 1 only †. v James ii. 15 reff. w 1 Pet. i. 15 reff. plur. here only. see 1 Pet. ii. 1. x ch. i. 3 reff. plur., as above (w). y see Matt. xxiv. 50. Luke xii. 46. (Acts xxvii. 33. Lam. ii. 16.) z vv. 13, 14. elsw. (see above, y) Gospp. & Acts only. a transit., here (Luke ii. 16. xix. 5, 6. Acts xx. 16. xxii. 18) only. Isa. xvi. 5. Hom. Il. ν 236. b = 2 Cor. vii. 6. Phil. i. 26. ii. 12. James v. 7, 8 reff. c here only. d 1 Cor. vii. 9. 2 Cor. xi. 29. Eph. vi. 16. Rev. i. 15. iii. 18 only. Prov. x. 20. e ver. 10 (reff.). f here only. Isa. lxiv. 1, 2 al. Isa. xxxiv 4. g Isa. lxv. 17. lxvi. 22. Rev. xxi. 1.

P. δειν P.] for *υμας*, *ημας* ℵ[1] : om B : *υμας* bef *υπαρχειν* d.
12. [ins *τους* bef *προσδ.* P m.] om *και σπευδοντας* ℵ[1]. for *θεου*, *κυριου* C[P] d 27-9 vulg(not fuld) spec [Pelag$_1$]. for *τηκεται*, *τακησεται* C 36. 137: *tabescent* vulg [syrr] lat-ff [*τακησονται* P Thl].
13. *καινην* bef *γην* Aℵ 13 vulg æth[(Tischdf) Cyr-p$_6$ Thl] Cosm.

λυομένων, the *present* implying destiny, as *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, He that should come: cf. Winer, § 40. 2. *a*. It *might* be, with *οὖν*, a present *proper*, "are in course of dissolution;" but *οὕτως* forbids this: for they *are not* in course of dissolution by fire (*ῥοιζηδὸν* &c.), **what manner of men** (if we take **ποταποὺς** interrogatively, we must not, as some (Pott, Meyer in his translation), put our interrogation at *ὑμᾶς*, or as others (Griesb., al.) at *εὐσεβείαις*: far better carry on the question to the end of ver. 12, as more like the fervent style of our Epistle. But (reff.) *ποταπός* seems in the N. T. never directly to ask a question, but always to belong to an exclamation. Certainly reff. Luke are close approaches to the interrogatory sense, so that I would not, as Huther, altogether exclude it, but only protest against dividing the sentence. Still I prefer the non-interrogatory form, as in the other reff. On the word, see note, 1 John iii. 1) **ought ye to be** (when the event comes: **ὑπάρχειν** seems to imply some fact supervening upon the previously existing state: see Acts xvi. 20, 21, 37 and notes) **in holy behaviours and pieties** (the plurals mark the holy behaviour and piety in all its different forms and examples. The words *may* be referred to *ὑπάρχειν*: but thus the strong *ποταποὺς* would only be weakened, and it stands far better alone. So that I would join *ἐν ἁγίαις κ.τ.λ.* with what follows) **12.**] **looking for and hastening** (the older Commentators mostly supplied *εἰς* after **σπεύδοντας**. So E. V., "*hasting unto:*" but there seems no reason for this. Two meanings are possible, regarding the accus. as in direct government by the participle: 1. '*busied about:*' so in reff.; also Pind. Isthm. v. 22, *σπεύδειν ἀρετάν*. But in each of these, the object of *σπεύδειν* seems more properly to belong to the action than here. In Isa., and in Pind., it is an abstract substantive: in Hom., it is *ταῦτα*, matters within the power and personal employment of the speakers. And so in the numerous other examples in Palm and Rost. Whereas the *παρουσία κ.τ.λ.*, a future thing, no matter of human practice, does not appear with equal propriety to be in this sense an object of *σπεύδειν*. 2. We have the other and cognate meaning of *σπεύδειν* transitive, to "*hasten,*" "*urge on:*" which I agree with De Wette in adopting, and in understanding as he does, "They hasten it by perfecting, in repentance and holiness, the work of the Gospel, and thus diminishing the need of the *μακροθυμία* ver. 9," to which the delay of that day is owing. Huther's objection to this is not difficult to answer. It is true, that the delay or hastening of that day is not man's matter, but God's: but it is not uncommon in Scripture to attribute to *us* those divine acts, or abstinences from acting, which are really and in their depth, God's own. Thus we read, that "He could not do many mighty works there because of their unbelief," Matt. xiii. 58 compared with Mark vi. 5, 6: thus repeatedly of man's striving with, hindering, quenching, God's Holy Spirit) **the advent** (**παρουσία** elsewhere commonly used of a person, and most usually of the presence or advent of the Lord Himself) **of the day of God** (= *ἡμέρας κυρίου* above. De W. compares Clem.-rom. Ep. ii. ad Cor. 12, p. 345, *οὐκ οἴδαμεν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ*. See also Tit. ii. 13), **by reason of which** (*δι' ἥν*, scil. *ἡμέραν*; or, but not so well, *παρουσίαν*, on account of, for the sake of, which) **the heavens being on fire** (the pres. part. gives the reason of the fut. verb following) **shall be dissolved, and the heavenly bodies being scorched up are to be melted** (**τήκεται**, the pres. of destiny: see above on *λυομένων*, ver. 11. De Wette thinks the meaning is not to be literally pressed, as if the *στοιχεῖα* were a solid mass which would actually liquefy: but why not? The same liquefaction has actually taken

νὴν κατὰ τὸ [h] ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ [i] προςδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη [j] κατοικεῖ. [14] διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα [i] προςδοκῶντες [k] σπουδάσατε [l] ἄσπιλοι καὶ [m] ἀμώμητοι [n] αὐτῷ [o] εὑρεθῆναι [p] ἐν εἰρήνῃ, [15] καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [q] μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν [r] ἡγεῖσθε, καθὼς καὶ ὁ [s] ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν [s] ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν [t] δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγρα-

ABCK P ℵ a b c d f g h k l m o 13

h ch. i. 4 only †. Demosth. 397. 3. i ver. 12. j = Eph. iii. 17. Isa. xxxii. 16. k ch. i. 10 reff. l 1 Tim. vi. 14. James i. 27. 1 Pet. i. 19 only. Job xv. 15 Symm. m here (Phil. ii. 15 v. r.) only †. (-μος, Jude 24.) n dat., Luke xxiv. 35. 2 Cor. xii. 20. o = 2 Cor. v. 3. Phil. iii. 9. p = Acts xvi. 36. James ii. 16. q 1 Pet. iii. 20 reff. r = ver. 9. s so Eph. vi. 21. Col. iv. 7, 9. see James i. 16 reff. t Rom. xii. 3, 6. xv. 15 al.

for κατα το επαγγελμα, και τα επαγγελματα A am(with demid fuld harl) sah [Cyr-p₂] Jer₁ Bede₁: κατα τα επαγγελματα ℵ [vulg copt Cyr-ed₁ Did₁ Aug₂ Promiss.] ενοικει A a 13. 14. αμωμοι A d 13 Phot₁.

15. [om 1st ημων P syr-pk arm Damasc₁.] for ηγεισθε, αγεισθαι ℵ[1]. [2nd ημ. bef αδελφος K a o.] rec αυτω bef δοθεισαν, with L rel Œc: txt ABCK [P]ℵ a b d m o 13. 36 vulg syrr coptt Phot Thl. In ℵ the σ of δοθεισαν is written over the line.

place in the crust of the earth wherever the central fires have acted on it. All our igneous rocks have been in a liquid state: why should not that day, in its purifying process, produce a similar effect on the earth again, and on her cognate planets, if they are to be included?

In this recapitulation, the Apostle mentions that part only of the destruction of that day which concerns the *heavens*: arguing à majori. The similarity to Isa. xxxiv. 4 can hardly escape notice, καὶ τακήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν. See also Micah i. 4). 13.] *The positive result of that day, as regards the church.* **But** (contrast to the destructive effects of the day lately dwelt on: not "*nevertheless*" as E. V., which looks as if the two effects were in antagonism, and the earth were to be *annihilated*, of which idea there is no trace. The flood did not annihilate the earth, but changed it; and as the new earth was the consequence of the flood, so the final new heavens and earth shall be of the fire) **according to His** (God's) **promise** (viz., that written in ref. Isa.) **we** (no stress, as is almost unavoidable in the E. V. "*Nevertheless we, according to his promise:*" there is no ἡμεῖς, nor is the distinction drawn between us and any other class of persons) **expect new heavens and a new earth, in which** (heavens and earth, plur.) **righteousness dwelleth** (ref. Isa., cf. also οὐκ ἀδικήσουσιν, . . . ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ μου, λέγει κύριος, of Isa. lxv. 25). 14.] *Exhortation founded on this expectation.* **Wherefore, beloved, expecting** (as ye do) **these things** (the pres. part. gives the reason of the verb following: and does not, as Huther and Dietlein, belong to the exhortation, προσδοκῶντες σπουδάσατε: for the Apostle has just assumed προσδοκῶμεν as a patent fact), **be earnest** (σπουδάσατε, aor.: not the daily habit so much, as the one great life-effort which shall accomplish the end, is in the Apostle's mind) **to be found** (at His coming. This word shews plainly enough that a personal coming of the Lord, as in ver. 4, is in the view of the Apostle throughout, as connected with the proceedings of the great Day. The form of expression reminds us forcibly of Matt. xxii. 11 ff.) **spotless** (reff.) **and blameless** (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 3, viii. 20; also σπίλοι κ. μῶμοι, the contrast, above, ch. ii. 13. From the connexion there with a feast, it seems very probable that in both passages the parable of the wedding garment was floating before the Apostle's mind) **in His sight** (so, and not, "*by Him*," or "*of Him*," as E. V., must we render: see reff.) **in peace** (second predicate after εὑρεθῆναι: the ἄσπιλοι κ. ἀμώμοι were with reference to God (αὐτῷ); this, in reference to your own state and lot: in peace *among* yourselves, in peace *with* yourselves, in peace *for* yourselves, with God. But perhaps an expression so familiar to the Eastern tongue as ἐν εἰρήνῃ, may have an onward as well as a present meaning, as in πορεύεσθαι ἐν εἰρήνῃ and εἰς εἰρήνην (reff. and Luke vii. 50, viii. 48): and be taken of that eternal peace, of which all earthly peace is but a feeble foretaste):

15.] **and account the long-suffering of our Lord** (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, thus expressed, is hardly to be dissevered from Him who is expressly thus named below, ver. 18. And if so, then, throughout this weighty passage, the Lord Jesus is invested with the full attributes of Deity. It is He who waits and is long-suffering: He, in His union and co-equality with the Father, who ruleth all things after the counsel of His own will) **salvation** (contrast to βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται, ver. 9): **even as also** (besides myself) **our beloved brother** (this term is probably used in a closer sense than as merely signifying fellow-Christian: our beloved fellow-Apostle) **Paul according to the wisdom given to him** (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 10, κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων κ.τ.λ. Also Gal. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 2, 7, 8; Col. i. 25)

ψεν ὑμῖν, [16] ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, ἐν αἷς ἐστιν [u] δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ [v] ἀμαθεῖς καὶ [w] ἀστήρικτοι [x] στρεβλοῦσιν, ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς [y] γραφάς, πρὸς τὴν [z] ἰδίαν [z] αὐτῶν [a] ἀπώλειαν.

u here only †. v here only †. Ps. xlviii. 11 Symm. w ch. ii. 14 only †. x here only. 2 Kings xxii. 27 B only. y = ch. i. 20 al. z so John x. 12. Acts i. 19. ii. 8. Demosth. 1244. 24. a = ver. 7 reff.

16. rec aft πασαις ins ταις, with KL[P]ℵ rel Phot Thl Œc: om ABC 13. αυτοις A 1 9. 21. 47. rec (for αις) οις, with CKL[P] rel Phot, Œc: txt ABℵ a d j m 13 syrr Thl. for εστ., εισιν A c d h l 13 sah. [στρεβλωσουσιν C¹P d: στρεβλωσιν C².]

wrote to you (What? Where? to whom? By some the reply to the first has been found in the preceding clause, τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε: which, in sense, is almost identical with Rom. ii. 4, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει. So Œc., Grot., al., and more recently Huther, Dietlein. But surely the reference is too narrow to satisfy what follows here, λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, where the reference must be to ταῦτα, which we Christians προσδοκῶμεν, viz. to the coming of the day of the Lord. Thus then we should interpret the καθὼς καί &c. of some particular passage in which St. Paul had exhorted to readiness in expectation of that day, and the ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις κ.τ.λ., ver. 16, of the frequent mention of that day in his other Epistles. In searching then, 2. for some passages which may fulfil the above condition, it seems to me that we need not go beyond the earliest Epistle of St. Paul, viz. 1 Thessalonians. There, in ch. iv. 13—v. 11, we have a passage on this very point, and the more satisfactory, because St. Peter seems, in our ver. 10, to have had 1 Thess. v. 2 before his mind. And as to, 3. ὑμῖν, there seems no need to press it as identifying any particular church, seeing that this our Epistle is addressed to all Christians alike: cf. ch. i. 1. All that follows from ὑμῖν is what may also be gathered from ver. 16, that our Epistle belongs to a date when the Pauline Epistles were no longer the property only of the churches to which they were written, but were dispersed through, and considered to belong to, the whole Christian Church. What date that is, I have discussed in the Prolegomena. There have been very various opinions as to the passage and Epistle meant: Estius, Calov., Spanheim, Bengel, Gerhard, al., think it to be the Epistle to the Hebrews, on account of ch. ix. 26 ff., x. 25, 37 (see on these in the Prolegg. to the Hebrews, § i. par. 6): Jachmann, the Epistles to the Corinthians, especially 1 Cor. i. 7—9, finding an allusion to 1 Cor. ii. 1 ff. in κατὰ σοφίαν κ.τ.λ.: Benson, the Epistles to the Gal., Eph., Col., being addressed to Asia Minor churches, as he holds this to be: Augusti, referring ἐν εἰρήνῃ to the difference between Paul and Peter, the Epistle to the Gal.: Pott, and Morus, some Epistle which has not come down to us), **16.] as also in all** (*his*, but not expressed: with the ταῖς it would mean, in all his Epistles *as a finished whole:* without it, in *all Epistles which he writes*, leaving room for the possibility that the number of those Epistles was not complete, but still being added to) **Epistles, speaking in them** (as he does: the pres. part. contains the justification of the assertion: not as Huther, "when he speaks") **of these things** (viz. the coming of our Lord, and the end of the world), **in which** (Epistles, if **αἷς** be read: if **οἷς**, "*in which sayings of his:*" not, "in which things," "in which subjects," as some (e. g. Bengel) have rendered by way of escape from the supposed difficulty: for οἷς is correlative with τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς, and must therefore designate some writings previously mentioned: or else the sentence is stultified) **are some things difficult to understand** (De W. especially refers to 2 Thess. ii. 1 ff.: and it is not improbable that this may have been particularly in the Apostle's mind. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 18. Grot. is clearly wrong in extending the list to difficulties about faith and works, &c.), **which the ignorant** (unintelligent, uninformed: hardly, as De W., with an understood meaning of rebellion and unbelief: for that would be too much here. ἀμαθία may arise from many causes: but the misunderstanding of difficult Scriptures is common to the ἀμαθεῖς in general) **and unstable** (ref.: those who, wanting firm foundation and anchorage, waver and drift about with every wind of doctrine. Such persons are stirred from their Christian stability by every apparent difficulty: are rendered anxious and perplexed by hard texts: and shewing more anxiety to interpret them somehow, than to wait upon God for their solution, rush upon erroneous and dangerous ways of interpretation) **distort** (στρεβλόω, properly, to twist with a handscrew or windlass, στρέβλη: σκάφος στρέβλαισι ναυτικαῖς προσηγμένον, Æsch. Suppl. 441. Hence to torment with the στρέβλη: and then met., to distort, pervert, strain, in meaning. Œc. gives for it ἐνδιαστρόφως ἐξαγγέλ-

17 ὑμεῖς οὖν [b] ἀγαπητοί, [c] προγινώσκοντες [d] φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῇ τῶν [e] ἀθέσμων [f] πλάνῃ [g] συναπαχθέντες [h] ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου [i] στηριγμοῦ, 18 [k] αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν [l] χάριτι καὶ [m] γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ [n] σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. [o] αὐτῷ ἡ [o] δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς [p] ἡμέραν [p] αἰῶνος. [ἀμήν.]

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Β.

b vv. 1, 14. c Acts xxvi. 5. Rom. viii. 29. xi. 2. 1 Pet. i. 20 only †. Wisd. vi. 13. viii. 3. xviii. 6 only. d constr., here only. see Job xxxvi. 21. Sir. xxii. 13. elsw. w. ἀπό, as Luke xii. 15, or acc. as Acts xxi. 25 al. e ch. ii. 7 (reff.) only. f ch. ii. 18 reff. g Rom. xii. 16. Gal. ii. 13 only. Exod. xiv. 6 only. h = Gal. v. 4. (James i. 11 reff.) i here only †. Isa. iii. 1 Symm. Diodor. Sic i. 81. (-ίζειν, ch. i. 12.) k intransit., Matt. vi. 28. Eph. iv. 15 al.‡ l = 1 Pet. v. 10. Jude 4. m = Phil. iii. 8. n ch. i. 1 reff. o Rom. xv. 36. Eph. iii. 21. Rev. i. 6. p here only. see Isa. xviii. 7. (Micah iv. 7.)

17. προγινωσκοντες bef αγαπητοι C: om αγαπητοι a. προγιγν. A: γινωσκοντες m. 18. αυξανεσθε C[P] 15. 40. [om δε P a. for γνωσει, πιστει P m.] om αμην B o 10 harl[1] Aug Bede$_1$.

Subscription. om a b c d f g l m o: επιστολαι πετρου α' και β' 13: του αγιου αποστολου πετρου επιστολη δευτερα L: [πετρου . . . . επ. καθολικη β' P:] επιστολη πετρου β' n: πετρου καθολικη C: txt ABℵ.

λειν), **as also the other Scriptures** (or, passages of Scripture having reference to this great subject: as we have ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει John xix. 37, πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος (see note) 2 Tim. iii. 16. Whichever be understood, it is plain, 1. that by these words St. Paul's Epistles are reckoned among the Christian scriptures: 2. that there were at this time besides those Epistles, other writings holding a similar place, known as γραφαί; probably, at least, the three Gospels (and Acts?), and some of the earlier written catholic Epistles. That by **τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς** should be meant the O. T. scriptures, is not probable: these would have been more fully designated than by being placed in the same category with the inspired writings of recent or living men), **to** (as a contribution to—towards,—so as to help towards) **their own perdition** (**τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν**, more strongly reflective than with one of these merely). 17, 18.] *Concluding exhortations:* conveyed first in the form of a caution (ver. 17), then in that of a positive exhortation to increase in grace and wisdom. 17.] **Ye therefore, beloved, knowing** (as ye do) **beforehand** (viz. the whole announcement of which this chapter has been full; the certainty that such false teachers will arise, and the course which they will take), **take heed** (be on your guard) **lest** (**ἵνα μή** aft. φυλάσσομαι, here only. In Xen. Mem. i. 2. 37, we have, in Charicles's famous answer to Socrates, φυλάττου ὅπως μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐλάττους τοὺς βοῦς ποιήσῃς) **being led away together with** (it is a remarkable coincidence, that St. Peter, well acquainted as he was with St. Paul's writings, should have written this word, which is the very one used by that Apostle (ref. Gal.) of Barnabas, at Antioch, when he συναπήχθη with the hypocrisy of Peter and the other Jews) **the error** (not, *the deceit*, act., deceiving others: but the aberration, wandering out of the right way, so as to follow it and become partakers with it) **of the lawless** (reff.) **ye fall from** (reff.: aor., because the fall would be one and decisive) **your own steadfastness** (contrast to ἀστήρικτοι above: see note there): 18.] **but** (contrast to the fall just predicated as possible) **grow** (not only do not ἐκπέσητε τοῦ στηριγμοῦ, but be so firmly rooted as to throw out branches and yield increase. "Hæc unica est perseverandi ratio, si assidue progredimur." Calv.) **in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ** (the gen., τοῦ κυρ. κ.τ.λ., belongs to both χάριτι and γνώσει, as is sufficiently shewn by the preposition extending over both. The common rendering, "*in grace and in the knowledge of . . .*" would more naturally be ἐν χάριτι καὶ ἐν γνώσει. Taken as above, the genitive stands in somewhat different relation to the two datives. As regards χάριτι, it is a subjective gen.,—the grace of which Christ is the author and bestower; of which it is said, ἡ χάρις διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἐγένετο: as regards γνῶσις, it is an objective genitive,—the knowledge of which Christ is the object).

Concluding doxology: "hymnus Christo quasi Deo," as Pliny's letter. **To Him** [**be**, or **is**] **the glory** (*the* glory—i. e. all glory that is rendered: the sum total of glory) **both now and to the day of eternity** (**ἡμέρα αἰῶνος**, the day which shall dawn at the end of time, and being eternal, itself know no end: "tota æternitas una dies est," as Estius. Bengel takes it to mean "dies sine nocte, merus et perpetuus:" and so Calov.: but this idea does not seem so congruous here, as that of mere duration. Grot., Beza take ἡμέρα for *time*. But considering how frequent ἡμέρα has been in this chapter, we have no right to seek for an unusual meaning, when the common one suits so well). [**Amen** (cf. Jude 25).]

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Α.

ABCKL P א a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

I. 1 ῞Ο [a] ἦν [b] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς

a John i. 1. Rev. i. 4 reff.
b = 2 Thess. ii. 13. ch. ii. 13, 14 (iii. 8. John viii. 44). Hab. i. 12.

TITLE. Steph *επιστολη ιωαννου καθολικη πρωτη*: elz *ιωαννου του αποστολου επιστολη καθολικη πρωτη*, with rel: *βροντης υιος ιωαννης ταδε χριστιανοισιν* f: *ιω. του αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου επιστολη α'* n: [*ιω. τ. ευαγ. κ. αποσ*(*τολου επ.*) *α* P:] *ιωαννου επιστολη α' ευαγγελικη θεολογια περι χῦ* 13: *επιστολη καθολικη του αγιου αποστολου ιωαννου* L: *ιωαννου επιστολη πρωτη* Kא(*α'*) j l m o: *καθ. α' επ. ιω.* h: *επ. ιω. πρ.* k: the title has perished in C: txt AB.

CHAP. I. 1. [*εορακαμεν* B[1] (so vv 2, 3, and A ver 1).] Tischendorf [ed 7] edits *εορακαμεν*, but, apparently, on insufficient grounds. The following is a statement of the evidence. The tense occurs six times in this epistle and once in 3 Jn, in all of these B[1] has *εορ.*, in addition to this B[1] has *εορ.* in Jn ix. 37; xx. 25; 1 Cor ix. 1; and Col ii. 18; A has *εορ.* once (or perhaps twice); C, twice (Lu ix. 36; Col ii. 1); D, once (Acts vii. 44); and א thrice (1 Cor ix. 1; Col ii. 1, 18). On the other hand the word occurs in 23 other passages, in all of which B has *εωρ.* (so Vercellone, nemine contradicente [except Tischdf who (Nov. Test. Vat.) assigns *εορ.* to B[1] in Lu i. 22; Jn i. 18; vi. 46 bis; viii. 57; xx. 25]: he seems to have paid especial attention to this point in preparing the 2nd edition [in ed 8 Tischdf has *εωρ.*].)

CHAP. I. 1—4.] INTRODUCTION: THE PERSONAL AUTHORITY OF THE WRITER, AND OBJECTS OF THE EPISTLE. This Epistle does not begin with an *address*, properly so called. But there is in this sentence the latent form of an address: the ὑμῖν of ver. 3, and the ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ . . . . πεπληρωμένη, answering to the more usual χαίρειν, seem to shew that what follows is an Epistle, not a treatise. The construction of these verses is difficult, and has been variously given. The simplest view, and that generally adopted (Syr., Vulg., Œc., Bullinger, Calv., Beza, Socinus, Grot., Calov., Fritzsche, Lücke, De Wette, Huther, &c.) is, that in ver. 1 a sentence is begun, which is broken off by the parenthetical ver. 2 inserted to explain ver. 1, and carried on again in ver. 3, some words being, for the sake of perspicuity, recited again from ver. 1. This construction was doubted by Winer in the earlier editions of his Grammar, but has now in the 6th edit. been adopted (§ 63, i. 1, note). The smaller clauses, ὃ ἦν, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, &c., are co-ordinate with each other, not to be arranged as subject and predicate, as Capellus, "quod erat ab initio, hoc ipsum est, quod audivimus, &c." or, as Paulus, who begins his predicatory apodosis at καὶ αἱ χεῖρες, "*that which, &c., &c., our hands also have handled.*" So that there is no need to adopt Calvin's solution of "abrupta et confusa oratio:" the sentence and construction flow smoothly and regularly.

That which was (not '*took place,*' as Crell., Schöttg., al. ἦν is not = ἐγένετο, as their very marked distinction in John i. 1 ff. might have shewn. See this idea discussed and refuted in a note to the dissertation de Epistt. Johannearum locis difficilioribus, in the Fritzschiorum Opuscula, p. 284 ff.: and in Düsterdieck's Comm. in loc. Œc. and Thl. say well, τὸ δὲ ἦν τοῦτο οὐ χρονικὴν παρίστησιν ὕπαρξιν, ἀλλ' ἐνυποστάτου πράγματος οὐσίαν) **from the beginning** (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is not synonymous with ἐν ἀρχῇ, though in the depth of its meaning it is virtually the same. It sets before us the terminus a quo, but without meaning strictly to define it as such exclusively. So μέχρι, ἄχρι, and words of this kind are not unfrequently

ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν [c] ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ [d] λόγου τῆς [d] ζωῆς [2] (καὶ ἡ [e] ζωὴ

c Luke xxiv. 39. Acts xvii. 27. Heb. xii. 18 only. Gen. xxvii. 12.
d Phil. ii. 16 only. see Acts v. 20. John vi. 68.
e = John i. 4.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

used: see Fritzsche on Matt. p. 53 f.: and cf. Acts xx. 6, Rom. viii. 22, 2 Cor. iii. 14. The interpretation, "*Since the beginning of the Gospel*," is connected with the misunderstanding of the whole passage by the Socinian interpreters, and cannot stand for a moment when we consider the context with ver. 2, and the use of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς by St. John when applied to Christ or to supernatural beings: see reff. Wherever he uses it of the preaching of the Gospel, it is definitely marked as bearing that meaning: cf. ch. ii. 7, 24, iii. 11. On the meaning of this clause, see below), **that which we have heard** (the perfect extends the reference of the verb from the beginning, and that which the Apostle might have heard concerning Christ, e. g. from John the Baptist, down to the time when he was writing; regards his hearing as a finished and abiding possession. This verb, **ἀκηκόαμεν**, rules the form of the sentence: hence περί below: see more there), **that which we have seen with our eyes** (the same is true again. The seeing as well as the hearing is a finished and abiding possession. The clauses rise in climax: seeing is more than hearing: **τοῖς ὀφθ. ἡμῶν** emphasizes the fact of eye-witness), **that which we looked upon** (now, the tense is altered: because the Evangelist comes from speaking of the closed testimony which abode with him as a whole, to that of the senses actually exercised at the time when Christ was on earth. Notice the climax again: θεᾶσθαι, 'intueri,' to look upon: ὁρᾶν, merely 'videre,' to see: so Beza here: "quod ego his oculis vidi, idque non semel nec obiter, sed quod ego vere et penitus sum contemplatus." See more below), **and our hands handled** ("attulerunt viri docti Joh. xx. 20, 27: Luc. xxiv. 39. Sed nihil hujusmodi opus est. An probandum, Johannem, amatissimum et ἐπιστήθιον Christi discipulum, Dominum suum manibus contrectasse?" Fritzsche, Opusc. p. 295. These words are not for a moment to be washed out with a 'veluti' or 'quasi:' they are literal matter of fact, and form one of the strongest proofs that what is said, is said of no other than the personal incarnate Son of God) **concerning the Word of life** (the *construction* seems to be this: the περί depends strictly upon ἀκηκόαμεν, loosely upon the other clauses. The *exegesis* turns wholly upon the sense which we assign to the words **τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς**: and here there has been great diversity among Commentators. This diversity may be gathered under two heads: those who make λόγου the personal hypostatic Logos, who is ζωή, and those who make it the account, or preaching, or doctrine, concerning ζωή. Of this *latter* number, are for the most part, Socinus and his school (see an exception below), and some few other expositors, e.g., Grotius, Semler, Rosenmüller. Of recent writers, the most distinguished is De Wette. The *former*, including Œc., Thl., Aug. ("forte de verbo vitæ sic quisque accipiat quasi locutionem quandam de Christo, non ipsum corpus Christi quod manibus tractatum est. Videte quid sequatur: *et ipsa vita manifestata est.* Christus ergo verbum vitæ." In Ep. Joh. Tract. i. 1, vol. iii. p. 1978), Bede, Calvin (gives both), Beza, Luther, Schlichting ("id est de Jesu quem suo more Sermonem appellat"), Episcopius (who however strikes a middle course, "utrumque simul intelligi, Evangelium, quatenus partim ab ipso Christo revelatum est, partim de ipso Chr. J. agit"), Calov., Bengel, Wolf, Lücke, Fritzsche, Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Huther, al., have been most worthily represented among modern Commentators by O. F. Fritzsche, in his Commentatio I. de Epistolarum Johannearum locis difficilioribus, in the Fritzschiorum Opuscula, pp. 276 ff. And with his interpretation, *in the main*, I agree, diverging from him in some points of more or less importance. And as this **περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς** is the keystone of the sentence, it will be well to set out the interpretation once for all. I regard then ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς as the designation of our Lord Himself. He is the λόγος, and is the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, this gen. being one of apposition, as He describes Himself as being the ζωή, John xi. 25, xiv. 6,—the ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, vi. 35, 48: the φῶς τῆς ζωῆς, viii. 12: cf. also i. 4. This being so, the ὃ —, ὃ —, ὃ —, ὃ —, are all matters concerning, belonging to, regarding, Himself, the Lord of Life: all zeugmatically predicated of Him by the περί, which more properly belongs to the one verb ἀκηκόαμεν (notice that in ver. 5, where the nature of the ἀγγελία is stated, ἀκηκόαμεν alone, of all these verbs, is repeated). The **ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς** is His eternal præ-existence and inherent Life and Glory with the Father: this is what, in a sense slightly, though but slightly differing from the common one, may be said to have been ἀπ' ἀρχῆς περὶ τοῦ

[f] ἐφανερώθη, καὶ ἑωράκαμεν, καὶ [g] μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ [h] ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, [i] ἥτις ἦν [j] πρὸς

f = John i. 31 al[6]. ch. ii. 19 al[6]. Heb. ix. 26 al. (Jer. xl. [xxxiii.] 6 only.) g = John i. 7, 15 & passim. Acts xxiii. 11. 1 Tim. vi. 13. h John, iv. 51, and here bis only. (Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 25. 1 Thess. i. 9 only. Heb. ii. 12. Gospp. Acts and LXX passim.) i = Heb. viii. 6. Rev. i. 12. xi. 8. xii. 13. xix. 2. j = John, i. 1. Mark ii. 3 ‖ Mt. ix. 19 ‖ L. 2 Thess. ii. 5. (see 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 7. Gal. i. 18. iv. 18.)

2. ins ο bef εωρακαμεν B 40. [om την ζωην K (at end of page).]

λόγου τῆς ζωῆς: that which was inherent indeed in Him, but by being announced to you, takes the form of being περί Him; His well-known character and attribute. The ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμ. ἡμῶν, hold a middle place between the eternal and præ-existent and the cosmical and human things περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς: the hearing of the ear embracing all the teaching of the Lord respecting ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, and the seeing of the eye taking in both His glory, as on the Mount of Transfiguration, and the human Body which He assumed, with all its actions and sufferings: cf. John xix. 35. Then, still lingering on the combined testimony to his præ-existent glory and His human presence in the flesh, he adds, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα, which 'contemplari,' as he himself tells us, saw through the human into the divine, John i. 14 (so Bede: "perspexerunt, cujus divinam quoque virtutem spiritalibus oculis cernebant"), besides its earnest and diligent observation of His human life ('mit allem Fleiß und genau beschauet und betrachtet,' Luther. But when Œc. and Thl. say θεᾶσθαι ἐστὶ τὸ μετὰ θαύματος κ. θάμβους ὁρᾶν, it is more than is in the word or in the context). Finally, he comes down to that which though the most direct and palpable proof for human testimony, is yet the lowest, as being only material and sensuous, the (ὃ) αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν. All this concerning Him, who is ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, as recapitulated again in ver. 3 under its two great heads, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν κ. ἀκηκόαμεν, we ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ ὑμῖν. I would refer the reader who wishes to see the various other interpretations discussed, to the dissertation of Fritzsche before named: to Huther's Commentary: to Brückner's ed. of De Wette's Handbuch, where the other view from that taken here is ably defended: and to the Commentary of Düsterdieck, who has gone at great length into the history of the exegesis. Lücke, in loc., has very fairly stated, and refuted, the Socinian view which makes ὃ to be the teaching of Jesus from the beginning of His official life onwards, and (cf. Socinus in loc.) ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, as in ch. ii. 7, ὁ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε: rightly stating the fatal and crucial obstacle to this view to consist in αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, which none of its advocates can in any way get over: from Œc. and Thl. who interpret it μετὰ πολλὴν ψηλάφησιν (τουτέστι συζήτησιν, adds Œc.) ἐρευνῶντες τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρούσας γραφάς, to Grot., who supplies "panes multiplicatos, Lazarum," &c., and De Wette, who explains it to mean "die Bestätigung des Geschehenen zur vollen Realität mit demjenigen Sinne, welcher keine Täuschung zuläßt," evading the direct application of the words to the human body of Jesus). **And the life** (i. e. the Lord Himself who is the Life,—ἡ αὐτοζωή, ἡ πηγάζουσα τὸ ζῆν, as Matthai's Catena: cf. John i. 4, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. This verse is parenthetical, taking up the last clause, and indeed the whole sense, of ver. 1, and shewing how the testimony there predicated became possible) **was manifested** (from being invisible, became visible: see reff.), **and we have seen (it), and bear witness (of it), and declare** (the verb ἀπαγγέλλομεν does not, either here or below, refer to the declaration in this present Epistle: it is the general declaration, in word and writing, of which the γράφομεν below, ver. 4, is the special portion at present employed) **to you that life which is eternal** (it is better thus, with Fritzsche, to supply an object for ἑωράκαμεν and μαρτυροῦμεν from ἡ ζωή above, than, with Lücke, to carry on the sense from them to τὴν ζωὴν τ. αἰώνιον below: for if this latter be done, 1) the sentence drags, by the verbal portion of its last clause being overdone; 2) the middle term between the manifestation and the announcement, viz. the sight and testimony of the announcer, would be wanting: 3) it is not the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, but the ζωή in Christ, which the Evangelist saw and of which he witnessed, and the predicative epithet ἡ αἰώνιος first comes in with the verb ἀπαγγέλλομεν), **the which** (ἥτις identifies not the individual only, but the species also: and thus gives a sort of causal force, 'quippe quæ.' The force of this here, as Düsterdieck remarks, is to refer the ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα back to the ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς: q. d. "that very before-mentioned life, which was with the Father") **was with the Father** (see on John i. 1. The prep. implies not juxtaposition only, but relation: hardly

k τὸν k πατέρα, καὶ f ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν) 3 ὃ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, h ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ ὑμῖν, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς l κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν. m καὶ ἡ l κοινωνία m δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ k τοῦ k πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

k — (absol.), John passim. elsw., Matt. xi. 27 bis ‖ L. xxiv. 36 ‖ Mk. xxviii. 19. Luke ix. 26. Acts i. 4, 7. ii. 33. Rom. vi. 4. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Eph. ii. 18. Col. i. 12. l constr., w. μετά, vv. 6, 7 only. (Acts ii. 42. 1 Cor. i. 9 al. fr. Lev. vi. 2. Wisd. viii. 18 only.) see Job xxxiv. 8. m John vi. 51. viii. 16, 17. xv. 27. Acts iii. 24. Heb. ix. 21 al. 2 Macc. v. 15 Edd.-vat.-Ald. (not AB).

3. rec om 2nd και, with KL rel [vulg-ed] (with demid tol) copt [Dion] Œc Aug$_1$ Bede: ins ABC[P]ℵ 13. 40 harl syr-w-ast æth arm Did Aug$_1$, so Syr sah but om και follg; και bef απαγ. k am Thl.—ℵ reads ακηκοαμεν και εωρακαμεν και απαγγελλομεν ῑ και υμιν (but ῑ erased by ℵ^1). om δε C^1[P] a^1 13 syr sah arm (Orig-int). aft ημετερα ins υμων ℵ^1(ℵ^3 disapproving).

however, as some here, *love*: at the same time it sets forth plainly the distinction of Persons: as Basil: ἵνα τὸ ἰδιάζον τῆς ὑποστάσεως παραστήσῃ . . . ἵνα μὴ πρόφασιν δῷ τῇ συγχύσει τῆς ὑποστάσεως), **and was manifested to us** (here the parenthesis ends, and the construction of ver. 1 is resumed. But on account of the distance at which that verse now stands, the leading particulars of its sense are recapitulated. Huther objects to the parenthetical view, that ὃ ἑωρ. κ. ἀκηκ. is not a full resumption, ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς not appearing in it. But it is included in the hearing, as the other sensuous clause in the seeing): **that which we have heard and seen, we declare to you also** (the καί of the old MSS. here seems to give to the Epistle the character of being addressed to some special circle of Christian readers, beyond those addressed at the conclusion of the Gospel, ch. xx. 31, or we may, with Socinus (in Huther), take the καί as indicating "vos, qui nimirum non audistis, nec vidistis, nec manibus vestris contrectastis verbum vitæ." But the other is more likely: a supposition which is confirmed when we look further into it: see the Prolegomena. It is quite beyond all probability that the καί should have been inserted to suit καὶ ὑμεῖς which follows, as De Wette imagines: far more probable that the very occurrence of those words so near made it seem superfluous, or even that it was erased to give the Epistle a more general character, as ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἐν Ῥώμῃ, at the opening of those Epistles), **in order that ye also** (see above) **may have communion with us** (not,—as Socinus ("non nos solum, sed vos etiam nobiscum eam communionem cum patre et filio habeatis"), Episcopius ("*τό nobiscum* nihil aliud sibi vult, quam 'sicut nos habemus'"), Bengel ("eandem, quam nos, qui vidimus"),—*the same communion which we have*, viz. that presently mentioned: but in the sense of κοιν. μετά immediately following, and in vv. 6, 7, communion *with us*, the Apostle and eye-witnesses (for thus I would take the ἡμεῖς throughout, and not, as Fritzsche, al., of the Evangelist himself only: "nobiscum, i. e. mecum"): τὸ γενέσθαι ἡμῶν κοινωνούς, as Schol. in Cramer's Catena; being bound in faith and love to them, as they were to Christ. ἔχειν must not be taken, with Corn.-a-lap., for "*pergere et in ea proficere et confirmari*," nor with Fritzsche, for "*to obtain*," "assequi," but in its simple meaning, *to have, to possess*. It may be very true, as Fr. insists, that here the Evangelist is speaking of his general work in the world, and below, ver. 4, the special object of writing this Epistle comes in: but even thus, the end proposed is simply that they might κοινωνίαν ἔχειν in the ordinary sense, of course by acquiring it; but this is not of necessity in the word ἔχειν): **and indeed** (see reff. for καὶ δέ. Here its use is to bring up something connected with what went before by καί, but contrasted with it by the δέ: the contrast here lying in the immeasurably more solemn and glorious character of the second κοινωνία, as compared with the first, which is the inlet to it: q. d. "and this κοινωνία μεθ' ἡμῶν will not stop here: for we are but your admitters into &c." See this same *coupled contrast* in reff.) **our communion is** ("pessime vulg. Grot., al. *sit*." Fritz. Even Augustine, Bede, Erasm. (paraphr., not in notes), Luth., Calv., take this: against which the δέ is decisive) **with the Father and with** (observe the repeated μετά, distinguishing the Personality, while the very fact of the κοινωνία with Both unites the Two in the Godhead. It is not, communion with God and us, but with us, whose communion is with God, the Father and the Son) **His Son Jesus Christ** (the personal and the Messianic Names are united, as in John i. 17, where He is first mentioned, as here. The question has been sometimes asked, why we have not here καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου? The answer to which is not, as Lücke, because the divine Personality of the Holy Ghost was not found in the apostolic mode of thought ("scheint mir nicht in der apostolischen

χριστοῦ. [4] καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ἡ [n] χαρὰ ἡμῶν ἦ [n] πεπληρωμένη. [5] καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ [o] ἀγγελία ἣν ἀκη-

n John iii. 29. xv. 11. xvi. 24. xvii. 13. 2 John 12. Phil. ii. 2. (Acts xiii. 52 al.)

o ch. iii. 11 only. Prov. xii. 25. xxvi. 16. (-λλειν, John xx. 18 only.)

4. rec (for ημεις) υμιν, with CKL rel vss Œc Thl Aug Bede: txt B[P]ℵ 13 harl[1] sah. (υμιν A. "υ, ι, et ν rescripta sunt a prima ut videtur manu. Olim ημεις" Woide.) elz υμων, with A(C)K[P] rel demid syr copt æth arm Aug Bede: txt BLℵ b f g h k l m n o (40?) am fuld harl tol (Syr) sah Œc-comm Thl-comm.—aft πεπλ. ins εν ημιν C[1]: εν υμιν Syr.

5. rec αυτη bef εστιν, with A rel syr-mg: txt BCKL[P]ℵ a c f g h k l m n 40 syr-txt Œc Thl. rec επαγγελια, with C[P] rel syr coptt: txt ABKLℵ[3] c d f g h j k l n 36 vulg Syr æth arm Did-comm Thl-comm Œc-comm.—ℵ[1] has α(γαπη της ε)παγγελιας, the portion in brackets being a correction above the line.

Denkweise zu liegen"), but because, the blessed Spirit being God dwelling in man, though we may be said to have τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, 2 Cor. xiii. 13,—we would hardly be said to have κοινωνίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος). **And these things** (i. e. this whole Epistle: not, as Sander, the foregoing, nor as De Wette (altern.), and Düst., the immediately following) **we write** (the reading ἡμεῖς finds no favour with most of the modern critical editors, as neither does ἡμῶν below. It is objected to the former, that thus an irrelevant emphasis will be introduced into the clause. But it has not been observed, that it is in St. John's manner thus to use ἡμεῖς with a verb, perhaps without any especial emphasis being conveyed: e.g. John viii. 48, οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς . . ., where as here the pron. follows the verb: ib. vi. 42, ix. 24, 29 (1 John iii. 14), al. Besides which, the ἡμεῖς is by no means otiose here, whether we read ὑμῶν or ἡμῶν below. If the former, the contrast would be plain: if the latter, we must take this ἡμεῖς to be the apostolic first person—"I, as one of the eye and ear witnesses:" and the ἡμῶν following in a wider sense, "our joy"—"the joy of us and you:"—or, it may be, our joy in accomplishing the end and bringing you into communion with us and through us with the Father and the Son: so Thl.: ἡμῶν γὰρ ὑμῖν κοινωνούντων πλεῖστον ἔχομεν τὴν χαρὰν ἡμῶν, ἣν τοῖς θερισταῖς ὁ χαίρων σπορεὺς ἐν τῇ τοῦ μισθοῦ ἀντιλήψει βραβεύσει χαιρόντων καὶ τούτων ὅτι τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν ἀπολαύουσι. Similarly Œc.: Schol. in catena, ἐπειδὰν δὲ ταύτην ἔχητε κοινωνίαν, χαρᾶς ἐσόμεθα μεστοί, ὅτι τῷ θεῷ ἐκολλήθημεν: Bede, "gaudium Doctorum sit plenum, cum multos prædicando ad sanctæ Ecclesiæ societatem, atque ad ejus per quem Ecclesia roboratur et crescit, Dei Patris et Filii ejus Jesu Christi, societatem perducunt:" referring to Phil. ii. 2, πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαράν, κ.τ.λ. As regards possibility of change of reading, it is far more probable that the not very obvious ἡμεῖς and ἡμῶν should have been altered to the very obvious ὑμῖν and ὑμῶν, so exactly correspondent to John xv. 11, xvi. 24), **that our** (see above) **joy may be full** (this rendering better represents the perfect than "*may be filled up*," which would indicate the process rather than the completion. The joy spoken of is the whole complex of the Christian life here and hereafter; its whole sum is, JOY. As Düsterdieck beautifully says, "The peace of reconciliation, the blessed consciousness of sonship, the happy growth in holiness, the bright prospect of future completion and glory,—all these are but simple details of that which in all its length and breadth is embraced by one word, Eternal Life, the real possession of which is the immediate source of our joy. We have joy, Christ's joy, because we are blessed, because we have Life itself in Christ." He quotes Augustine, Confess. x. 22 (32), vol. i. p. 793: "Est enim gaudium quod non datur impiis, sed eis tantum qui te gratis colunt, quorum gaudium tu ipse es. Et ipsa est beata vita gaudere ad te, de te, propter te, ipsa est et non altera." It has been noticed before, sub initio, that this verse fills the place of the χαίρειν so common in the opening of Epistles, and gives an epistolary character to what follows).

5—II. 28.] FIRST PART OF THE EPISTLE: the message, that, *if we would have communion with Him who is Light, we must walk in light, keeping His commandments.* See the discussion on the division of the Epistle, in the Prolegomena.

5.] In each of these divisions, the first verse contains the ground-tone of the whole. And so here—GOD IS LIGHT. **And** (καί is not a sequence on what goes before (*igitur*, Beza) any further than it refers back by the words ἀγγελία ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν to ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπαγγέλλομεν above. It serves to introduce the new subject) **the message** (De Wette supposes ἀγγελία to be a correction from the more difficult ἐπαγγελία. But as Düsterdieck has well argued, the great manuscript authority for ἀγγ., com-

p John iv. 25 al[5]. 2 Cor. vii. 7 al. Josh. iv. 10.
q - John i. 7. iii. 19. ch. ii. 8—10. (John only.) see James i. 17.
r John i. 5 al.

κόαμεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ [p] ἀναγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς [q] φῶς ἐστὶν καὶ [r] σκοτία [s] ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ [s] ἔστιν οὐδεμία. 6 ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι [t] κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν [t] μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ [u] σκότει [v] περιπατῶμεν, [w] ψευδόμεθα καὶ οὐ [x] ποιοῦμεν

ABCKL P א a b c d f g h k l m o 13

John only, exc. Matt. iv. 16. x. 27 ‖ L. Job xxviii. 3 only. see Rom. xiii. 12. Eph. v. 8, 11. 1 Thess. v. 4. s ver. 8. see Acts xiii. 15. t ver. 3. u John, here and John iii. 19 only. see (r) above. v John xi. 9, 10. xii. 35. Eph. v. 2. ch. ii. 11 al. 4 Kings xx. 3. (see Isa. ii. 6. ix. 2.) w - Rom. ix. 1. Rev. iii. 9 al. Prov. xiv. 5. x John iii. 21.

ουκ εστιν bef εν αυτω B m 13. 180 Syr coptt æth Clem $Orig_4$[and int_1 Cæs]: txt ACKL[P]א rel vulg syr arm $Orig_5$.
6. ins γαρ bef ειπωμεν A. ποιωμεν A.

bined with the fact that in ch. iii. 11 ἐπαγγ. is also read, and with this also, that ἐπαγγ. is a very common word in the N. T., whereas ἀγγ. occurs only in these two places, precludes De W.'s supposition. The correction from ἀγγ. to ἐπαγγ. was very obvious from ch. ii. 25, which also suggested transposing ἔστιν αὕτη to αὕτ. ἐστ.) **which we have heard from Him** (viz. from Christ), **and announce to you** ("quod filius annunciavit a patre, hoc apostolus acceptum a filio renunciat nobis." Erasm. Düsterd. remarks that St. John seems every where to observe the distinction between ἀν- and ἀπ-αγγέλλειν, to *announce* and to *declare*. And to this distinction ἀγγελία here exactly corresponds (as Bengel, "quæ in ore Christi fuit ἀγγελία, eam Apostoli ἀναγγέλλουσι: nam ἀγγελίαν ab ipso acceptam reddunt et propagant"); whereas ἐπαγγελία, which means in the N. T. nothing but "*promise*" (neither in 2 Tim. i. 1, nor in Acts xxiii. 21 has it any other sense; see note on the latter place), seems to carry no meaning here, and has, as above, evidently crept in from ch. ii. 25), **is this** (αὕτη predicate, as always in such sentences): **that God is light** (not, as Luther, "a light:" φῶς is purely predicative, indicating the essence of God: just as when it is said in ch. iv. 8, ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν. There it is true the predicative is purely ethical, and thus literal, when used of God who is a Spirit, whereas here, φῶς being a material, not an ethical object, some amount of figurative meaning must be conceded. But of all material objects, light is that which most easily passes into an ethical predicative without even the process, in our thought, of interpretation. It unites in itself purity and clearness and beauty and glory, as no other material object does: it is the condition of all material life and growth and joy. And the application to God of such a predicative requires no transference. He is Light, and the Fountain of light material and light ethical. In the one world, darkness is the absence of light: in the other, darkness, untruthfulness, deceit, falsehood, is the absence of God. They who are in communion with God, and walk with God, are of the light, and walk in the light), **and there is not in Him any darkness at all** (it is according to the manner of St. John, to strengthen an affirmation by the emphatic negation of its opposite; cf. ver. 8: ch. ii. 4, 10, 27, &c. Of the ethical darkness here denied, the Schol. says, οὔτε γὰρ ἄγνοια, οὔτε πλάνη, οὔτε ἁμαρτία, οὔτε θάνατος. The **οὐδεμία** strengthens the negative—"no, not even one speck." The Greek expositors ask the question respecting this message, καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο ἤκουσε;—and answer it, ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου λέγοντος. Their reply is right, but their reference to those words of our Lord is wrong. It was ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ: viz. from the whole revelation, in doings and sufferings and sayings, of Him who was the ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης of the Father. With that revelation those His words admirably and exactly coincided: but they were not the source of the message, referring as they did specially to Himself, and not directly to the Father. In His whole life on earth, and in the testimony of His Spirit, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο αὐτόν. So that this message is the result of the whole complex of ver. 1).

6.] *None can have communion with Him who walk in darkness.* **If we say** (the hypothesis is not assumed,—"If we say, as we do:"—but is purely hypothetical, "say who will and when he will." This ἐάν with the subj. is repeated in every verse as far as ch. ii. 1. The 1st pers. plur. gives to the sayings a more general form, precluding any from escaping from the inference: at the same time that by including himself in the hypothesis, the Apostle descends to the level of his readers, thus giving to his exhortations the "come," and not "go," which ever wins men's hearts the most) **that we have communion with Him** (see on ver. 3. "Communion with God is the very innermost essence of all true Christian life." Huther), **and walk in the darkness** (περιπατῶμεν, as so often in N. T., of the whole being and moving

τὴν [xy] ἀλήθειαν· [7] ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ [q] φωτὶ [v] περιπατῶμεν ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί, [t] κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν [t] μετ' ἀλλήλων, καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ [z] καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ

y = John chiefly, ch. ii. 4, 21 al. Eph. i. 13. 2 Tim. ii. 18. James v. 19 al.
z John, here bis only. = Acts xv. 9. Eph. v. 26. Tit. ii. 14. Heb. ix. 14, 22, 23. Ps. xviii. 13.

7. om εστιν L Clem. for αλληλων, αυτου tol æth-pl Clem Tert Did-int: *inter nos cum eo* æth-rom: *cum deo* harl. (A deficient.) rec aft ιησ. ins χριστου, with AKL rel vulg syr-w-ast copt Œc Thl Tert Aug Bede: om BC[P]א a fuld Syr sah æth-rom arm Clem Jer Fulg Leo. (om ιησ. Aug_1: om τ. υι. αυ. æth.)

and turning in the world: as Bengel, "actione interna et externa, quoquo nos vertimus:" see reff. τῷ σκότει, τῷ φωτί, mark off the two more distinctly than could be done without the art., as two existing separate ethical regions, the God and no-God regions of spiritual being), **we lie** (ψευδόμεθα is used with reference to εἴπωμεν: our assertion is a false one), **and do not the truth** (this clause is not a mere repetition, in a negative form, of the preceding ψευδόμεθα, as e. g. Episcopius, "hoc dicentes non facimus quod rectum est:" but is an independent proposition, answering to ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν, and asserting that all such walking in darkness is a not-doing of the truth. Christ is "the Truth:" and all doing the Truth is of Him, and of those who are in union with Him. So that ἡ ἀλήθεια is objective, not as ἀλήθεια alone might be, subjective, and imports "God's truth," καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Eph. iv. 21. We may observe how closely the teaching here as to φῶς and ἀλήθεια resembles that in Eph. iv. v. See also John iii. 21) 7.] (is not merely the contrasted hypothesis to ver. 6, but together with that contains a further unfolding of the subject): **but if** (see on ἐάν with the subj. above) **we walk in the light** (this walking in the light is explained by what follows, ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί, and by the apodosis, which gives the result of so walking,—viz. communion, &c. See Eph. v. 8 ff. for the ethical details), **as He** (God) **is in the light** (because the Christian is made θείας κοινωνὸς φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4. ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί is parallel with φῶς ἐστίν above, ver. 5. ἔστιν, as of Him who is eternal and fixed; περιπατῶμεν, as of us who are of time, moving onward: so Bede, "notanda distinctio verborum, quia Deum esse in luce dicit, nos autem in luce ambulare debere. Ambulant enim justi in luce, cum virtutum operibus servientes ad meliora proficiunt:" see note on ch. ii. 6: τὸ φῶς is the element in which God dwelleth: cf. 1 Tim. vi. 16. Notice that this walking in the light, as He is in the light, is no mere imitation of God, as Episcopius, al., but is an identity in the essential element of our daily walk with the essential element of God's eternal being: not imitation, but coincidence and identity of the very atmosphere of life), **we have communion with one another** (these words, κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων, are to be taken in their plain literal sense, and refer, not to our communion with God, which is assumed in our walking in the light as He is in the light, but to our mutual communion with one another by all having the same ground-element of life, viz. the light of the Lord, Isa. ii. 5. This has been very commonly misunderstood: e. g. by Œc. (ὥστε τῆς κοινωνίας ἐχόμενοι τῆς ἀλλήλων, δῆλον δὲ ὅτι τῆς ἡμῶν τε καὶ τοῦ φωτός, so Thl. also), Schol. in Oxf. Cat., Aug. ("ut possimus societatem habere cum illo"), Beza ("interpretor cum illo mutuam: agitur enim nunc de communione non sanctorum inter se, sed Dei et sanctorum"), Calv., Socinus, al.: even De Wette interprets "Gemeinschaft unter einander, nämlich mit Gott:" and Bengel wavers between the two. The words are taken rightly by Bede (who however regards them as putting forward mutual love as the necessary result of walking in the light), Erasmus, Lyra, Luther, Grot., Estius, (Bengel,) Lücke, Baumg.-Crus., Neander, Sander, Düsterd., al. The words are evidently an allusion to ver. 3, and as there communion with God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ is expressed, so here it lies in the background, but need not be supplied. De Wette's remark is most true; Christian communion is then only real, when it is communion with God), **and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin** (in order to understand rightly this important sentence, we must fix definitely two or three points regarding its connexion and construction. First then, καί connects it, as an additional result of our walking in the light, as He is in the light, with κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων: just as in ch. iii. 10, end, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. Consequently, the proposition contained in it cannot be as Œc., Thl., Beza, Wolf, Sander, al., imagine, the *ground* (καὶ γάρ) of the former one, that "if we walk, &c., we have communion,

a John ix. 41. xv. 22, 24. xix. 11. (Acts xxiii. 29. 1 Tim. v. 12.)

πάσης ἁμαρτίας. [8] ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι [a] ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

&c.," but follows as a co-ordinate result with κοιν. ἔχ. κ.τ.λ. Secondly, καθαρίζει is the present tense, and must be kept to its *present* meaning. This consideration precludes all such meanings as the former of the two given by Jerome ("quod scriptum est 'et sanguis Jesu filii ejus mundat nos ab omni peccato' tam in confessione baptismatis, quam in clementia pœnitudinis accipiendum est," adv. Pelag. ii. 8, vol. ii. p. 750), and Bede ("sacramentum namque (καί) dominicæ passionis et præterita nobis omnia in baptismo pariter peccata laxavit (notice the past tense), et quidquid quotidiana fragilitate post baptisma commisimus ejusdem Redemtoris nostri gratia dimittit"): and as that of Calvin ("hæc igitur summa est, ut certo statuant fideles se acceptos esse Deo, quia sacrificio mortis Christi illis placatus est"), Calovius, Episcopius, al. *Thirdly*, the *sense* of καθαρίζει must be accurately ascertained and strictly kept to. In ver. 9, ἵνα καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας is plainly distinguished from ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας: distinguished, as a further process; as, in a word, sanctification, distinct from justification. This meaning then, however much it may be supposed that justification is implied or presupposed, must be held fast here. *Fourthly*, the sense of τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ must be also clearly defined. The expression is an objective one, not a subjective: is spoken of that which is the objective cause ab extra, of our being cleansed from all sin. And this is the material Blood of Jesus the personal Redeemer, shed on the cross as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of the world. So we have the same Blood said in Col. i. 20 to be the great medium of pacification between God and the world: so in Eph. i. 7, to be the means of our ἀπολύτρωσις: so in Heb. ix. 14, which approaches very nearly to our passage, to cleanse (καθαρίζειν as here) our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. In all these places, and similar ones, whatever application to ourselves by faith or otherwise may lie in the background, it is not that which is *spoken of*, but the Blood of Christ itself, as the actual objective cause, once for all, of our reconciliation and sanctification. These considerations remove much of the difficulty and possible misunderstanding of the sentence. Thus understood, it will mean, much as in the second clause of Bede's interpretation, that this our walking in light, itself necessarily grounded in communion with the Father and the Son, will bring about, that whatever sins we may still be betrayed into by the infirmity of our nature and the malice of the devil, from them the Blood of Jesus purifies us day by day. Observe, not, the *application* of that Blood: for we are speaking of a state of faith and holiness, in which that blood is continually applied: the περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ φωτί is, in fact, *the application*: is that, which, as a subjective conditional element, makes that Blood of Christ's cross to be to us a means of purifying from all sin. The whole doctrine of this verse is fully and admirably set forth in Düsterdieck. The sum of what he says may be thus stated. St. John, in accord with the other Apostles, sets forth the Death and Blood of Christ in two different aspects: 1) as the one sin-offering for the world, in which sense we are justified by the application of the Blood of Christ by faith, His satisfaction being imputed to us. 2) as a victory over Sin itself, His blood being the purifying medium, whereby we gradually, being already justified, become pure and clean from all sin. And this application of Christ's blood is made by the Spirit which dwelleth in us. The former of these asserts the imputed righteousness of Christ put on us in justification: the latter, the inherent righteousness of Christ, wrought in us gradually in sanctification. And it is of this latter that he here is treating. Cf. next verse).

8—II. 2.] *Unfolding of the idea of purification from sin by the blood of Christ, in connexion with our walking in light.* This last is adduced in one of its plainest and simplest consequences, viz. the recognition of all that is yet darkness in us, in the confession of our sins. "Si te confessus fueris peccatorem, est in te veritas: nam ipsa veritas lux est. Nondum perfecte splenduit vita tua, quia insunt peccata: sed tamen jam illuminari cœpisti, quia inest confessio peccatorum." Aug. The light that is in us convicts the darkness, and we, no longer loving nor desiring to sin, have, by means of the propitiatory and sanctifying blood of Christ, both full forgiveness of and sure purification from all our sins. But the true test of this state of communion with and knowledge of God is, the keeping of His commandments (ii. 3—6), the walking as Christ walked: and this test is concentrated and summed up in its one crucial application, viz. to the law of love (ii. 7—11).

8.] If we say (see on ἐάν with subj. above, ver. 6) that we have not sin (i. e. in the course and abiding of our

[a] ἔχομεν, [b] ἑαυτοὺς [c] πλανῶμεν καὶ ἡ [y] ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν [d] ἐν ἡμῖν. 9 ἐὰν [e] ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς [e] ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, [f] πιστός

b 1st pers., Acts xxiii. 14. 2 Cor. iii. 1 al. fr. Gen. xliii. 22.
c = ch. ii. 26. iii. 7. John vii. 12. Matt. xxiv. 4. 1 Cor. vi. 9. Isa. xlvi. 8.
d John v. 38. Acts xiii. 15. 2 Cor. xi. 10.
e here only. (Susan. 14 Theod.) elsw., ἐξομολ., as Matt. iii. 6 ‖ Mk. James v. 16.
f = 1 Cor. i. 9. x. 13. 2 Cor. i. 18. 1 Thess. v, 24. 2 Thess. iii. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 13 al. Deut. xxxii. 4.

8. *εν ημιν* bef *ουκ εστιν* ACK[P] a d j m[1] 13. 36(*υμιν*) vulg spec syr arm Thl Opt er Aug$_{saepe}$ Oros (so also al am syrr Thl in ver 10): txt BLℵ rel Syr coptt Œc Tert.

walking in light: if we maintain that we are pure and free from all stain of sin. St. John is writing to persons whose sins have been forgiven them (ch. ii. 12), and therefore necessarily the present tense *ἔχομεν* refers not to any previous state of sinful life before conversion, but to their now existing state and the sins to which they are liable in that state. And in thus referring, it takes up the conclusion of the last verse, in which the onward cleansing power of the sanctifying blood of Christ was asserted: q. d. this state of needing cleansing from all present sin is veritably that of all of us: and our recognition and confession of it is the very first essential of walking in light. The Socinian interpreters, Socinus, Schlichting, and following them Grotius, go in omnia alia, and understand the passage of sins before conversion, or of the general imputation of sin. And our own Hammond has been entirely led away from the sense of the passage by the unfortunate notion of Gnostics being every where aimed at in this Epistle: imagining that their profession of perfection while living impure lives was here intended. See these erroneous interpretations refuted at length in Lücke and Düsterdieck), **we are deceiving ourselves** (causing ourselves to err from the straight and true way), **and the truth** (God's truth, objective) **is not in us** (has no subjective place in us. That truth respecting God's holiness and our own sinfulness, which is the very first spark of light within, has no place in us at all. It would be mere wasting of room and of patience, at every turn to be stating and impugning the inadequate interpretations of the Socinian Commentators and of their followers, Grotius, Semler, &c. It may be sufficient here just to notice Grotius's "non est in nobis studium veri," and Semler's "castior cognitio." Even Lücke has gone wrong here; "die Selbsttäuschung verräbet auf Mangel an innerem Wahrheitssinn und ist dieser Mangel selbst." **ἑαυτούς** = *ἡμᾶς αὐτούς*, see Winer): **if we confess our sins** (it is evident, from the whole sense of the passage, which has regard to our walking in light and in the truth, that no mere outward lip-confession is here meant, nor on the other hand any mere being aware within ourselves of sin (as Socinus: "confiteri significat interiorem ac profundam suorum peccatorum cognitionem"), but the union of the two, an external spoken confession springing from genuine inward contrition. As evident is it, that the confession here spoken of is not confined to confession to God, but embraces all our utterances on the subject, to one another as well as to Him; cf. James v. 16: and see more below), **He** (God, the Father; not, Christ, though this may at first sight seem probable from ver. 7 and ch. ii. 1; nor, the Father and Christ combined, as Lange and Sander hold. God is the chief subject through the whole passage: cf. *ὁ θεός*, ver. 5: *μετ' αὐτοῦ*, ver. 6: *αὐτός*, and *τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, in ver. 7. It is ever God's truth (1 Cor. i. 9, 10, 13; 2 Cor. i. 18; 1 Thess. v. 24) and righteousness (John xvii. 25; Rom. iii. 25; Rev. xvi. 5) that are concerned in, and vindicated by, our redemption) **is faithful and just** (His being faithful and just does not *depend on* our confessing our sins: He had both these attributes before, and will ever continue to have them: but by confessing our sins, we cast ourselves on, we approach and put to the proof for ourselves, and shall find operative in our case, in the *ἀφῇ* and *καθαρίσῃ*, &c., those His attributes of faithfulness and justice.

On the former of these adjectives, **πιστός**, almost all Commentators agree. It is, faithful to His plighted word and promise: see reff. and citations above. Œc. and Thl. alone have given a singular and not very clear interpretation: *πιστὸν δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀληθῆ εἴρηκε. πιστὸς γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τοῦ πεπιστευμένου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πιστωτικοῦ εἴρηται, ὃς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀληθοῦς τρόπου ἔχει καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις τούτου μεταδιδόναι.* The latter, **δίκαιος**, has not been so unanimously interpreted. The idea of God's *justice* seeming strange here, where the remission of and purification from sin is in question, some Commentators have endeavoured to give **δίκαιος** the sense of *good, merciful:* so Grot., Rosenm.; or, which amounts to the same, *fair, favourably disposed:* so Semler, Lange, Carpzov Bretschn. Lex. But Lücke has

g = John viii. 56. xi. 15. xii. 23.
h John xx. 23. ch. ii. 12. Matt. ix. 2 ‖ al. fr. Ps. xxiv. 18.
i ch. v. 17.
k John viii. 44, 55. ch. ii. 4, 22. iv. 20. v. 10. Rom. iii. 4 al. Ps. cxv. 2.
l ch. v. 10 only.

ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, [g] ἵνα [h] ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς [h] ἁμαρτίας καὶ [z] καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης [i] ἀδικίας. [10] ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν, [k] ψεύστην [l] ποιοῦμεν αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν [d] ἐν ἡμῖν.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h k l m a e 13

9. om εστιν ℵ[1]. [Damasc Jer Aug]. aft 2nd αμαρτιας ins ημων Cℵ a j vulg syrr coptt æth arm [καθαρισει AC[3] 13.] om ημας C.

shewn, that in none of the O. T. passages which are cited to substantiate these meanings, have they really place; but in all, righteousness, justice, is the fundamental idea, and the context only makes it mean, justice in this or in that direction. See note on Matt. i. 19. The meaning then being **just**, we have still to decide between several different views as to what particular phase of the divine justice is meant. Some, as Calov., Wolf, al., understand that God's justice has been satisfied in Christ, and thus the application of that satisfaction to us if we confess our sins, is an act of divine justice: is due to us in Christ. But this is plainly too much to be extracted from our verse. In Rom. iii. 26, where this *is* asserted, the reason is given, and all is fully explained: whereas here the ellipsis would be most harsh and unprecedented, and thus to fill it up would amount to an introduction into the context of an idea which is altogether foreign to it. (The notion that δίκαιος = δικαιῶν need only be mentioned to refute itself: Rom. iii. 26 is decisive against it.) The correct view seems to be, that δίκαιος as well as πιστός here is an attribute strictly to be kept to that which is predicated of it under the circumstances, without entering upon reasons external to the context. God is *faithful*, to His promise: is *just*, in His dealing: and both attributes operate in the forgiveness of sins to the penitent, now and hereafter; and in cleansing them from all unrighteousness. The laws of His spiritual kingdom require this: by those laws He acts in holy and infinite justice. His promises announced it, and to those promises he is faithful: but then those promises were themselves made only in accordance with his nature, who is holy, just, and true. In the background lie all the details of redemption, but they are not here in this verse: only the simple fact of God's justice is adduced) **to forgive us our sins** (ἵνα here is not = ὥστε: it is not "so as to forgive, &c.," but "that He may forgive, &c." His doing so is in accordance with, and therefore as with Him all facts are purposed, is in pursuance of, furthers the object of, His faithfulness and justice. "So that He is faithful and just, in order that He may, &c." See John iv. 34 note: reff. here: and Winer, § 44. 8 *c*. With regard to the particular here mentioned, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας is the continued remission of the guilt of each committed sin, which is the special promise and just act of God under the Gospel covenant: see Heb. x. 14, 18), **and cleanse us from all unrighteousness** (the explanation of the sense, see above. Here ἀδικίας is used, in reference to δίκαιος above, as corresponding to ἁμαρτίας in ver. 7. The divine δικαιοσύνη is revealed in God's law: every transgression then of that law (ἁμαρτία, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν τοῦ σκόπου: cf. Theodorus Abukara in Suicer, s. v. ἁμαρτία) is of its nature and essence an ἀδικία, an unrighteousness, as contrary to that δικαιοσύνη. Observe, the two verbs are aorists, because the purpose of the faithfulness and justice of God is to do each as one great complex act—to justify and to sanctify wholly and entirely.

10.] Not a mere repetition, but a confirmation and intensification of ver. 8. Huther well remarks, that this verse is related to ver. 9 as ver. 8 to ver. 7). **If we say that we have not sinned** (if we deny, that is, the fact of our commission of sins in our Christian state. The perf., so far from removing the time to that before conversion, brings it down to the present: had it been ἡμαρτήσαμεν, it might have had that signification. ἡμαρτήκαμεν answers in time to ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν: the one representing the state as existing, the other the sum of sinful acts which have gone to make it up), **we make Him** (God, see above) **a liar** (this is the climax, gradually reached through ψευδόμεθα ver. 6, and ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν ver. 8. And it is justified, by the uniform assertion of God both in the O. T. and N. T. that all men are sinners, which we thus falsify as far as in us lies), **and His word is not in us** (cf. John v. 38. ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ may be interpreted generally,—"that which He saith." "Deus dixit '*peccasti:*' id negare nefandum est. Verbum nos vere accusat, et contradicendo arcetur a corde." Bengel. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν, as in John l. c., **has no abiding place in, within, us**: is something heard by the ear, and external to us, but

II. [1] [m]Τεκνία μου, ταῦτα γράφω ὑμῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἁμάρτητε. καὶ ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ, [n]παράκλητον ἔχομεν [o]πρὸς

m John (xiii. 33. vv. 12, 28. ch. iii. 7, 18. iv. 4. v. 21) only, exc. Gal. iv. 19†. n (see note.) John xiv. 16, 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7 only †. Job xvi. 2 Aq. o = John v. 45.

not finding place among the thoughts and maxims of our heart and life. God declares that to be true which we assume to be untrue. It is evident that with Œc., Grot., De Wette, to understand the O. T. by ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ is to miss the connexion, seeing that it is of the sins of *Christians* that St. John is treating, to whom ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ has become a far higher revelation of His will, viz. that given by Christ, and brought home to the heart by His indwelling Spirit. This final revelation of God includes the O. and N. T., and all other manifestations of His will to us: and it is this as a whole, which we reject and thrust from us, if we say at any time that we have not sinned, for its united testimony proclaims the contrary). CHAP. II. 1.] The connexion is thus given by Augustine: "Et ne forte impunitatem videretur dedisse peccatis (but see below) quia dixit: fidelis est et justus qui mundet nos ab omni iniquitate, et dicerent jam sibi homines: peccemus, securi faciamus quod volumus, purgat nos Christus:—tollit tibi malam securitatem et inserit utilem timorem. Male vis esse securus, sollicitus esto: fidelis enim est et justus ut dimittat nobis delicta nostra, et semper tibi displiceas, et muteris donec perficiaris. Ideo quid sequitur? Filioli, &c. Sed forte surrepit de vita humana peccatum. Quid ergo fiet? Jam desperatio erit? Audi. Si quis, inquit, peccaverit, &c." See more below. So also Bede, Calvin, Luther, Calov. But there is more in the connexion than this. It is not corrective only of a possible mistake, but it is progressive—a further step taken in the direction of unfolding the great theme of this part of the Epistle, enounced in ch. i. 5. The first step for those walking in the light of God was, that they should confess their sins: the next and consequent one, that they should forsake them, and, agreeably to their new nature, keep His commandments. This verse introduces that further unfolding of our subject, which is continued, and especially pressed as regards the one great commandment of love, in our vv. 3—11.

1.] **My little children** (see reff.: the diminutive expresses tender affection: perhaps also is used in reference to his age and long standing as a father in Christ. Compare the beautiful legend in Eus. H. E. iii. 23, where St. John calls back the young man to him with the words τί με φεύγεις, τέκνον, τὸν σαυτοῦ πατέρα;) **these things I write unto you, that ye may sin not (at all)** (this exclusive meaning is given by the aor. implying the absence not only of the habit, but of any single acts, of sin. **ταῦτα γράφω**, not as Bengel, *that which follows;* nor, as Grot., both the preceding and the following: but as most Commentators, the preceding only, viz. the concluding verses 8—10 of the former chapter, not in their details merely, but as Düsterd., "in seiner lebendigen Harmonie." The object of writing that passage was, to bring about in them the forsaking of sin. The very announcement there made, that if we confess our sins He in His faithfulness and righteousness will *cleanse us from all sin*, sufficiently substantiates what the Apostle here says, without, with Aug., al. (see above), bringing out too strongly the contemplation of a supposed misunderstanding on the part of the readers. To do this is to miss the deeper connexion in which these words stand to the great whole in its harmony, and to give instead only an apparent and superficial one. The reference of this exhortation to the unconverted among them, and rendering of ἵνα μὴ ἁμάρτητε, "ne maneatis in peccato," maintained by Socinus and his followers, need only be mentioned to be refuted. The aor. alone, ἁμάρτητε, may serve to shew its utter untenableness). **And if any man have sinned** (aor., have committed an act of sin: still speaking of those spots of sin which owing to the infirmity of the flesh remain even in those who are walking in the light. By this ἐάν τις ἁμ., there is not, as Benson objects to this interpretation, any doubt expressed that all do occasionally sin, but the hypothesis is made, as ever by this formula, purely and generally. The resumption of the first person immediately, makes it evident that the hypothesis is in fact realized in us all), **we have an Advocate with** (here the sense of πρός, as a prep. of reference, is more brought out than when it is joined with a merely essential verb, as in John i. 1, and our ch. i. 2) **the Father, Jesus Christ** (the principal word requiring elucidation here is **παράκλητον**. There are two classes of interpretations of it, which, as already remarked (on John xiv. 16), by no means exclude one another. Of these, that one which may be summed up under the meaning "COMFORTER," has already been treated, on John, l. c. With the other we have now to deal. ADVOCATE, *advocatus*, παράκλητος, 'causæ patronus,' is the

τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν [p] δίκαιον, [2] καὶ αὐτὸς [q] ἱλασμός ἐστιν [r] περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν· οὐ περὶ τῶν

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

p = Matt. xxvii. 19. Luke xxiii. 47. Acts vii. 52. xxii. 14. 1 Pet. iii. 18. Zech. ix. 9.
q ch. iv. 10 only. Num. v. 8 B. (ἐξιλ. A.) Ps. cxxix. 4. Ezek. xliv. 27.
r so w. ἱλάσκεσθαι, Exod. xxxii. 14 A.

Chap. II. 2. εστιν bef ιλασμος A 180 vulg Syr Cypr Hil Aug$_{alic}$: txt B(sic: see table)

commoner sense of the word, answering as it does more closely to its etymology. It is found in Demosth. (p. 343. 10) and the orators: and occurs frequently in Philo in the same peculiar reference as here: e. g. in Flacc. 3, vol. ii. p. 519, where Macro is called the παράκλητος of Caius with Tiberius: de Jos. 40, p. 75: and most notably for our present place, de vita Mos. iii. 14, p. 155, ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερώμενον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρί, παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ πρός τε ἀμνηστίαν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν. In patristic literature, Düsterd. cites the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (Eus. H. E. v. 1), where a young Christian, named Vettius Epagathus, ἠξίου καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκουσθῆναι ἀπολογούμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ... ἀνελήφθη καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν κλῆρον τῶν μαρτύρων, παράκλητος χριστιανῶν χρηματίσας, ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ: where Ruffinus's version, "habens in se advocatum pro nobis Jesum," is certainly not right; τὸν παράκλητον meaning the Holy Spirit. Cyril Alex. in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, p. 164 (Suicer), says, παράκλητος καὶ ἱλαστήριον ὁ υἱὸς ὠνόμασται· καθίστησι γὰρ τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς εὐμενῆ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ παντὸς ἡμῖν εὑρίσκεται πρόξενος ἀγαθοῦ. Augustine gives the sense thus, in words following those above cited: "Ille est ergo advocatus: da operam tu ne pecces: si de infirmitate vitæ subrepserit peccatum, continuo vide, continuo displiceat, continuo damna; et cum damnaveris, securus ad judicem venies. Ibi habes advocatum: noli timere ne perdas caussam confessionis tuæ. Si enim aliquando in hac vita committit se homo disertæ linguæ et non perit: committis te verbo, et periturus es?" There is no discrepancy between this passage, where the Son is our παράκλητος, and John xiv. 16, where the Holy Spirit is called by the same name: rather is there the closest accordance, seeing that there our Lord says He will pray the Father and He will send us ἄλλον παράκλητον: Himself, the Son of God, being thus asserted to hold this office in the first place, and the Holy Spirit to be His Substitute in His absence. See on the definite idea of the detail of the advocacy of the Son of God, Huther's important note here) **(being) righteous** (the adj. δίκαιον, without the art., carries a ratiocinative force; "in that He is righteous," as a contrast to ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ. In a strict rendering, this force of the anarthrous adj. should be kept, and pointed out in exegesis: in an English version, it is hardly possible to render it otherwise than our translators have done, "the righteous," though it is not τὸν δίκαιον. The definite art. in English calls attention at once to the predicate, as does the *omission of the definite art.* in Greek: and thus the purpose of the writer is answered. And this is often the case: a vernacular version, in order to bring out in English the same idea which is expressed by the Greek, is constrained to adopt a phrase which is not in the Greek, and which sometimes looks as if the translators had made a blunder in grammar. It would be well if this were always carefully kept in mind by those who would revise our authorized version. No supposed by-sense of δίκαιος, bonus, lenis (Grot.), or = δικαιῶν (see Wolf), must (see above on ch. i. 9) be for a moment thought of. "The righteousness of Christ stands on our side: for God's righteousness is, in Jesus Christ, ours." Luther):—

2.] **and He** ("idemque ille," as Lücke. καί is merely the copula, not = *quia*, as Corn.-a-lap.; nor γάρ, as Syr. (not in Etheridge), Beza; it serves to bind the fundamental general proposition which follows, to the resulting particular one which has preceded) **is a propitiation** ("the abstract verbal substantive in -μος betokens the intransitive reference of the verb," see Kühner's Gr. Gr. vol. i. § 378. So that ἱλασμός is not, as Grot., in his notes, = ἱλαστής, but is abstract, as ἁγιασμός applied to Christ 1 Cor. i. 30, ἁμαρτία 2 Cor. v. 21. Düsterdieck here has given a long and able exposition of the word and idea, in refutation of Socinus, and of Grotius's *notes*. Grot. himself, being suspected of Socinianism, wrote his "Defensio fidei catholicæ de satisfactione Christi adversus Faustum Socinum," in which, ch. vii.—x., he gives a full and satisfactory explanation "de placatione et reconciliatione, de redemptione, de expiatione nostra per Christi mortem facta." Socinus had maintained that ἱλάσκεσθαι does not mean "ex irato mitem reddere," but merely "*declarare* quod pertinet ad pœnas peccatorum, ejus animum cujus est eas sumere

ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ [s] ὅλου του κοσμου. [3] καὶ [t] ἐν τούτῳ [t] γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν, ἐὰν

s constr., John v. 36. 1 Cor. i. 25.
t John xiii. 35. 1 John passim. Gen. xlii. 33. see 1 Cor. iv. 6. ch. iii. 10 al.

CKL[P]ℵ rel Clem $Orig_{saepe}$ Petr Ath_2 Thl Œc Tert Aug_6 Vig. μονων B 80[1] coptt $Orig_1$. [του κοσμου bef ολου P m.]
3. γινωσκωμεν A.

atque repetere, mitem atque pacatum: *declarare*, fore ut peccata meritas pœnas non luant." But against this Grot. shews that ἱλάσκεσθαι, as εἰρηνοποιεῖν and καταλλάσσειν, imports 'placare,' i.e. 'iram avertere;' and Christ has, as our ἱλασμός or ἱλαστήριον, i.e. as a sin-offering, reconciled God and us by nothing else but by His voluntary death as a sacrifice: has by this averted God's wrath from us. According to the constant usage of Scripture, God is in so far ἵλεως in regard to the sins of men, as He suffers His ἔλεος to prevail instead of His ὀργή. See LXX in 2 Chron. vi. 25, 27; Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 34, xliii. (xxxvi.) 3, Num. xiv. 18 ff. And the Greek usage entirely agrees; see Hom. Il. α. 147, ὄφρ' ἡμῖν ἑκάεργον ἱλάσσεαι, and Alberti's note on Hesych. s. v. ἱλάσκεσθαι. Hesych. gives the sense of ἱλάσκεσθαι, ἐξιλεοῦσθαι, and of ἱλασμός, εὐμένεια, συγχώρησις, διαλλαγή, πραότης) for (περί, as so often in similar connexions, cf. Heb. x. 6, 8, and reff., concerning, i.e. in behalf of; not so strong as ὑπέρ, which *fixes* the latter meaning, excluding the wider one) **our sins: yet not for ours only, but also for the whole world** (in the latter clause there is an ellipsis very common in ordinary speech in every language: *"for the whole world"* = "for the sins of the whole world." See besides reff., Rev. xiii. 11, 2 Pet. i. 1; and Winer, edn. 6, § 66. 2 f. "Quam late patet peccatum, tam late propitiatio," Bengel. But this has been misunderstood or evaded by many interpreters. Cyril and Œc. (alt.) explain ἡμετέρων to refer to the Jews, **ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου** to the Gentiles. And many others, taking the former in its true sense, yet limit the latter, not being able to take in the true doctrine of universal redemption. So Bede, "non pro illis solum propitiatio est Christus quibus tunc in carne viventibus scribebat Joannes, sed etiam pro omni Ecclesia quæ per totam mundi latitudinem diffusa est, (a) primo nimirum electo usque ad ultimum qui in fine mundi nasciturus est porrecta... Pro totius ergo mundi peccatis interpellat Dominus, quia per totum mundum est Ecclesia, quam suo sanguine comparavit." (This latter part is an evident reference to Augustine; but it is remarkable that on referring to Augustine we find "Ecce habes Ecclesiam per totum mundum;" but he ends, "... sed et totius mundi, quem suo sanguine comparavit.") Similarly Calvin: "neque enim aliud fuit consilium Johannis, quam toti Ecclesiæ commune facere hoc bonum. Ergo sub *omnibus*, reprobos non comprehendit: sed eos designat qui simul credituri erant, et qui per varias mundi plagas dispersi erant." But this unworthy and evasive view is opposed by the whole mass of evangelical expositors. The reason of the insertion of the particular here, is well given by Luther: "It is a patent fact that thou too art a part of the whole world: so that thine heart cannot deceive itself and think, The Lord died for Peter and Paul, but not for me").

3—11.] *This communion with God consists, secondly, in keeping His commandments, and especially the commandment to love one another.* No new division of the Epistle begins, as in Sander: ver. 3 is closely joined to ch. i. 5, 6, which introduced the first conditional passage i. 7—ii. 2. The great test of communion with God, walking in the light, first requires that we confess our sins: next requires that we keep His commandments. So in the main Œc.: εἰρηκὼς ἄνω τοὺς εἰς τὸν κύριον πεπιστευκότας κοινωνίαν ἔχειν πρὸς αὐτόν, πιστωτικὰ τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν παρατίθεται. **And in this** (ἐν, of the conditional element: in this is placed, on this depends, our knowledge. In ch. iii. 24 (see below), the ἐν τούτῳ is resumed by ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος οὗ ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν) **we know** (pres.: from time to time, from day to day) **that we have the knowledge of him** (perf.: have acquired and retain that knowledge: and this ἐγνωκέναι is not, as some (Lange, Carpzov., Wahl) make it, the *love* of God, as neither of course is it mere theoretical knowledge: but is that inner and living acquaintance which springs out of unity of heart and affection), **if** ("St. John uses the formula ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν first as referring the demonstrative pronoun back to what has gone before, as e.g. in our ver. 5, and in ch. iii. 10. If however the demonstrative pronoun in this or a like formula looks onward, and the token itself, with the circumstance of which it is a token, follows, he expresses this token variously and significantly, according to the various shades of meaning to be conveyed. Some-

u Matt. xix. 17. John xiv. 15. xv. 10. ch. iii. 22, 24. Rev. xii. 17 al.+ see 1 Cor. vii. 10. Sir. xxxv. (xxxii.) 23.
v ch. iv. 6 reff.
w ch. i. 10 reff.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

τὰς [u] ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ [u] τηρῶμεν. [4] ὁ λέγων ὅτι [v] ἔγνωκα αὐτόν, καὶ τὰς [u] ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ μὴ [u] τηρῶν, [w] ψεύστης ἐστίν, καὶ [x] ἐν τούτῳ ἡ [x] ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν· [5] ὃς δ' ἂν [y] τηρῇ αὐτοῦ τὸν [y] λόγον, [z] ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ [a] ἀγάπη τοῦ

x ch. i. 8. y John viii. 51, 52, 55. xiv. 23, 24. xv. 20. xvii. 6. Rev. iii. 8, 10. xxii. 7, 9. J. 1 Kings xv. 11 B. z = John iv. 42. viii. 31. a = John v. 42. ver. 15. ch. iii. 17. iv. 12. v. 3. Luke xi. 42. 2 Thess. iii. 5.

for τηρωμεν, φυλαξωμεν ℵ[1].

4. rec om οτι, with CKL[P] rel copt æth arm $Clem_1$ Œc $Lucif_1$: ins ABℵ a j syrr sah $Clem_1$ Thl Cypr $Lucif_1$ Tich. om 2nd και A[P] 13. 27-9. om εν τουτω ℵ. aft αληθεια ins του θεου ℵ 25 æth.

[5. η αγαπη του θεου bef εν τουτω P.]

times the token implied in the demonstrative follows in a separate sentence, as in ch. iv. 2: sometimes the construction is slightly changed, and the sentence begun with ἐν τούτῳ is not regularly brought to a close, but continued in a new and correlative form: e.g. ch. iii. 24, where ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκ. is taken up by ἐκ τοῦ πν. And this way of expression is closely parallel to that where ὅτι completes the construction begun with ἐν τούτῳ. So ch. iii. 16, 19; iv. 9, 10, 13. In these cases, the full objective reality of the token as a fact, is set forth. It is an undoubted fact that He has given us of His Spirit, that He has sent His Son: and from these facts our inference is secure to the other facts in question, that He abideth in us, &c. But in other passages, we find instead of this ὅτι, an ἵνα, as ch. iv. 17 (but see note there: the case surely is not quite parallel, H. A.), or an ἐάν, as here, John xiii. 35, or ὅταν, ch. v. 2. This ἐάν, ὅταν, mark the token implied in ἐν τούτῳ as one not actually existent, an historical or objectively certain fact; but as a possible contingency, something hypothetically, and conditionally assumed: in other words as ideal." Düsterdieck, pp. 172 f. And so here: the token, that we have the knowledge of Him, is present, *if*, posito that) **we keep** (pres., as a habit, from time to time, ἐντολαί being necessarily prescriptions regarding circumstances as they arise) **His commandments** (first as to the expression. St. John never uses the word νόμος for the rule of Christian obedience: this word is reserved for the Mosaic law, John i. 17, 46, and in all, fifteen times in the Gospel: but almost always ἐντολαί,—sometimes λόγος θεοῦ or χριστοῦ, John viii. 51 f., xiv. 23 f., xvii. 6, our ver. 5. And as a verb he always uses τηρεῖν, very seldom ποιεῖν (only in the two controverted places, ch. v. 4, Rev. xxii. 14 v. r.: ch. i. 6, ii. 17 are not cases in point). τηρεῖν keeps its peculiar meaning of *watching*, guarding as some precious thing, "observing to keep." Next, *whose* commandments? The older expositors for the most part refer αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ, vv. 3—6, to Christ: so Aug., Episcop., Grot., Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Wolf, Lange, Bengel, Sander, Neander. Socinus inclines to this view, but doubtfully; Erasmus understands αὐτός vv. 3, 4, of God, αὐτός and ἐκεῖνος vv. 5, 6, of Christ. Most modern Commentators understand αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ throughout of God, and ἐκεῖνος of Christ. So Lücke, Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Huther, Brückner, and in old times Bede and Œc. That this latter is the right understanding of the terms, is supposed to be shewn by the substitution (?) in ver. 5 of τοῦ θεοῦ for αὐτοῦ, and its taking up again by ἐν αὐτῷ in ver. 6, followed by καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιεπάτησεν. But of this I am by no means thoroughly persuaded: see note, ver. 6). **4.**] *Assertion*, parallel with ch. i. 8, *of the futility of pretending to the knowledge of God where this test is not fulfilled.* **The man saying** (ὁ λέγων answers to ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, ch. i. 8. ὅτι recitantis cannot be expressed in English), **I have the knowledge of Him** (see above) **and not keeping His commandments, is a liar** (answers to ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν ch. i. 8), **and in this man the truth is not** (see above on ch. i. 8, where the words are the same: **5.**] *assertion of the other alternative*, not merely as before, but, as usual, carried further and differently expressed: "oppositio cum accessione," as Grot.):—**but whosoever keepeth His word** (synonymous with τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, considered as a whole: on the mode of expression, see above), **of a truth in him is the love of God perfected** (why should this transition be made from knowledge to love? "Amor præsupponit cognitionem," as Grot.: and is a further step in the same κοινωνία with God: not indeed that the former step is passed through and done with, but that true knowledge and love increase together, and the former is the measure of the latter, just as keeping God's commandments is the test and measure of true knowledge of Him. And thus in the

[a] θεοῦ [b] τετελείωται. [t] ἐν τούτῳ [t] γινώσκομεν ὅτι [c] ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν. 6 ὁ λέγων [c] ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν [d] ὀφείλει καθὼς ἐκεῖνος [e] περιεπάτησεν καὶ αὐτὸς [οὕτως] [e] περιπατεῖν. 7 [f] ἀγαπητοί, οὐκ [g] ἐντολὴν [g] καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν-

b = ch. iv. 12, 17, 18. John iv. 34 al. see James ii. 22.
c John xv. 2, 4, &c.
d = John xiii. 14. xix. 7. Rom. xv. 1. ch. iii. 16. iv. 11. 3 John 8 ‡.
e absol., 1 Cor. vii. 17. see ch. i. 6 reff.
f John, ch. iii. 2, 21 al7. Rom. xii. 19. Jude 3, 17, 20.
g here bis. John xiii. 34. 2 John 5 only.

6. rec ins ουτως, with CK[P]א rel syr (copt) arm Thl Œc: om AB d vulg Syr sah æth Clem Cyr Cypr Cæs-arel.—om και αυτ. (ουτ.) περιπ. L.

7. rec (for αγαπητοι) αδελφοι, with KL rel æth Œc: in red, beg of pericope, a: om j: txt ABC[P]א d 13. 36. 40 vulg syrr coptt arm Thl Did-int Aug Bede.

final and perfect ideal, the two are coincident: the perfect observation of His commandments is the perfection of love to Him. It is manifest, from what has been said, that ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ must be our love towards God, not His love towards us: τοῦ θεοῦ a gen. objective, not subjective. Some Commentators have held the other meaning: partly because τετελείωται seemed better to be interpreted thus, and partly from doctrinal motives, as in the case of Flacius and Calovius, to keep out the Romish folly of supererogation. But the explanation, though the words themselves admit it (see ch. iv. 9), is manifestly alien from the context. And of any foolish dreams of perfection or super-perfection there is no fear, if we understand the passage as intended by the Apostle, as setting forth the true ideal and perfection of knowledge and love to God, as measured by the perfect keeping of His word: which though none of us can fully reach, every true Christian has before him as his aim and final object. So that there is no need again to depart from the meaning of τετελείωται, as has been done by Beza ("itaque τελειοῦν hoc in loco non declarat perfecte aliquid præstare, sed mendacio et simulationi, inani denique speciei opponitur: ut hoc plane sit quod dicimus in vulgato sermone, mettre en exécution")). **In this** (in the fact of our progress towards this ideal state of perfection of obedience and therefore of love:—thus assured that the germ of the state is in us and unfolding) **we know that we are in Him** (this completes the logical period which began in ver. 3, by reasserting that verse, carrying however that assertion yet deeper, by substituting ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν for ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν. This "being in Him" is in fact the Christian life in its central depth of κοινωνία with God and with one another: the spiritual truth corresponding to the physical one enunciated by St. Paul, Acts xvii. 28, ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν). 6.] The state of being in Him is carried forward a step further by the expression "abide in Him:" ("Synonyma cum gradatione: *Illum nosse: in Illo esse: in Illo manere:* cognitio: communio: constantia." Bengel:) and the way is prepared, by what follows, for the coming exhortation vv. 7—11, to walk in love. **The man saying that He abideth in Him** (God, as above) **ought** (see reff. Huther well remarks, that the obligation is grounded on the λέγειν, the profession, being one of consistency with it; not on the μένειν, which would imply that which follows, as matter of necessity), **even as He** (Christ: by ἐκεῖνος (see above) a third person is introduced: not necessarily, see 2 Tim. ii. 26 and note, but apparently by the requirements of this passage, αὐτός having come down all the way from ch. i. 5 as referred to God. I say *apparently*: because I do not regard it as by any means a settled matter that this αὐτός does not throughout apply to Christ, and then this ἐκεῖνος will merely refer to a different phase of predication respecting the same person as the ἐν αὐτῷ designates, as in the examples produced in the note as above) **walked** (during His life upon earth: see below), **himself also thus to walk** (not any one particular of Christ's walk upon earth is here pointed at, but the whole of his life of holiness and purity and love. This latter, as including all the rest, is most in the Apostle's mind. So in Eph. v. 1, 2, where St. Paul exhorts us to be followers of God, he adds, καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ὑμᾶς. Luther simply but appositely remarks, that it is not Christ's walking on the sea, but His ordinary walk, that we are called on here to imitate).

7—11.] *The commandment of Love.* The context see below. **Beloved, I write not to you a new commandment, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning: the old commandment is the word which ye heard** (on the right understanding of this verse, very much depends. The great question is, To what commandment does ἐντολή refer? Does it point forward to the commandment of brotherly love, in ver. 9, or back to that of walking as Christ walked, in ver. 6? One

τολὴν [h] παλαιάν, ἣν εἴχετε [i] ἀπ' [i] ἀρχῆς. ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ [h] παλαιά ἐστιν ὁ [k] λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε. [8] πάλιν [g] ἐντολὴν

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

h Rom. vi. 6. 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. 2 Cor. iii. 14. John, here bis only.
i = John xv. 27. ch. iii. 11. 2 John 5, 6. see Isa. xlviii. 16.
k = Acts xviii. 15. ch. i. 1 al.

rec aft ηκουσατε ins απ' αρχης (*see ver* 24, *ch* iii. 11, *&c*), with KL rel Ath Œc Did-int: om ABC[P]ℵ d j 13 vss Thl Aug Cassiod Bede.

or other of these views has generally been taken decidedly, and exclusively of the other. The former view has been upheld by Aug., Bede, Œc., Thl., Luther, Calv., Grot., Wolf, Bengel, Knapp, Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Neander, Sander, Düsterdieck, al.; the latter by Beza, Socinus, Seb.-Schmidt, Piscator, Episcopius, Flacius, Calov., Lücke, Fritzsche, Jackmann, al. Of these, some on both sides may fairly be dismissed, as maintaining preposterous meanings for some of the terms used. Thus Flacius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., understand ἐντολή to be, not a *commandment*, which from usage and from ver. 3 and ch. iii. 23, v. 3, it must be, but the whole "doctrina de Christo ejusque beneficiis," including the forgiveness of sins, vv. 1, 2, 12. Then thus taking it, the epithets "old" and "new" become the O. T. prophecies of Christ, and their N. T. fulfilment. Thus on the other side some, e. g. Aug., Bede, Beza, Luther (2), Seb.-Schmidt, Wolf, al., understand "new" and "old" not of time, but in a tropical meaning, with reference to the old Jewish or heathen darkness and the new light of Christ: a view which cannot possibly be maintained in the face of so plain a token of time as is furnished by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and by the aor. εἴχετε and ἠκούσατε. These being so far set aside, the above classes of interpreters are again divided as to their understanding of the epithets "old" and "new." Those who understand the ἐντολή vv. 7, 8, of the command of love, mostly explain the oldness and newness of the difference between O. and N. T. revelation (so the Greeks, Grot., and Wolf), and some go on to understand the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of the original obscure and imperfect command to love one another in the O. T. which failed in the crowning particular of love towards enemies. Of these, the Greeks, holding not Jewish Christians alone, but Gentile also to be addressed, interpret παλαιὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἠκούσατε of the testimony of conscience to the law of love among the Gentiles: so Œc. and the Scholl. speak of ἡ κατὰ τὰς φυσικὰς ἐννοίας φιλικὴ διάθεσις. Wolf tries to distinguish the two by referring εἴχετε to the Jews, ἠκούσατε to the Gentiles. On the other hand, those who refer ἐντολή in vv. 7, 8, to ver. 6, mostly understand the "old" and "new" of the different aspects in which the following the example of Christ would be regarded, within the limits of the N. T. period, since the readers had begun their Christian lives: so Socinus, Jackmann, Piscator, Episcopius, Lücke. The last-named reference of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς to the beginning of the Christian life of the readers, and the corresponding explanation of the "oldness" of the commandment, is combined by De Wette and Neander only with their view of ἐντολή as the law of love. Düsterdieck, from whom the above particulars are mainly taken, finds fault with the exclusive reference maintained for the most part by the interpreters on both sides, and believes that a via media may be found more agreeable to the ethical habits of thought of the Apostle, and to the context of the passage. This context requires, 1) that we maintain a logical connexion between ver. 6 and ver. 7, as indicated by ὀφείλει and ἐντολή: 2) that we maintain the like logical connexion between ver. 8 and ver. 9, as indicated by the figure common to them both, of the darkness and the light. Now, of these, 1) is neglected by those who understand the ἐντολή barely as the law of love; 2) is neglected by those who understand it barely of following Christ's example. The former make ver. 7 spring out of no contextual development: the latter treat similarly ver. 9. And the true view is to be found as thus indicated: the walk of Christ, which is our example, is essentially and completely summed up in one word, Love: and so the command, to walk as he walked, essentially and completely resolves itself into the law of brotherly love: for this last, taken in all its depth, includes not one special detail in a holy Christian life, but the whole of that life itself. Taking then this view, how are we to interpret in detail? What is καινήν? what is παλαιάν? what is ἀπ' ἀρχῆς? For these clearly all hang together. If ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is to signify 'from the beginning of O. T. revelation,' or 'from the beginning of God's testimony in man's conscience,' we seem to be doing violence to the simple mode of address which is prevalent in our Apostle's style. The εἴχετε and ἠκούσατε, especially the latter, will hardly bear interpreting of the remote forefathers of the readers, as on this hypothesis they must, but require to be confined to the readers themselves, especially as

[8] καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς [l] ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ [l] ἐν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ [m] σκοτία [n] παράγεται καὶ τὸ [mn] φῶς τὸ [o] ἀλη-

l = ver. 3. m so John i. 5. iii. 19. see ch. i. 5. n = (mid.) ver. 17 only‡. intr., John [viii. 59] ix. 1 al. Ps. cxxviii. 8. o = John i. 9. iv. 23 al. fr.

8. εν αυτω bef αληθες A. aft αληθες ins και ℵ. for 2nd υμιν, ημιν A c m tol syr-mg Jer: txt BCKL[P]ℵ rel vss Thl Œc Aug Bede. for σκοτια, σκια A. for 2nd το, τον(sic) ℵ[1]

they are aorists and not perfects. And if so, the meaning of ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς is fixed to be, from the beginning of the Christian lives, from the time when τὸν λόγον ἤκουσαν. Then as to καινήν, and παλαιάν, the explanation will be simple enough. The command to love one another cannot be said to be new, for it forms a part of the λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε, nay, is the very sum and centre of that λόγος: but again, it may be said to be new, inasmuch as it ever assumes new freshness as the Christian life unfolds, as the old darkness is more and more cleared away and the true light shineth: in that light we see light; in the light of Him who maketh all things new.

That the ἐντολή as such refers to the law of love, thus indeed connected with Christ's example here, but still to the law of love and no other, is plain from the whole usage of the Apostle; compare especially 2 John 4—6, where the very same train of thought occurs as here, the περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ being = περιπατεῖν ἐν φωτί here, being followed up by καθὼς ἐντολὴν ἐλάβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, and that ἐντολή being characterized, as here,—οὐχ ὡς ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι καινήν, ἀλλὰ ἣν εἴχομεν ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, and finally being stated to be ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους. Indeed the whole process of that passage from this point is most instructive as to our present one: καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστιν, καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατῆτε: where the same complex of the whole Christian walk is included in the one idea of love, and ἀγάπη identified with walking according to His commandments. Again in ch. iii. 11, the same formula is used in speaking of the law of love—αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους: cf. also ch. iv. 21, v. 3, iii. 22—24: again ch. iii. 14, iv. 16, John xiii. 35; ch. v. 1, 2, John xv. 10.

To recapitulate: on the interpretation here adopted, which is also that of Düsterdieck and Huther, the ἐντολή is the command to walk as Christ walked, passing as the passage advances into the law of love. This ἐντολή is no καινή, but παλαιά, seeing that they had it ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, from the beginning of their faith, and it was in fact the sum of the λόγος which they ἤκουσαν).

8.] **Again** (this πάλιν is what is called ἐπανορθωτικόν; takes up and contravenes what has been as yet said: q. d., "in another view of the subject, ... :" "et contrarietatem declarat et iterationem, hic antem non repetitionis sed contrarietatis est declaratio," as Erasm. It refers to the whole sentence, not merely to γράφω. The emphasis is on καινήν) **a new commandment write I unto you** ("*new*," in three possible ways of interpretation: 1) "novum dicit quod Deus quotidie suggerendo veluti renovat: . . . . Joannes negat ejusmodi esse doctrinam de fratribus diligendis, quæ tempore obsolescat: sed perpetuo vigere," Calv.: or 2) "illam præceptionem quam vobis dudum cognitam esse dixi, sic vobis denuo commendo atque injungo, tanquam si nova esset, nec vobis antehac unquam cognita," Knapp, and so Neander; or 3) in that it was first promulgated with Christianity and unknown before. The two first are condemned by the fact, that the word in each case on which the stress of the interpretation rests, is not expressed in the text: there is for 1) no ἀεί, for 2) no νῦν. The third agrees well both with the context and with St. John's habit of thought, as well as with matter of fact, and our Lord's own words, John xiii. 34, xv. 12. When Lücke objects to it that thus we have to take παλαιάν and καινήν in two different senses, he hits in fact the very point in which this interpretation approves itself the most to those who are familiar with the oxymoron of St. John's style. As Düsterd. replies, "when I stand at the point of time indicated by ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, and look forwards on the Christian life of the readers, the ἐντολή appears as one long known; the readers have known it from the beginning as an essential commandment, they have had it as long as they have been Christians: on the other hand, if I look backward on the life of the readers before that ἀρχή, whether they were before that Jews or Gentiles, this same commandment of necessity appears as a new one, essentially Christian, first beginning for the readers with that beginning; for even for the Jewish Christians the command of brotherly love is a new one, seeing that it is ordained *in imitation of Christ*, John xiii. 34"), **which** (thing, viz

θινὸν ἤδη [p] φαίνει. [9] ὁ λέγων [q] ἐν τῷ [q] φωτὶ εἶναι καὶ

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

p Act., John i. 4. v. 35. 2 Pet. i. 19. Rev. i. 16. viii. 12. xxi. 23. Gen. i. 17. always intr. in N. T. and LXX. q ch. i. 7. Col. i. 12. Isa. ii. 5.

the fact that the commandment is a new one: see below) **is true in Him and in you: because the darkness is passing away, and the true light is now shining** (i. e. the commandment *is a new one,* and this is true both in (the case of) Him (Christ) and in (the case of) you: because (ἐν ὑμῖν) the darkness is passing away, and (ἐν αὐτῷ) the true light is shining: therefore on both accounts the command is a *new* one: new as regards you, because you are newly come from darkness into light: new as regards Him, because He uttered it when He came into the world to lighten every man, and began that shining which even now continues. This reference of the two clauses I hold fast against Düsterdieck, who maintains that the ὅ refers to the content of the ἐντολή, viz. walking in brotherly love: that the commandment finds its fulfilment (ἀληθές ἐστιν?) in the walk of Christians in union with Christ. But to this there are several objections which he has not noticed: 1) the probable logic of the sentence. The Apostle has made what is apparently a paradoxical assertion. He has stated that the commandment is not new but old, and then has, notwithstanding, asserted its newness. Then he proceeds ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς . . . . ὅτι κ.τ.λ. Is it not probable that this form of sentence introduces the explanation of the paradox? Is it probable, as would be the case on the other view, that so startling a proposition (after ver. 7) as πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, would remain altogether unexplained? 2) the word ἀληθές. Düsterd. says, "The Apostle calls that which is enjoined in the ἐντολή, ἀληθές, because it finds its truth in its living activity, in its practical reality: it is in deed and truth (ἀληθῶς, ver. 5, John iv. 42, (vi. 55)) living and present, and so far *true, real.*" But even granting this sense of ἀληθής to be possible (which may be doubted: ἀληθῶς is clearly no case in point, its adverbial character removing it into another phase of predication), is it likely that so unusual and harsh a word would be chosen as the adj. ἀληθές (rather than the adv. ἀληθῶς) when the obvious sense of ἀληθές would so naturally refer it, in the reader's mind, to the καινότης just asserted? 3) Düsterd. has entirely neglected the repetition of the prep. ἐν, which fact separates off ἐν αὐτῷ and ἐν ὑμῖν as two distinct departments, and prevents their being considered in union. "Him," Christ, the Head, and "you," the readers, as the members, which depend on the Head as the grapes on the true vine, the Apostle regards as united in the real community of life (ch. i. 3 f.), &c. But this would require ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ὑμῖν: and accordingly a little below he says, "Ihm und Euch ist es wahr, was Johannes fordert." 4) The strict present παράγεται is disregarded by D.'s explanation. He upholds indeed a present sense, as against the "*transierunt* tenebræ" of the vulgate ("the darkness is *past,*" E. V.), but makes no further remark, not seeing apparently how peculiarly this present fits the application of the sentence to accounting for the *newness* of the commandment—"You are living in a time when the darkness is rolling away, even now passing:" so that the command, which is of the Light, is well said to be "*new.*"

As in almost every verse of this difficult portion of the Epistle, the divergencies of interpretation are almost endless. Some few only of them can be mentioned here. That recently defended (as above) by Düsterdieck, was before taken by Œc., Luther, Grot., Knapp, Baumg.-Crus., Semler, &c.: that which I have maintained, by Calvin, Socinus, Flacius, Calov., Morus, Horneius, De Wette, Lücke, Neander, Huther. Some take the ὅτι as declarative: "it is true, that the darkness," &c.: so Castellio, Socinus, Bengel, "ὅτι, *quod:* hoc est illud præceptum, amor fratris, ex luce." Erasm., Episcopius, Grot., separate the words ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν into subject and predicate: "quod verum est in illo (Christo), id etiam in vobis verum est," or "esse debet." The whole discussion, carried into most minute detail, may be seen in Düsterdieck's note. To mention two matters of verbal nicety: 1) παράγεται need not be pressed, with Bengel, to its passive meaning: "non dicit παράγει, *transit,* sed -εται, traducitur, commutatur, ut tandem absorbeatur. Idem verbum, ver. 17, ubi opponitur mansioni." But the passive is not necessary for this sense: nay, in ver. 17 it is hardly admissible, and there can be no doubt that the middle was intended, in the same sense as the intr. act., 1 Cor. vii. 31: 2) ἤδη φαίνει, joined with the present παράγεται, is best taken to mean, not the full and entire shining of the true light, but its beginning to shine: its full light at the coming of the Lord, is indeed close at hand, ver. 18, and to that the ἤδη φαίνει looks on.

τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῶν ἐν τῇ [r] σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶν [s] ἕως [s] ἄρτι. [10] ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ [q] ἐν τῷ [q] φωτὶ μένει, καὶ [t] σκάνδαλον οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ· [11] ὁ δὲ μισῶν

r ch. i. 5 reff. s John ii. 10. v. 17. xvi. 24. Matt. xi. 12. 1 Cor. iv. 13. viii. 7. xv. 6 only. t John, Rev. ii. 14 only. = Matt. xvi. 23. xviii. 7 al. Ps. cxviii. 165. Judith v. 20.

9. aft μισων ins ψευστης εστιν και ℵ 15. 43. 98. 137 æth arm Cypr$_1$.

10. rec εν αυτω bef ουκ εστιν, with BKL[P] rel vulg syr arm Thl Œc Aug Fulg Bede: txt ACℵ j spec Syr (copt) sah Lucif.

9, 10.] We now come to the *enunciation of the law of brotherly love*, and in a form resembling that used in ch. i. 8, 10: and in vv. 4 f. First is asserted the incompatibility of living in hatred and walking in the light: then the identity of walking in love and walking in the light: then lastly as a contrast to the last (ὁ ἀγαπῶν . . . . ὁ δὲ μισῶν), the same fact with regard to hatred and the darkness, and the blinding effect on him who walks in it. The φῶς is as before, the light of Christ, now partially shining, but one day to be fully revealed: the σκοτία is the darkness of this present world, now passing away). **He that saith that he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in the darkness until now** (Düsterd. has very properly protested against the softening down of μισεῖν into "minus diligere, posthabere, non colere," &c. "Nothing," he says, "can be more shallow and weak as compared with the ethics of the whole Scripture. All the truth, depth, and power of Christian ethics rests on the 'aut . . aut,' so distinctly insisted on by St. John. On the one side is God, on the other the world: here is life, there is death (ch. iii. 14): here, love; there, hate, i. e. murder (ch. iii. 14 ff.), there is no medium. In the space between, is nothing. Life may as yet be merely elementary and fragmentary. Love may be as yet weak and poor, but still, life in God and its necessary demonstration in love is present really and truly, and the word of our Lord is true, 'He that is not against me is with me,' Luke ix. 50: and on the other side, the life according to the flesh, the attachment to the world, and the necessary action of this selfishness by means of hatred, may be much hidden, may be craftily covered and with splendid outer surface; but in the secret depth of the man, there where spring the real fountains of his moral life, is not God but the world; the man is yet in death, and can consequently love nothing but himself and must hate his brother: and then that other word of the Lord is true, 'He that is not for me is against me,' Luke xi. 23. For a man can only be either for or against Christ, and consequently can only have either love or hate towards his brother." Bengel says well, on ver. 11, "oppositio immediata: ubi non est amor, odium est: cor enim non est vacuum." It has been questioned, who is meant by τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. It seems plain that the expression here is not = τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, seeing that St. John is writing to Christians, and treating of their κοινωνία μετ' ἀλλήλων. On the other hand, if we are to restrict the meaning, as is done by most modern Commentators, to Christian brotherhood, it is plain that we cannot understand strictly τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ in vv. 9, 11, seeing that the man there spoken of is in reality not a Christian at all. So that either we must enlarge the sense of ἀδελφός, or suppose some impropriety of language in the use of the term in these verses, q. d. him who ought to be loved by him as a Christian brother, supposing himself to be really a Christian. This difficulty does not seem to have struck any of the Commentators: but it is one which certainly will not allow us to confine the term to its utmost strictness of meaning. ἕως ἄρτι, *up to this moment:* notwithstanding any apparent change which may have taken place in him when he passed into the ranks of nominal Christians). 10.] **He that loveth his brother abideth in the light** (i. e. the continuance of the habit of brotherly love is a measure of and a guarantee for his continuance in that light whose great command is Love), **and there is no occasion of stumbling in him** (so E. V., excellently. For it is clear by the parallel in ver. 11, that this is what is meant, and not that he gives no occasion of stumbling to others, as Calov., al., "Qui fratrem odit, ipse sibi offendiculum est, et incurrit in seipsum et in omnia intus et foris; qui amat, expeditum iter habet." Bengel. Cf. also John xi. 9, 10, which is in more than one respect the key-text here. For it also explains the apparently difficult ἐν αὐτῷ, occurring as it does there in ver. 10, ἐὰν δέ τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ νυκτί, προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ. The light, and the darkness, by which we walk safely, or stumble, are within ourselves; admitted into us by the eye, whose singleness fills the whole body with light). 11.] **But** (= whereas) **he that hateth**

τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ [r] σκοτίᾳ ἐστίν, καὶ [u] ἐν τῇ [r] σκοτίᾳ [uv] περιπατεῖ καὶ [u] οὐκ οἶδεν [uwx] ποῦ [uw] ὑπάγει, ὅτι ἡ [r] σκοτία [y] ἐτύφλωσεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.

[12] Γράφω ὑμῖν, [z] τεκνία, ὅτι [a] ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ [a] ἁμαρτίαι [b] διὰ τὸ [b] ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. [13] γράφω ὑμῖν, [c] πατέρες,

ABCKL Pℵ abc dfghj klmno 13

u John xii. 35. v ch. i. 6, 7 reff. w as above (u). John iii. 8. viii. 14 bis. xiii. 36. xiv. 5. xvi. 5. x of motion, as above (u, w). John xi. 34. xx. 2, 13, 15. Heb. xi. 8. Gen. xvi. 8. y John xii. 40 (cf. Isa. vi. 10). 2 Cor. iv. 4 only. Isa. xlii. 19 only. z ver. 1 reff. a ch. i. 9 reff. b John xv. 21. Matt. x. 22. xxiv. 9 ‖. (Acts iv. 30. 1 Cor. i. 10.) Rev. ii. 3 only. c see Acts vii. 2. xxii. 1.

[11. for *εστιν*, *μενει* (*see ver* 9) P.]

his brother (see above) **is in the darkness** (has never come out of it: corresponds to *ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει* above: denotes his state, whereas *περιπατεῖ* indicates more his outward acts), **and walketh in the darkness, and knoweth not where** (see reff. *ποῦ* with a verb of motion obviously *includes* that motion: but it includes also the spot on which the motion is taking place: e. g., here, not only the destination to which, but also the way by which, he is going. In some places, this cannot be pressed, as in John viii. 14, where *πόθεν ἦλθον* and *ποῦ* (*ποῖ*) *ὑπάγω* are opposed to one another) **he goeth, because the darkness blinded** (it is a matter of old standing: "*blinded*," and not "*hath blinded*," because it is no new effect of a state into which he has lately come, but the long past work of a state which is supposed to be gone by, and is not) **his eyes.**

12—14.] *Threefold address to the readers, accompanied by a threefold reason for writing to them; all repeated by way of parallelism, with some variations and enlargements.* On the connexion and explanation of these verses, it may be observed, 1) that we have three classes of readers, denoted the first time by *τεκνία*, *πατέρες*, *νεανίσκοι*, and the second time by *παιδία*, *πατέρες*, *νεανίσκοι*. 2) that all three are addressed the first time in the present *γράφω*, the second time in the aorist *ἔγραψα*. 3) that while to the *πατέρες* and *νεανίσκοι* the same words are each time used (to the latter with an addition the second time), the *τεκνία* and *παιδία* are differently addressed. The first question arising is, what do these three classes import, and how are they to be distributed among the readers? It is obvious that the chief difficulty here is with *τεκνία* and *παιδία*. The former word is used by our Apostle once with *μου*, ver. 1, and six times without *μου*; ver. 28, ch. iii. 7, 18, iv. 4, v. 21; but always as importing the whole of his readers; and once it is reported by him as used by our Lord, also in a general address to all His disciples, John xiii. 33. *παιδία* is used by him similarly in our ver. 18, and reported by him as used by our Lord in a general address, John xxi. 5. These facts make it very probable that both the words are here used as general designations of all the readers, and not as a designation of any particular class among them. And this is made more probable, by the fact that if *τεκνία* and *παιδία* did point out the children among them, properly or spiritually so called, the rank of classes would be different from that which would occur to any writer, viz. neither according to ascending age nor to descending, but children, fathers, young men. We seem then to have made it highly probable that *τεκνία* and *παιδία* address all the readers alike. Now if we lay any stress on the third circumstance above mentioned, that *τεκνία* and *παιδία* are differently addressed, and not so *πατέρες* and *νεανίσκοι*, and endeavour therefrom to deduce any distinction between *τεκνία* and *παιδία* in the age or qualities expressed by them, I conceive that we shall establish nothing satisfactory. If a reason for this variation of address is to be discovered, it must be sought in the parallelism of the passage. With these preliminary remarks, we come to the details. **I write to you, little children** (see above), **because** (Socinus, Seb.-Schmidt, Schött., Bengel, Paulus, Sander, Neander, render *ὅτι* "*that.*" But the meaning seems determined for us by ver. 21, where it is quite impossible thus to render it: although even there Bengel tries to be consistent. It is manifest that we must keep the same rendering throughout. The particle then gives the reasons why he writes (*what*, see below on the first *ἔγραψα*) to each class among them) **your sins have been** (perf.: see note on Matt. ix. 2) **forgiven you for the sake of His** (Christ's) **name** (Ἰησοῦς χριστός, the Saviour, the anointed one, bringing to mind all the work wrought out by Him for us, and all the acceptance of that work by the Father: so that it may be well said that on account of, for the sake of, that Name which the Father hath given Him, which is above every name, our sins are forgiven).

13.] **I write to you, fathers, because ye know Him that was** (cf. *ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρ-*

ὅτι [d] ἐγνώκατε τὸν [e] ἀπ᾿ ἀρχῆς. γράφω ὑμῖν, [f] νεανίσκοι, ὅτι νενικήκατε τὸν [g] πονηρόν. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, [h] παιδία, ὅτι

d ch. iv. 6 reff. e see ch. i. 1 (reff.). f Matt. xix. 20. Acts ii. 17, from Joel ii. 28. g masc., Matt. xiii. 19, 38. Eph. vi. 16. ch. iii. 12. v. 18, 19. h = John xxi. 5. ver. 18.

13. rec (for *εγραψα*) *γραφω*, with K rel Orig-int$_1$ Œc: txt ABCL[P]א a j o 13. 36. 40 syrr coptt æth Orig-int$_1$ Cyr Phot Thl.—om from *εγραψα* to *αρχης* ver 14 vulg(not demid fuld harl).—fuld demid harl have *scribo* 5 times, am in the 5th place has *scripsi*.

χῆς, ch. i. 1) **from the beginning** (i.e. in St. John's usage of speech, Christ; see ch. i. 1 and notes). **I write to you, young men, because ye have conquered the wicked one** (the proper attribute of youth is, to carry on the active parts of life: if soldiers, to be engaged in all active service: that of age, to contemplate, and arrive at sound and matured knowledge. The latter have conquered as well, but the burden and heat of their struggle is past: "viribus fortibus et robustis tribuitur supra fortissimum et robustissimum victoria." Carpzov. The πονηρός is he in whom, in whose power, the whole world lieth, ch. v. 19, John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11: the διάβολος, who deceives from the beginning, John viii. 44, ch. iii. 8, 10, 12: whose works Christ came into the world to destroy, ch. iii. 8. He is conquered once and for all, by those who have passed from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, to communion with the Father and the Son, ch. v. 18. Whatever conflict remains for them afterwards, is with a baffled and conquered enemy: is a τηρεῖν αὐτοὺς (ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ), ch. v. 18, which τηρεῖν (see note there), owing to their whole life being led in communion with the Father and Son, is a τηρεῖσθαι, John xvii. 15). He now repeats (see above) the three classes, but with some variations and additions in his reasons for writing to each, and with the aor. ἔγραψα instead of the present γράφω. In seeking a reason for this change of tense, we have a choice between several views of Commentators. These are rather complicated by the fact that many of them read γράφω in the fourth place, against almost all authority. Of those, some, as Calvin, have been fairly baffled by the two aorists following the four presents, and have imagined ver. 14 to be interpolated: "Quanquam fieri potest ut Joannes ipse sententiam de adolescentibus augendi causa secunde inseruerit (illic enim addit fortes esse, quod non prius dixerat), librarii autem temere numerum implere voluerint." Of the rest, some (Storr, Lange, Baumg.-Crus., Schött.) think that the allusion is to St. John's Gospel: others, as Michaelis, to a former epistle; by far the greater part however agree rightly that this Epistle must be meant by both: see Gal. vi. 11, Philem. 19, 21; our vv. 21, 26; ch. v. 13. Still, there is a wide difference in giving each tense a distinct reference. Bengel holds them to import much the same: "a *scribo* transit ad *scripsi*: non temere: scilicet verbo scribendi ex præsenti in præteritum transposito immisit commonitionem firmissimam:" and so Sander, and in the main Neander: "as John has said 'I write to you,' so now he takes up again and sums up that which he has written, saying, 'I have written to you:' q. d., it stands fast: I have nothing more to say: this you must regard as my permanent testimony." And Paulus, comparing the formula "we decree and have decreed." But as Huther remarks, this view presupposes the false rendering of ὅτι by "that." Lücke, after Rickli, with much ingenuity tries to fix ἔγραψα on the preceding portion of the Epistle, keeping γράφω for the following. And in so doing, he fancies he sees a correspondence, in what has preceded and in what follows, with these addresses to different classes of hearers: e.g., in ch. i. 5—7, and ii. 15—17, with ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμ.: in i. 8—ii. 2, and ii. 18—27, with ὅτι ἐγνώκατε . . .: in ii. 3—11, and ii. 28—iii. 22, with ὅτι νενικήκατε . . . But no such correspondence really subsists: and Lücke himself subsequently gave up this view:—see note in Bertheau's edn. of Lücke, p. 265. De Wette and Brückner, with whom Huther agrees, believe γράφω to refer to the immediate act of writing, going on at the moment: ἔγραψα, to what has preceded this point: so that the former refers more to the whole Epistle, the latter to the contents of what has gone before. Düsterdieck disapproves this, and, following Beza, refers both γράφω and ἔγραψα to the *whole Epistle*: the former to the Apostle's immediate act of writing, the latter to the readers' act of reading when complete. In deciding between these two last views, we must bear in mind the epistolary use of the aor. ἔγραψα, according to which it refers, never, that I am aware, when thus used absolutely, to a previous portion of the Epistle, but always to the whole: which circumstance would seem to rule the meaning here, and to determine for Beza and Düs-

[d] ἐγνώκατε [i] τὸν [i] πατέρα. [14] ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, [c] πατέρες, ὅτι [d] ἐγνώκατε [e] τὸν [e] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, [f] νεανίσκοι, ὅτι [j] ἰσχυροί ἐστε καὶ ὁ [k] λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ [k] ἐν ὑμῖν [k] μένει καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν [g] πονηρόν. [15] μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν

i ch. i. 3 reff. j John, here and Rev. (v. 2 al.) only. = 1 Cor. iv. 10. Heb. xi. 34. k = John (only) v. 38. xv. 7, 11. ch. iii. 9, 17 al.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

14. for 1st τον, το B. om του θεου B sah.

terdieck. And no objection lies against their view, as Huther urges, from the change of persons to be supplied (see above): the supply may just as well be thus made, understanding the reference both times to be to the Apostle himself: "I write (γράφω), now that I am writing:" "I wrote (ἔγραψα), when I wrote." **I wrote to you, children** (by παιδία all the readers are meant: see above), **because ye know the Father** (the very word παιδία reminds of πατήρ: and the relation is close, between this and that which is said before, that their sins are forgiven for Christ's name's sake. They are received thus by adoption into God's family, and He is become *their* reconciled Father, as He is the Father of Him through whom they have received their adoption: and one of the first evidences of dawning intelligence in a child is the recognition of its father. But this knowledge of the Father does not precede, nay, it presupposes, communion with the Son: for none knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him, Matt. xi. 27). **I wrote to you, fathers, because ye know Him that was from the beginning** (verbatim as before: to shew perhaps in strong light the great truth of John xvii. 3, that the whole sum of Christian ripeness and experience is, this knowledge of σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν χριστόν. Bengel gives another reason: "Hoc comma ex versu præcedente, non additis pluribus verbis, repetit propositioni tractationem æque brevem subjungens, et modestia ad patres utens, quibus non opus erat multa scribi"). **I wrote to you, young men, because ye are strong** (Ovid, Met. xv. 208, "Transit in æstatem post ver robustior annus, Fitque valens juvenis, neque enim robustior ætas Ulla." Wetst. ἰσχυρός, strong in fight: so in ref. Heb., Luke xi. 21 ||), **and the word of God abideth in you** (i. e. the whole announcement of the good news of the gospel in Christ has found entrance into your hearts and an abiding place there, and there dwells and works. The copulæ may be supplied as Grot., "Illud prius *καί* valet hic *quia*, alterum *καί* positum est pro *ob id*. . . . . Fortes jam estis, non vestris viribus, verum ideo quod verbum illud Dei, profectum a Christo, est in vobis: inde vobis robur tantum obtigit, ut et mundi hujus principem vinceretis"), **and ye have conquered the wicked one** (see above).

15—17.] *Dehortation from the love of the world.* The preceding designation of the different classes has been, as so frequently in St. John, their ideal designation, in the perfection of their several states of Christian life: and now, as so often, he brings that ideal state to bear on real temptations and duties. The love of the Father, the abiding in Him by His word abiding in them, the victory over him in whom ὅλος ὁ κόσμος κεῖται,—these particulars have been enounced: and though there may be a more apparent reason why the young should have this dehortation addressed to them, and more apparent allusion to the νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν in the bringing out of the κόσμος, yet there can be no doubt that it is to *all* that this address is made. All are in the world, and as long as they are, are in danger of being betrayed by the senses to cleave to the things present and seen, to the forgetfulness of those which are absent and unseen. This general reference is shewn by the ἐάν τις which follows. **Love not the world** (what is ὁ κόσμος, in the diction of St. John? And what does he import by ἀγαπᾷν τὸν κόσμον? When we read John iii. 16, οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ., are we to understand the same thing by the words as here? and if not, are *both* κόσμος and ἀγαπᾷν taken in a different sense, or if one only, *which?* Beza replies, "Mundum considerat quatenus cum Dei voluntate non consentit, et enim amorem damnat qui nos a Deo abducit: alioquin dicitur Deus ipse suum mundum infinito quodam amore dilexisse, id est, eos quos ex mundo elegit." The palpable error of this last "id est," directs us to the right solution of both questions. The κόσμος in both cases is the same, the ἀγαπᾷν is different. In John iii. 16 it is the love of divine compassion and creative and redeeming mercy: here, it is the love of selfish desire, cherishing avarice or pride. But then recurs our question, What is ὁ κόσμος? And it is no easy one to

κόσμον, μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον,

answer. If we reply so as to make it *personal*, we are met at once by the difficulty of τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: from which we cannot escape by saying that these are as below ἡ ἐπιθυμία κ.τ.λ., for none can be said ἀγαπᾷν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, but the ἐπιθυμία *is* the ἀγάπη. Hence some have been led to take these three, ἡ ἐπιθ. τῆς σαρκός, ἡ ἐπιθ. τῶν ὀφθ., ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου, as put for the things desired, and the material of the ἀλαζονεία. So Calvin, Episcopius, Bengel: but this manifestly will not hold, owing to the opposition in ver. 17 between ὁ κόσμος κ. ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ on the one hand, and ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ on the other, which evidently requires that its first member should be personal as well as its second. And this last will be a weighty reason also against 2) taking ὁ κόσμος as merely material, the present order of things, in so far as it is alien from God. We are thus brought to a point, for our understanding of ὁ κόσμος, intermediate between personal and material. But then our question is, which of the two is to take the first place? Is ὁ κόσμος the world of matter, including the men who dwell in it, or is it the world of man, including matter as subordinate to man? If the former, we seem in danger of falling into a dualism, in which God and the world of matter should be set over against one another as independent existences: for thus the evil one, the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου, and his agents the κοσμοκράτορες, would themselves be included in the κόσμος, and adjuncts to the world of matter: a mode of thought which no where appears in the apostolic writings. We are thus narrowed to our other alternative, that of understanding ὁ κόσμος as of human persons, including the inferior ranks of created being, and the mass of inanimate matter which they inhabit. Let us see whether this view will meet the necessities of our text and of similar passages. Thus understood, the κόσμος was constituted at first in Adam, well-pleasing to God and obedient to Him: it was man's world, and in man it is summed up: and in man it fell from God's light into the darkness of selfish pursuits and ἐπιθυμίαι κοσμικαί, in and by which man, who should be rising through his cosmic corporeal nature to God, has become materialized in spirit and dragged down so as to be worldly and sensual and like him who has led him astray, and who now, having thus subjected man's nature by temptation, has become the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου. And thus the κόσμος is "*man and man's world*," in his and its fall from God. It was this world which God loved, in its enmity to Him, with the holy love of Redemption: it is this world which we are not to love, in its alienation from Him, with the selfish love of participation. And this κόσμος is spoken of sometimes as personal, sometimes as material, according to the context in which it occurs. To give but a few decisive examples; of the purely personal sense, John xv. 18, εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ κ.τ.λ., followed by εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν, where the singular is broken up into the individual persons: of the purely material, John xi. 9, ἐάν τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου βλέπει. And in passages like the present, these two senses alternate with and interpenetrate one another: e.g. in τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, the κόσμος is apparently material and local: in the opposition which follows, between the love of the world and the love of the Father, the personal meaning begins to be evident: in what follows, πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, which at first sight seems material, is explained by ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός, κ.τ.λ., which are the subjective desires of the τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, not the things themselves: then, finally, in ver. 17 where ὁ κόσμος καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ is opposed to ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, it is plain that we have passed, by the transition in the last verse, from the material to the personal sense altogether. This account may serve to explain that which has given so much trouble to Commentators here, the question whether ἐπιθυμία is not put for the thing itself which is desired: the fact being that, the κόσμος including the material world *in* the men, the ἐπιθυμίαι, which are in the men, are in the κόσμος, as well as the things of which they are the desires, and which are in their turn included in them. See on the whole, the long and elaborate note in Düsterdieck, the results of which are nearly the same as those arrived at above. To detail all the shades of opinion, would be hopeless: they will mostly be found, classified and discussed, in the note referred to), nor yet (not = μήτε, but carrying with it an exclusive and disjunctive force, implying that what follows is not identical with what went before. That was spoken of the world itself, the totality: "have no love for this present world as such." But an escape from this prohibition might be sought by men who would deny in the abstract the charge of worldly-mindedness,

l = ver. 5 reff. m Gal. v. 16. Eph. ii. 3. 2 Pet. ii. 18. (Rom. xiii. 14.) n John viii. 44. Jude 16, 18. Rev. xviii. 14.

οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ [l]ἀγάπη [l]τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ· [16] ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἡ [mn]ἐπιθυμία τῆς [m]σαρκὸς καὶ ἡ [n]ἐπιθυμία

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

15. [η αγαπη του πατρος bef ουκ εστιν P: η αγ. τ. π. εν αυ. bef ουκ εστιν m.] for πατρος, θεου AC d 13 harl æth Cyr: txt BKL[P]ℵ rel vulg syrr coptt arm Orig Thl Œc Cypr$_3$ Aug.

but devoted themselves to some one object of those followed by worldly men: so that it is necessary to add, after "Love not the world,"—"no, nor any thing in it") **the things in the world** (explained above: here, the objects after which the ungodly world's ἐπιθυμία reaches out, and on which its ἀλαζονεία is founded). **If any man** (see on the same expression above, ver. 1) **love the world, the love of the Father is not in him** (ἡ ἀγ. τοῦ πατρός, love *to* the Father, as opposed to his love to the world: not as Luther (2), Seb.-Schmidt, and Calov., the love *which the Father hath shewed to us:* nor as Bengel, "amor Patris erga suos et filialis erga Patrem." As Bede, "unum cor duos sibi tam adversarios amores non capit." Philo says, fragm. ex Joh. Damasceni sacris parallelis, p. 370 B (vol. ii. p. 649), ἀμήχανον συνυπάρχειν τὴν πρὸς κόσμον ἀγάπην τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀγάπῃ, ὡς ἀμήχανον συνυπάρχειν ἀλλήλοις φῶς καὶ σκότος). **16.**] *Gives a reason for the assertion in ver.* 15: viz. the entire separation from one another of the world and God. In order to understand clearly the following, it is necessary to define strictly the things mentioned, and to lay down explicitly the apposition between πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κ., and the three particulars which follow as included in that category. By some Commentators this has been altogether passed over: by others very variously done. I apprehend it can only be rightly done by bearing in mind what was said before,—that, as the world is summed up in man, both those objective material things which are properly τὰ ἐν τῷ κ., and those inward subjectivities which are in man and grounded on his cosmic state, are regarded as being ἐν τῷ κ., and these pass into, and are almost interchanged with, one another. Now here, the three things spoken of as examples of τὰ ἐν τῷ κ., are all purely subjective,—ἐπιθυμία, ἐπιθυμία, ἀλαζονεία. But they are subjectivities having their ground in the objectivities of the ungodly world: the first ἐπιθυμία springs out of (see below) the σάρξ, the human nature unrenewed by God: the second resides in that sense which takes note of outward things and so is inflamed by them; and the ἀλαζονεία is that belonging to ὁ βίος, the manner of life of worldly men among one another, whereby pride as to display and pomp is cherished. Now each one of these three is included in, and includes in itself, love to the world: and he that loves the world falls into, walks after, becomes part of, these lusts, and this ἀλαζονεία, which is not of the Father but of the world. Loving the things of the world, he becomes *conformed* to the world, and following the lusts and pride which are in the world, he himself becomes one of the things in the world. **Because every thing that is in the world,** (namely, or for instance) **the lust of the flesh** (τῆς σαρκός is not, as made by so many Commentators, an objective gen., so that the words should mean, "lust after the flesh," i.e. impure desire: this they include, but far more. The gen. is subjective, the flesh being that wherein the lust dwells, as in reff.: and in ἐπιθ. τῶν καρδιῶν, Rom. i. 24: cf. Prov. xxi. 26, Sir. v. 2, xviii. 30,—τοῦ σώματος, Rom. vi. 12,—τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 1 Pet. iv. 2: cf. 2 Pet. iii. 3, Jude 16, 18,—and cf. also such expressions as ἐπιθυμίαι κοσμικαί, Tit. ii. 12, and σαρκικαί, 1 Pet. ii. 11. The gen. after ἐπιθυμία is never, either in LXX or N. T., objective. Cf. some passages in which it occurs in other than the subjective sense, but never of the object desired: Eph. iv. 22, 2 Pet. ii. 10. In Phil. i. 23, only Origen reads after ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων, τοῦ ἀναλῦσαι instead of εἰς τὸ ἀν.), **and the lust of the eyes** (subjective gen. as before: the lust which the eye begets by seeing. In the apocryphal Testament of the twelve patriarchs (Fabricius, cod. Pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. p. 522), among the seven πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης is enumerated the πνεῦμα ὁράσεως, μεθ' ἧς γίνεται ἐπιθυμία. Sander, whose commentary, otherwise useful, is disfigured throughout by an ill-natured spirit of carping at Lücke and De Wette, denies the applicability of this passage, understanding ἐπιθυμ. τῶν ὀφθ. as (if I rightly take his meaning, which is not very clear) the desire of seeing, as of the man who would not come to the supper because he must *go and see* his five yoke of oxen. But his whole view of this difficult passage is very superficial), **and the vain-glory of life** (the ἀλαζών is one who lays claim to credit or glory which is not his own: see notes on Rom. i. 30 and

τῶν [o] ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἡ [p] ἀλαζονεία τοῦ [q] βίου, οὐκ ἔστιν [r] ἐκ [s] τοῦ [s] πατρός, ἀλλ' [r] ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστίν. [17] καὶ ὁ κόσμος [t] παράγεται, καὶ ἡ [u] ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ [u] ποιῶν τὸ [u] θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ [v] μένει [v] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. [18] [w] Παιδία,

o see Ezek. xxiv. 16. Gen. iii. 6. p James iv. 16 only. Wis l. xvii. 7. Hos. v. 5 Aq. The. (-ζων, 2 Tim. iii. 2.) q = Luke viii. 14. r = 2 Tim. ii. 4. John iii. 31. viii. 23, 44. ch. iii. 10. iv. 1, &c. s = ch. i. 3 reff. t ver. 8 reff. u John iv. 34. vi. 38. vii. 17. ix. 31. Matt. vii. 21. xii. 50 ‖ Mk. Eph. vi. 6. Heb. x. 7, 9 (from Ps. xxxix. 8), 36. v John viii. 35. xii. 34. 2 Cor. ix. 9. Heb. vii. 24. 1 Pet. i. 25 only. Ps. lxxxviii. 36. w = ver. 13.

16. (αλλα BC Thl.) 17. om *αυτου* A[P] 5. 13. 27·9 (66) arm-zoh Orig.

James iv. 16. **βίος** here as in ref. is men's way or course of life. So in Polyb. vi. 57. 6, *ἡ περὶ τοὺς βίους ἀλαζονεία κ. πολυτέλεια*: he having before observed, *τοὺς βίους γενέσθαι πολυτελεστέρους*. This *βίος* comprehends in it the means of living and fashion of living,—table, furniture, equipage, income, rank; and the *ἀλαζονεία* arising out of these is that vainglorious pride, which is so common in the rich and fashionable), **is not of** (springs not from, has not as its source: see below) **the Father** (this name is again used for God, in reference to *τεκνία* and *παιδία* above), **but is of the world** (has its origin from the world. It is necessary, in opposition to all such interpretations as that of Socinus, "valde dissident ab eis quæ Deus per Christum nos sectari jussit," and Rosenmüller, "non est in his perfectio moralis," to lay down very distinctly St. John's limits of thought and speech in this matter. "Through our whole Epistle," says Düsterdieck (cf. especially ver. 29, ch. iii. 7 ff., iv. 2 ff., 7 ff., v. 1 ff.), "runs the view, which also is manifest in the Gospel of St. John, that only the mind which springs from God is directed to God. He who is born of God, loves God, knows God (vv. 3 ff.), does God's will. God Himself, who first loved us, viz. in Christ His incarnate Son, begot in us that love which of moral necessity returns again to the Father, and of like necessity embraces our brethren also. This love is hated by the world, because it springs not from the world. It depends not on the world, any more than that perverted love which springs from the world and is directed towards the world, the lust of the flesh, &c., can be directed to the Father, or to God's children. So that John grasps in reality down to the very foundations of the moral life, when he reminds his readers of the essentially distinct origin of the love of the world, and the love of God. The inmost kernel of the matter is hereby laid bare, and with it a glimpse is given of the whole process of the love of the world, and the love of God, even to the end; and this end is now set forth expressly with extraordinary power:" viz., in the next verse).

17.] **And the world is passing away, and the lust of it** (**αὐτοῦ** is subjective again: not as Lücke, Neander, Sander, objective, "*the lust after it*," but as in ver. 16, which see on the construction: **ἡ ἐπιθ. αὐτοῦ** summing up in one the three which are there mentioned. **παράγεται** as in ver. 8: not declaring merely an attribute, that it is the quality of the world and its lust to pass away,—but a matter of fact, that it is even now in act so to pass. See Meyer on 1 Cor. vii. 31. It is no objection to this, that the **μένει**, which is opposed to *παράγεται*, contains, not a matter of fact, but a qualitative predication. This is made necessary by the words *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* which that clause contains): **but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever** (in this latter member of the contrast, we have a clearly personal agent introduced: and therefore, as above remarked, we may expect that the former member also will have a like personal reference. But this expectation must not be pushed *too far*: seeing that in the *κόσμος*, the ungodly men, who are in all their desires and thoughts *ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου*, are included. They and their lusts belong to, are part of, depend on, a world which is passing away. On the other hand, eternal fixity and duration belongs only to that order of things, and to those men, who are in entire accordance with the will of God. And among these is ***he that doeth that will***, which is (see vv. 3—6) the true proof and following out of love towards Him. As God Himself is eternal, so is all that is in communion with Him: and this are they who believe in Him and love Him, and do His will).

18—28.] Warning against antichrists and false teachers (vv. 18—23): and exhortation to abide in Christ (vv. 24—28). The place which this portion holds will be best seen by strictly recapitulating. "God is light, and in Him is no darkness:" that (ch. i. 5) is the ground-tone of this whole division of the Epistle. In ch. i. 5—ii. 11, the Apostle shews, wherein the believer's

x ἐσχάτη y ὥρα ἐστίν, καὶ καθὼς ἠκούσατε ὅτι z ἀντί-

x = Acts ii. 17. 2 Tim. iii. 1. James v. 3. 1 Pet. i. 5. Isa. ii. 2. 3. 2 John 7 only †.
y = John iv. 21, 23. Rev. iii. 10. xv. 7, 15.
z here bis. ver. 22. ch. iv. 3. 2 John 7 only †.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

18. om 1st και K. om 1st οτι AL æth-rom. [P def.] rec ins ο bef αντι-

walking in light consists. At ver. 12, his style takes at once a hortatory turn. In his addresses to the various classes of his readers, the tone of warning is slightly struck by νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν: if indeed the whole form of assertion of an ideal state in each case do not of itself carry a delicate shade of warning. Hence the transition is easy to actual warning. And this in vv. 15—17 begins by general dehortation from the love of the world as excluding the love of God, and now proceeds by caution against those in the world who would rob them of Him by whom alone walking in the light of God is made both possible and actual to us. The note of transition from the last verses is the παράγεται, here taken up by ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν. The world is passing away: and those temptations and conflicts of which ye have heard as belonging to its last period, are now upon you: those adversaries who would endanger your abiding in Him and being found in Him at His coming.

18.] **Children** (παιδία, as before, is addressed not to any one class, but to all the readers), **it is the last time** (what is exactly the Apostle's meaning by these words? Clearly, *in some sense or other*, that it is the last period of the world. For we must at once repudiate such views as that of Bengel, who, strange to say, seems to understand it as "*extrema Johannis ætas*," and that of Steinhofer, who explains it to be John's own time as the *close of the Apostolic age:* and even more decidedly that of Œc. (ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἔσχατον καὶ κατὰ τὸ χείριστον ἐκλαβεῖν, ὡς ὅταν φαμέν, εἰς ἔσχατον ἀφῖγμαι κακοῦ), Schöttgen, Carpzov., Rosenm., for all other reasons, and on account of the saying 2 Tim. iii. 1, ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. These then being cleared away, we come to the view of Grot.: "ultimum tempus, ubi ad Judæos sermo est, significat tempus proximum excidio urbis ac templi et reipublicæ Judæorum," proceeding to interpret the ἀντίχριστοι to be the many false Christs who arose in that period, and ἀντίχριστος to be the chief of them, Barchochebas. So Hammond, Mede, Lightfoot, Socinus: and similarly, but not so decidedly, Episcopius. But two sufficient replies may be given to this view. First, that thus these false Messiahs of the Jews must have gone forth ἐξ ἡμῶν, i. e. from the Christian Church, which they did not. Secondly, what would the approximation of the destruction of Jerusalem, viewed merely as a Jewish event (which it must be, on the hypothesis here, as ἐσχάτη would only be true as addressed to Jews), have to do with the subject of our Epistle?

And thus we have arrived at the views of those who recognize here the last age of the world, but are anxious to get rid of the idea that the Apostle, in thus speaking, regarded the coming of the Lord as near at hand, and endeavour to give some meaning to the expression which shall preclude this (to them) objectionable notion. Among these may be mentioned Calvin, and many of the elder Commentators (e. g. Aug., Bede, Schol. I., Œc., Thl.), who understand the *latter dispensation:* the time from Christ's advent in the flesh to His coming to judgment. This is (Calv.) "ultimum tempus, in quo sic complentur omnia, ut nihil supersit præter ultimam Christi revelationem." With this in the main, Beza, Wolf, Lücke, De Wette, Neander, Sander, also agree. But, apart from considerations of the unfitness of such an idea in the context, in which παράγεται, vv. 8, 17,—and our ver. 28, shew that it is the coming of the Lord which is before the mind of the Apostle,—this objection is fatal to it: that manifestly not this whole period itself, but some time within its limits is meant, from the nature of the sign given below, ὅθεν γινώσκομεν κ.τ.λ. If the whole Christian dispensation were intended by ἐσχάτη ὥρα, it would not be stated as a sign of its presence, that already there were many antichrists, but rather that already He was come who is to be the final revelation of the Father. The circumstance of there being already many antichrists, corresponds with a prophecy delivered by our Lord, not of the general character of the whole of the last dispensation, but of the particular character of the time preceding τὸ τέλος, to which prophecy and to which time the Apostle here beyond question alludes.

Düsterdieck's interpretation is founded in some respects on those of Socinus and Grotius, impugned above,—but with this difference, that he believes the expression to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem considered not as a Jewish, but as a Christian event: as opening that period of judgment, which shall precede the end, and the

χριστος [a] ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν [z] ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγό- [a] pres., Matt. xi. 3. xvii. 11. John iv. 25. vii. 41, 42 al. Isa. v. 26.

χριστος, with AKLℵ[3] rel Thl Œc: om BCℵ[1] arm Orig[2] Epiph[2]. [P def.]

length of which was no where laid down in our Lord's prophecies, nor revealed to the Apostles. But thus, with all his anxiety to escape the ascribing to the Apostles a mistaken view as to the nearness of the Lord's second coming, he does in fact fall unavoidably into that class of interpreters, by regarding that as left uncertain, of which the apostolic prophecies seem to speak with some certainty. And I believe that if we are to deal ingenuously both with words and with facts, we must recognize this difficulty here, as well as in such passages as 1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.; 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff.; and understand the Apostle to be speaking, as any one in any subsequent age of the Church might have spoken, and as we may speak now, of his time as being the last time, seeing that the signs of the last time were rife in it. How long it may please God to prolong this ἐσχάτη ὥρα, how long to permit the signs to continue which demonstrate each age of the church to have this character, is a question to which it was not given to him, and is not given to us, to reply. To him indeed many prophetic visions were given, and have been recorded for us; but what is their plain and unmistakable import, will only then be known, when it becomes necessary for the churches to see clearly the signs of His coming): **and even as ye heard** (in our preaching, when ye received the Gospel) **that antichrist cometh** (ἔρχεται, the present of ordained fixity: "*is to come.*" But who, and what, is ἀντίχριστος? As far as the meaning of the word is concerned, it may mean, either 1) one who stands *against* Christ, or 2) one who stands *instead of* Christ. The latter meaning is strenuously maintained here by Grotius, who holds that our ἀντίχριστος here has nothing to do with the ἀντικείμενος of St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3: that being "qui Deo summo se hostem profitetur," whereas this is "qui se Christum facit:" understanding this and what follows (see above) of the ψευδόχριστοι prophesied of by our Lord, Matt. xxiv. 5, 24. This he defends by ἀντιβασιλεύς, meaning a *viceroy*, not an adversary of the king. And as Düsterd. suggests, he might have cited more instances on his side: ἀντίψυχος, in Ignat. Smyrn. 10, p. 716; Eph. 21, p. 661; Polyc. 2, 6, pp. 721, 725, in the sense of ἀντίλυτρον: the Homeric ἀντίθεος, "equal to the gods:" ἀνθύπατος, a proconsul, &c. But seeing that the other meaning, "adversarius Christi," is also upheld by precedent,—e. g. τύπος—ἀντίτυπος, ἀντιφιλόσοφος, ἀντιφάρμακον, ἀντίθεος in Homer also = enemy to the gods (so Chrys. on 2 Thess. ii. 4, ἀντίθεός τις ἔσται, κ. πάντας καταλύσει τοὺς θεούς, κ. κελεύσει προσκυνεῖν αὐτὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ θεοῦ), ἀντιφύλαξ, ἀντιμαχητής, ἀντικάτων (the book written by Cæsar against Cato), &c.,—it is clear that we cannot solve the doubt by philology alone, but must take into account other considerations. And first among these comes the fact, that St. John, who was acquainted with the form ψευδόχριστος, using as he does ψευδοπροφήτης, ch. iv. 1, never uses it, but always (see reff.) this word ἀντίχριστος. Is it not hence probable that he intended to signify, not a false Christ, but an antichrist? Next, we may fairly allege the ancient interpretations, as shewing how Greeks themselves understood the word. In these we do not find a vestige of the meaning ψευδόχριστος being attached to the term ἀντίχριστος (Hippolyt. de Antichristo, § 6, p. 734, Migne, κατὰ πάντα ἐξομοιοῦσθαι βούλεται ὁ πλάνος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, is not really to the point; it does not give a meaning to ἀντίχριστος, but only alleges an undeniable feature in his character. The same may be said of Iren. Hær. v. 28. 2, p. 326, "ut sicut Christum adorent illum qui seducentur ab illo:" and of that of Hippolytus, de Christo et Antichristo, c. 49, p. 768, ἐξομοιοῦσθαι μέλλει τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, and indeed of all the passages where the Greek Fathers, as Cyril, Theodoret, &c., speak of the likeness of antichrist to Christ), but every where (see e. g. the quotations in Suicer) they interpret ἀντίχριστος by ἐναντίος τῷ χριστῷ. The most decided is Thl., πάντως ὁ ψεύστης ἐναντίος ὢν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἤτοι τῷ χριστῷ ἀντίχριστός ἐστι. So also the Latins: Tert. de præscr. hær. 4, vol. ii. p. 16,—"qui antichristi, interim et semper, nisi Christi rebelles?" —Aug. in loc.,—"Latine Antichristus est, contrarius Christo:" and so Bede. And lastly our ver. 22 is quite against Grot.'s view, where ἀντίχριστος is interpreted, not ὁ προσποιούμενος χριστὸν εἶναι, but ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα κ. τὸν υἱόν, which is explained, ver. 23, to be involved in ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν υἱόν. Taking then (ὁ) ἀντίχριστος for Christ's adversary, I would refer to the disquisition and summary of opinions in the Prolegomena to Vol. III. on

b = Heb. ii. 17. viii. 3 al.
c Matt. ii. 6. Acts xv. 24. Deut. xiii. 13.
d so Mark xiv 20. see ver. 16.

νασιν, [b] ὅθεν γινώσκομεν ὅτι [x] ἐσχάτη [y] ὥρα ἐστίν. 19 [c] ἐξ ἡμῶν [c] ἐξῆλθαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν [d] ἐξ ἡμῶν, εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n 13

γινωσκωμεν A.

19. (εξηλθαν, so ABC.) εξ ημων bef ησαν (2nd time) BC a (Syr) syr coptt

2 Thess. ii. 1 ff., where the reasons which have induced me to expect a personal Antichrist are given in full: as are also the indications furnished by prophecy, and by the history of the church and the world, as to his probable character and work), **even now there have arisen many antichrists** (not, "even now many have become antichrists:" this would rather be *ἀντίχριστοι γεγόνασιν πολλοί*, or *πολλοὶ ἀντίχ. γεγ.* By the *πολλοί* being thrown between the subst. and the verb, it is shewn to be only an epithet, not the subject of the proposition. But what are we to understand the Apostle as saying? Is this fact alleged as a presumption that *ὁ ἀντίχριστος* is *near*, these *πολλοὶ ἀντίχριστοι* prefiguring and heralding him,—or as a proof that he is come, being in fact the aggregate of these? The question is an important one, as affecting that of a personal or collective antichrist. And the first thing to be noticed in answering it is, that these *ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί* are explained by the Apostle himself, ver. 22 f., to be deniers of the Father and the Son: i. e. of the Son: and even more explicitly, ch. iv. 3, deniers that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. Here, however, this latter point is not yet brought out: here it is as *ψεῦσται* that we hear of them: as *deniers* of the truth, which Truth is Jesus Christ, the Son of God: as not having the Spirit, which is truth and no lie, ver. 27. They are said to have gone forth from the Christian church, but not to have been *ἐξ ἡμῶν*, as their spirit *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν*, ch. iv. 3. They are *ἀντίχριστοι*; their spirit is *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου*, ibid., of which the readers had heard that it should come, and it was in the world already. From much of this it might at first sight appear as if these *ἀντίχριστοι* in their aggregate formed *ὁ ἀντίχριστος*. But a nearer inspection will convince us that this cannot be so. (*ὁ*) *χριστός* and (*ὁ*) *ἀντίχριστος* stand over against one another, and analogy requires that if the one be personal, the other should be also. And in ch. iv. 3 we are not told that merely the spirit is *ἀντιχρίστου*, but that it is *τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου*, the personal reference being still kept. Again, we have *ἔρχεται*, the present future of prophetic fixity, in both places, here and in ch. iv. 3, set against *γεγόνασιν* and *ἐστίν*: and the verb itself, in its prophetic sense, one regularly used of Christ, as here of antichrist. So that our only refuge in order to consistent interpretation here, is to regard these *ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί* clothed with the attributes and having the spirit of *ὁ ἀντίχριστος*, as being his forerunners, in the sense of 2 Thess. ii. 7, *τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας*: meaning, as I have explained at length in the summary referred to above, that the antichristian principle was then, as it is now, and will be in every age, working, realizing, and concentrating itself from time to time, in evil men and evil books and evil days, but awaiting its final development and consummation in (*ὁ*) *ἀντίχριστος*, who shall personally appear before the coming of the Lord. In St. John's time these *ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί* were to be seen in the early heretical teachers whose false and corrupting doctrine and practice was beginning to trouble the church. See again, Düsterdieck's long and elaborate note, in which he has discussed all the difficulties of the subject. He in the main agrees with the conclusion given above; as do also De Wette, Lücke, Erdmann): **from whence we know that it is the last time** (these words are a formal statement of the connexion between the first and second members of the foregoing sentence, which without them it would be left for the reader to supply in his mind).

19.] These antichrists are designated as having been formerly attached to the Christian church, but never really members of it. They had not that communion with the Father and the Son in which the communion of Christians with one another really consists, inasmuch as they deny the Father and the Son. **They went out from among us, but they were not of us** (it is plain that the prep. *ἐξ* must in this sentence be taken in two different meanings: first, with *ἐξῆλθαν*, in the mere local reference, and even so our Lord Himself uses the expression, John viii. 42, *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω*, words which are varied, John xiii. 3, by *ἀπό*, and xvi. 27 by *παρά*. And in xiii. 3, the local meaning is stamped as the true one by the addition of *καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει*. On the other hand, *ἐκ* with *εἶναι* is very frequently used by our Apostle to denote that inner and vital dependence which betokens *origin*: cf. John iii. 31, vii. 17, viii. 23,

[d] ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενήκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν· ἀλλ' ἵνα [e] φανερω- [e John iii. 21. 2 Cor. iii. 3.]

Tert Opt Ambr$_2$: txt AKL[P]ℵ rel vulg arm Clem Orig Cyr-jer Epiph Thl Œc Iren-int Orig-int Cypr Lucif.

44, &c. It is clear then from this double meaning of ἐξ, that ἐξῆλθαν ἐξ ἡμῶν should be rendered with Aug. and Bede, "ex nobis exierunt," and not "ex nobis *pro*dierunt," as vulg. The idea of origin should be kept out of view, as necessarily not contained in the words, which are to be understood as Œc. and Thl., γεγονότες μαθηταὶ ἀπέστησαν τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἰδίας βλασφημίας ἐξεῦρον. Aug. and Bede illustrate their relation to the body of Christ by a homely but instructive comparison: "quandoquidem adhuc curatur corpus ipsius (Domini nostri Jesu Christi), et sanitas perfecta non erit nisi in resurrectione mortuorum; sic sunt in corpore Christi, quomodo humores mali. Quando evomuntur, tunc relevatur corpus: sic et mali quando exeunt, tunc ecclesia relevatur. Et dicit quando eos evomit atque projicit corpus, ex me exierunt humores isti, sed non erant ex me. Quid est, non erant ex me? Non de carne mea præcisi sunt, sed pectus mihi premebant dum inessent." Aug. in Ep. Joh. Tract. iii. 4, vol. iii. p. 1999. On this, see more below): **for if they had been of us** (ἐξ ἡμῶν is emphatically repeated), **they would have remained with us** (the E. V. inserts "*no doubt*," as representing the "*utique*" of the vulgate, which was the result of the futile endeavour to render the Greek verbatim, and was intended to give the ἄν. In some places this endeavour has produced results more serious than here. In John iv. 10, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας is rendered "*tu forsitan petiisses*," and by the Rheims version, "Thou perhaps wouldest have asked of Him:" in John v. 46, "*si enim crederetis Mosi, crederetis forsitan et mihi:*" see also Vulgate, and Rheims, and Bishops' Bible, in John viii. 42, Matt. xi. 23. I am indebted for this useful remark to the Rev. Henry Craik of Bristol.

The sense is, if they had really belonged to our number, had been true servants of Christ, they would have endured, and would not have become ἀντίχριστοι: their very becoming so, proves the unreality of their Christian profession. This point is now brought out in what follows): **but** (the ellipsis is variously supplied: by ἐξῆλθαν from above; so the Syr., Bengel, Lücke, al.: by τοῦτο πεποιήκασιν, πεπόνθασιν, as Œc., Thl.: "hoc factum est," as Socinus: "hæc facit Deus," as Calvin. All these in fact come to the same, provided that we keep ἵνα to its true telic meaning, which must imply a *doer;* and that doer, God. So that it will be better, as the divine purpose must be understood in the depth of the meaning, whatever be supplied, to take the simplest supplement, viz. the ἐξῆλθαν, which is already the expressed verb of the sentence) **in order that they may be made manifest, that all are not of us** (the construction is a mixed one, compounded of two, 1) ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, and 2) ἵνα φανερωθῇ ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν: and the meaning is, that by their example it may be made manifest that all (who are among us) are not of us. This is shewn by the change of tense from ἦσαν to εἰσίν: and by the impossibility of giving any adequate grammatical sense to the words on the other hypothesis, viz. that πάντες means "they all," viz. the ἀντίχριστοι. For, of the two ways in which the words have been taken, we have 1) that of the E. V. "that they were not all of us," which leaves open the inevitable conclusion that *some of them are of us*. Œcumenius indeed tries to make the distinction in another way,—τουτέστι κατάδηλοι γίνωνται ὅτι πάντῃ ἀπηλλοτρίωνται ἡμῶν καὶ μετὰ τῶν οὐχ ἡμετέρων προσεκολλήθησαν. εἰσὶ γάρ τινες ἐν τούτοις καὶ οὐχ ἐξ ἡμῶν ὄντες, οἷς δηλαδὴ συνῆψαν ἑαυτοὺς οἱ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξελθόντες . . . . ἡμῶν γὰρ ἀποῤῥαγέντες τῶν οἰκείων, ἄλλοις ἐκολλήθησαν τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις ἡμῶν. But this is manifestly a mistake, and is in fact a confounding of ἐξ ἡμῶν εἶσιν with ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν, which the Apostle expressly distinguishes. Then 2) we have the way proposed by Socinus, to take οὐ πάντες for "nulli;" not "non omnes" but "omnes non:" in fact making οὐκ belong to the predicate, εἰσὶν ἐξ ἡμῶν, not to the subject, πάντες; which is the case in Rom. iii. 20, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ. But it may fairly be replied here, that whereas in that passage there is no ambiguity whatever, the words πᾶσα σάρξ falling emphatically at the end, here there would be every chance of the reader mistaking the meaning, no such stress lying on the πάντες as would lie if the arrangement were οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐξ ἡμῶν πάντες, or πάντες οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐξ ἡμῶν. So that our only refuge seems to be, to believe that the Apostle makes their φανέρωσις the proof not that *they* were not of us, but that *all* are not of us, scil. who are commonly found among us. This is the rendering of the principal

θῶσιν ᵉ ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν πάντες ᵈ ἐξ ἡμῶν. ²⁰ καὶ ὑμεῖς

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

modern Commentators: cf. Lücke, De Wette, Düsterdieck, Huther. See on the sense, 1 Cor. xi. 19, δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα (καὶ) οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν. It is not my intention to go at length into the question as to the dogmatic consequences which have been deduced from this verse. It may be sufficient to refer my readers to the principal sources of the two antagonistic opinions as to the final perseverance (not of the elect, which is a truism, but) of those who have been once truly children of God. They will find the most complete statement of the predestinarian view as founded on our passage, in Augustine, De dono perseverantiæ, 8, 9 (19, 21), vol. x. p. 1003 f. and De correptione et gratia, 9 (20), p. 928. In the former passage he says, "Hominibus videtur omnes qui boni apparent fideles perseverantiam usque in finem accipere debuisse. Deus autem melius esse judicavit, miscere quosdam non perseveraturos certo numero sanctorum, ut quibus non expedit in hujus vitæ tentatione securitas, non possint esse securi, 1 Cor. x. 12. Ex duobus autem piis cur huic donetur perseverantia usque in finem, illi autem non detur, inscrutabiliora sunt judicia Dei. Illud tamen fidelibus debet esse certissimum, hunc esse ex prædestinatis, illum non esse. Nam si fuissent ex nobis, ait unus prædestinatorum, qui de pectore Domini bibebat hoc secretum, mansissent utique nobiscum." See also Calvin h. l., who sums up all thus, "Quare non immerito dicit, ubi efficax est Dei vocatio, illic certam perseverantiam fore." The other side is ably stated by Didymus (cited in Düsterd.), whose conclusion is, "Igitur, licet figurate dicta sint hæc, attamen voluntariam necessitatem ostendunt, a quorum et cohabitatione quæ potest esse malis viris cum bonis abscesserint, dum vitio suo tales sint facti. Non igitur oportet intelligi contrarietatem hoc verbo significari naturarum." The various opponents of the predestinarian view as such, have had recourse, as so often, to various unworthy artifices and untenable explainings away of words, to escape from the inference pressed on them. Thus Socinus and Episcopius lay stress on the fact that ἦσαν is imperfect, not perfect: "non enim Apostolus dicit antichristos illos nunquam antea vere Christianos fuisse, sed tantum quod tum, vel jam antequam antichristos se esse profiterentur, non erant ii, qui esse debebant," &c. And so even Grot. ("qui ista crepitabant, jam deseruerant Christianam professionem . . . Si illi tunc ex animo fuissent Christiani cum ista inciperent, non deseruissent cœtus nostros"). Calov. again tries to escape from the inference, by making ἐξ ἡμῶν apply not to Christians in general, but to the Apostles only.

The best account of the whole matter is found in Düsterdieck's long note, in which he has thoroughly gone over all the opinions and given his own conclusion. It is, in the main, as follows. The Apostle is speaking here not dogmatically but ethically. As Didymus above, if there is a necessity in the μεμενήκεισαν, it is a "necessitas voluntaria." As Aug. in his comm. here (written sixteen years before the treatise De dono perseverantiæ), "de voluntate sua quisque aut Antichristus, aut in Christo est. Aut in membris sumus, aut in humoribus malis. Qui se in melius commutat, in corpore membrum est: qui autem in malitia permanet, humor malus est: et quando exierit, relevabuntur qui premebantur." We must take these words, ver. 19, in intimate connexion with the enunciation of this whole portion of the Epistle, ch. i. 5—7. The object of this portion is, ch. i. 3, that ye may have fellowship with us, in that we have fellowship with the Father and the Son. This aim penetrates all the warning and exhortation vv. 18—28. This fellowship depends on the walking in light, i. e. on knowledge of the truth as regards ourselves and God, and love to God and the brethren. He who departs from the truth, he who loves not God and the brethren, belongs not to this fellowship, and shews that he belongs not to it. If he had belonged to it, he would have held fast his walk in the light, as shewn by these indications. This is the human side, on which our passage regards the act and fact. There is also a divine side. They who attain eternal life are given by the Father to the Son, and no man can come to the Son except the Father draw him (John vi. 37, 44, 65, xvii. 6), and such are kept by God (ib. xvii. 11); but also we read that they believe on the Son, receive the word of the Son, and keep themselves (John vi. 40, xvii. 6 f., i. 12, James i. 27). And so again on the other side, they who remain at last excluded from eternal life, are thus excluded not only by God's decree, but by their own evil choice and will. The words cited above, John vi. 65, were spoken by our Lord with direct reference to the traitor Judas: but on the other hand St. John gives notices of the ethical development of Judas which leave no doubt that his depravity went hand in hand with God's judgment on him. Judas

[f] χρῖσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ [g] τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ [h] οἴδατε * [h] πάντα.

f ver. 27 bis only. Exod. xxix. 7 al. g ≈ John vi. 69. Acts iii. 14. h Jude 5.

20. om και B sah. * πάντες B[P]ℵ sah : παντα ACKL rel vss.

was covetous: his heart was inclined to mammon; hence he understood not the love of Mary when she anointed Jesus with her precious ointment: he grudged his Lord this token of love: he could not abide with Christ, because he shut his heart through greed, through love of the world, against the love of Christ; for the knowledge of the Lord, faith in Him, fellowship with Him, are all summed up in Love. Thus we see that in the rejection, as in the acceptance of eternal life, the two factors, God's will and man's will, are to be regarded in their ethical connexion only. In order to that knowledge of God, which is eternal life, man must be *taught* of God (John vi. 45): but man must also *learn* of God. And the more St. John sets forth the essential nature of this knowledge of God and Jesus Christ as *ethical*, the more does he recognize, in putting forward God's will in the matter, man's will also. Christ is the Saviour of the whole world, ch. ii. 2, iv. 14. But in the personal appropriation of this universal salvation, not all really take it to themselves,—and many, who have taken it, fall away again, because they do not keep the grace given, do not abide in Christ, do not walk in the light. This last is by no means denied by St. John when he says "if they had been of us they would have remained with us." The words set forth an ideal (ἄν, not γε or a similar particle) similar to that in ch. ii. 5, iii. 9, v. 18. As in no one of those places can the Apostle possibly mean, that a true believer, one really born of God, has perfect love to God and cannot sin (for what then would ch. ii. 1 mean?),—so neither here can he mean that whoever once inwardly and truly belongs to the communion of believers cannot by any possibility fall from it. I have abridged Düsterd.'s remarks, and thereby, I fear, not increased their perspicuity. Those who are able (and I would hope, for the sake of English theology, that this number is daily increasing) should by all means give some days to the thorough study of them).

20, 21.] The Apostle puts them in mind, in an apologetic form, of the truth which they as Christians possessed, and the very possession of which, not the contrary, was his reason for thus writing to them. This reminiscence carries at the same time with it the force of an exhortation, as so many of the ideal statements on Christian perfection in our Epistle. What they *have* in the ideal depth of their Christian life, that they ought to have in living and working reality. **And** (hardly as Lücke, logically adversative to what preceded: so De Wette (aber), and many others. Huther ascribes this interpretation virtually to Düsterdieck, but wrongly: for the latter keeps καί in its simple copulative meaning, and only asserts that what adversative meaning there is consists in the *sense*, not in the outward expression. "John," he says, "denotes only the passage to a new particular, without distinctly marking its adversative relation to the last") **ye** (expressed, as emphatic: see above) **have an anointing** (χρῖσμα is properly the oil or ointment with which the anointing takes place, not the act itself of anointing. For this we have in English no word adequate to the necessity of the passage: "unguent" is the nearest approach, but is still inadequate. It is certain that in later Greek there arose a considerable confusion between verbal nouns in -μα and their cognates in -σις. Thus in Exod. xxix., the ἔλαιον τοῦ χρίσματος, ver. 7, becomes the ἔλαιον τῆς χρίσεως, in ver. 21. On the meaning, see below) **from the Holy One** (viz. from Christ, the δίκαιος of our ver. 1, the ἁγνός of ch. iii. 3, the ἅγιος of Acts iii. 14, and ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ of John vi. 69: cf. also Rev. iii. 18, where the Laodicean church is counselled to buy of *Christ* κολλύριον ἐγχρῖσαι τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου, ἵνα βλέπῃς. This is agreed to by almost all Commentators: even Socinus says that the Apostle "de Deo simul et Christo loqui, non secus ac si ambo una tantum persona essent:" and Schlichting concedes that the words *may* be understood of Christ), **and know all things** (the full and perfect knowledge of Christian truth is the ideal completion of those who have this anointing. This of course must not be understood as actually predicated of these readers: but the expression explains itself as referring to all things needful for right action in the matter under consideration: q. d. πάντα ταῦτα. So most Commentators. "Quod autem omnia dicit novisse, non universaliter capi, sed ad præsentis loci circumstantiam restringi debet," Calv. See note on John xvi. 13: cf. also 1 Cor. i. 5, viii. 1; Eph. i. 18; Col. ii. 2. Some understand, all things necessary to Christian life and godliness: so Œc., Wolf, Bengel, Neander: "quæ ut

21 οὐκ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλ' ὅτι οἴδατε αὐτήν, καὶ ὅτι [i] πᾶν [k] ψεῦδος [l] ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας [l] οὐκ ἔστιν. 22 τίς ἐστιν ὁ [m] ψεύστης, [n] εἰ μὴ ὁ [o] ἀρ-

i ch. iii. 15. Rev. xviii. 22. xxii. 3. k = Rom. i. 25. 2 Thess. ii. 11. l = ver. 16. m ch. i. 10 reff. n constr., ch. v. 5. o w. ὅτι, here only.—folld by neg., see Luke xx. 27. Soph. Antig. 438, 439.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

21. om παν C.

homines a Spiritu Sancto uncti doctique tum ad salutem, tum ad cavendos illos seductorum et antichristorum errores scire debetis," Wolf. The alternative reading πάντες would mean "*ye all know it:*" a sense which hardly seems to be applicable.

But now the question recurs, What is this χρῖσμα, and what leads the Apostle to use this peculiar expression here? The reply to the latter question is probably, as Bengel, "Alludit appellatio *chrismatis* ad antichristi nomen, ex opposito." The Apostle sets his readers, as χριστούς, anointed of God, over against the ἀντίχριστοι. Then as to the nature of the χρῖσμα, we can hardly fail to be right in interpreting it of the *Holy Ghost*. For "Christ received the Holy Ghost without measure (John iii. 34): on Him the Holy Ghost abode (ib. i. 33): God ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (Acts x. 38). Christ baptizeth with the Holy Ghost (John i. 33): He sends the Holy Ghost, who takes of His and shews it to believers (John xv. 26, xvi. 14, Acts ii. 33). And seeing that the Son hath all which the Father hath, the Father is said to send forth the Spirit of His Son into the hearts of His children (Gal. iv. 6: cf. Eph. iii. 16, Phil. i. 19, 2 Cor. iii. 17 ff.), and this, at the prayer, in the name, through the mediation, of the Son (John xiv. 16, xvi. 7 f.): the Father anoints believers by giving them His Spirit (2 Cor. i. 21 f.), as He has anointed the Son with the Holy Ghost. And hence the Spirit, which we have received, is the token that we are in the Father (ch. iii. 24), and in the Son (ii. 27), that we are children of God (Rom. viii. 14 ff., Gal. iv. 6). The Holy Ghost teaches the faithful the truth and keeps them in it: that truth, in the knowledge of which they have eternal life, having thereby the Father and the Son." Düsterdieck, p. 354 f. This anointing, by virtue of which they are Christ's and the Father's, and without which a man is none of Christ's (Rom. viii. 14, 9), in respect of which they are χριστοί, the ἀντίχριστοι attack in its very root, and would rob them of, thereby severing them from the Son and from the Father: from light and truth and life. And this very χρῖσμα is the means and weapon whereby *they* must be detected and resisted). **21.**] **I did not write to you** (see on ἔγραψα above, vv. 13, 14. It may refer either to what has immediately preceded, or to the whole Epistle: here probably to the immediately preceding) **because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and because no lie is of the truth** (i. e. coupling the fact of your knowledge of the truth with the fact that no lie is of the truth, I wrote to supply the link between these two, to point out to you the lie and the liar, that you might at once act on that your knowledge of the truth, and not listen to them that deceive you. Thus we keep ὅτι and καὶ ὅτι correlative. So Justiniani, Schlichting, and Neander: but almost all the expositors take the second ὅτι as dependent on οἴδατε, "because ye know the truth, and (also know) that no lie, &c." So Aug., Bede, Erasmus, Grot., Calvin, Luther, Estius, Corn.-a-lap., Socinus, Episcopius, Wolf, Whitby, Hammond, Lücke, Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Sander, Düsterd., Huther, and many others. But this surely does violence to the construction: ὅτι οἴδατε αὐτήν, καὶ ὅτι . . . οὐκ ἔστιν. ὅτι twice repeated, and each time with an indicative verb, surely must be kept to one and the same meaning in both clauses. Nor does the sense gain any thing, as Düsterd. maintains. For their knowing the truth and their knowing that no lie is of the truth, the one a cognition of God and His Son, the other a mere apprehension of a truism, are no logical correlatives, nor can be concurrent reasons for the Apostle's writing: whereas the two facts, the one, their knowing the truth, the other, that no lie belongs to that truth, are concurrent reasons for the Apostle's writing: viz. that he may set plainly before them what the lie is, that they may at once discern their entire alienation from it. And this accordingly he proceeds to do in the next verse. As regards the construction of πᾶν ψεῦδος . . . . οὐκ ἔστιν, it is not, as so many of the Commentators, a Hebraism, but merely that common one of attaching the negative to the predicate, instead of to the subject. πᾶν ψεῦδος (every lie) ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν (is excluded from being of the truth)). **22.**] **Who is the liar** (the question passes from the abstract τὸ ψεῦδος to the concrete ὁ ψεύστης. "Quis est illius mendacii reus?" as Ben-

νούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ χριστός; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ [p] ἀντίχριστος, ὁ [q] ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν. 23 πᾶς ὁ [q] ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα [r] ἔχει· ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα [r] ἔχει. 24 ὑμεῖς ὃ

p ver. 18 reff. q = Matt. x. 33 bis. Luke xii. 9. Acts iii. 13, 14. vii. 35. 1 Tim. v. 8. 2 Tim. ii. 12. 2 Pet. ii. 1. 2 John 9. Jude 4. Rev. ii. 13. iii. 8. r = ch. v. 12.

22. aft *αρνουμενος* ins *και* (but marked and erased) א[1].

23. rec om 2nd clause, with KL rel harl(Tischdf) sah(prob) Œc: ins ABC[P]א a b[2] j 13. 36 vss Clem Orig$_3$ Ath Cyr-jer Cyr Thl Vig Pel. (*The omission arose from the τον πατερα εχει occurring twice.*)

24. rec aft *υμεις* ins *ουν*, with KL rel Thl Œc Aug: om ABC[P]א a 13 vulg syrr

gel. The Apostle proceeds to identify the utterer of the *ψεῦδος* of which he has just spoken. We have a similar question in ch. v. 4, 5: where after describing the victory that overcometh the world, he rejoins *τίς ἐστιν ὁ νικῶν κ.τ.λ. εἰ μὴ ὁ*, as here. Some have neglected the article altogether; so Luther, and the E. V.; others have given it merely the force of pointing out as "insigne:" so Calv. ("nisi hoc censeatur mendacium, aliud nullum haberi posse"), Seb.-Schmidt; Socin. ("mendacium, quo nihil possit esse majus"), De Wette ('diese Irrlehre gilt dem Xp. statt aller, scheint ihm alle andern einzuschließen'). So also Lücke, and Huther. But there can be little doubt that the *ὁ* refers as above to the preceding *ψεῦδος*), but ("if not:" so *εἰ μή* in ref. and Luke xvii. 18, Rom. xi. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 11, 2 Cor. ii. 2) **he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ** (lit. "*denieth* (to the effect) *that Jesus is not the Christ.*" "This *excepting εἰ μή*," says Kühner, Gram. ii. p. 561, "is frequently found after *τί* (= *τί ἄλλο*), and also after *οὐδεὶς ἄλλος*. Hom. hymn. Cer. 78, *οὐδέ τις ἄλλος αἴτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, εἰ μὴ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς*: Aristoph. Eq. 1106, *μηδὲν ἄλλ', εἰ μὴ ἔσθιε*: Xen. Œc. ix. 1, *τί δέ, εἰ μὴ ὑπισχνεῖτό γε ἐπιμελήσεσθαι;* Cf. Cyr. i. 4. 13." So the Greeks often, bringing out more distinctly the negative proposition involved in the verb of negation,—so Demosth. p. 871: *ὡς δ' οὐκ ἐκεῖνος ἐγεώργει τὴν γῆν, οὐκ ἠδύνατ' ἀρνηθῆναι*,—or prohibition,—so Herod. iii. 128, *Δαρεῖος ἀπαγορεύει ὑμῖν μὴ δορυφορέειν Ὀροίτεα.* See Kühner, Gram. ii. p. 410. On the meaning, see below)? **This** (the *ψεύστης* just described; *ὁ ἀρνούμενος*, &c. below being appositional, and an additional consequence from his former denial) **is the antichrist** (on the personal interpretation, see above, ver. 18. *ὁ ἀντίχρ.* is obviously here used not as predicating the one person in whom the character shall be finally and centrally realized, but as setting forth identity of character with him, and participation in the same development of the antichristian principle. Nor is this, as Huther characterizes it, a "willkürliche Umdeutung und Ergänzung," but something of the kind must be understood, whichever way antichrist be taken, collective or personal), **who denieth the Father and the Son** (it is implied then, that the denying Jesus to be the Christ, is equivalent to denying the Father and the Son. And this the Apostle carefully asserts in the next verse). **23.**] **Every one that denieth the Son, neither hath he the Father** (the *οὐδέ* is exclusive and climacteric; not only hath he denied the Son, but he cannot hold, possess the Father): **he that confesseth the Son hath also the Father.** As nearly the whole of this Epistle, so especially such an assertion as this, formed a battle-field for the old rationalists. Some of the early Commentators and Fathers imagining that *Jewish* error was indicated by the denying that Jesus is the Christ, the idea has been again taken up by Semler, al., and pressed in the anti-trinitarian interest. Grot., Socinus, Episcopius, all evade the Apostle's words by inadequate or far-fetched interpretations, understanding the expressions in this verse, of not obeying the teaching, not following the example, &c. of the Son, and by consequence of the Father. But the deeper and truer meaning of the Apostle's words has been recognized by all the better Commentators, with some variations from one another. While some, as Beza, Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, mark perhaps too precisely the doctrinal character of the words, others, as Lücke and De Wette, make their force consist too much in an ideal and economical relation between the divine Persons. Still all are agreed, that that which is spoken of is the revelation of the Father by the Son only, and that he who rejects this in its fulness rejects all that can be known of the real essence and nature of the Father Himself; "nempe quia Deus se totum nobis in Christo fruendum dedit," as Calvin. "The antichrists denied that Jesus, the definite Person whom the Apostles had seen, heard, and handled, is the Christ. In whatever sense this denial is to be taken,—the Apostle speaks merely of the fact, as known to the readers;—at all

s = ver. 7 reff. t see John xv. 7. u John, here only. Luke xxiv. 49. Acts, Paul, Heb., passim. 2 Pet. iii. 4, 9. Esth. iv. 7.

ἠκούσατε [s] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς [t] ἐν ὑμῖν [t] μενέτω. ἐὰν [t] ἐν ὑμῖν [t] μείνῃ ὃ [s] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἠκούσατε, καὶ ὑμεῖς [t] ἐν τῷ υἱῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ [t] μενεῖτε. 25 καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ [u] ἐπαγγελία

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m s o 13

arm Cyr Bede. ακηκοατε (twice) ℵ. om 2nd εν ℵ[1]. ακηκοατε bef 2nd απ αρχης ℵ vulg Syr coptt. om last εν B vulg Melet-ap-Epiph lat-ff: ins ACKL [P]ℵ rel demid syrr sah Cyr Thl Œc. transp υιω and πατρι ℵ c h 5. 38. 80. 96 Syr.

events there is involved in it a denial of the Son of God; because it is only as the incarnate Son of God (ch. iv. 2), that Jesus is the Christ. And in the denial of the Son is involved necessarily the denial of the Father, since the Father cannot be known without the Son, and the Father cannot be perceived, believed on, loved, by any man, without the Son, or otherwise than through the Son, i. e. the Son manifested in the flesh, the Christ, which is, Jesus. So that in St. John's development of the argument there are three essentially connected points: denial of the Christ, of the Son, of the Father. The middle link of the chain, the denial of the Son of God, shews how the denial of the Father is of necessity involved in the denial of Christ. And the cogency of this proof is made yet more stringent by another equally unavoidable process of argument. The antichristian false doctrine consists mainly in a negation, in the denying of the fundamental Christian truth, that Jesus is the Christ. But in this is involved the denial of the essence of the Son as well as of the Father, and again in this denial is involved the losing, the virtual *not-having* of the Son and of the Father. In the sense of St. John, we may say, taking the first and last steps of his argument and leaving out the intervening ones: *He who denieth that Jesus is the Christ, hath not the Father*. And this necessary connexion between denying and not having, is perfectly clear, the moment we understand the ethical character, the living realism, of St. John's way of regarding the subject. As (ver. 23) we cannot separate the knowledge and confession of the Christ, the Son, the Father, from the *having*, the real possession of, the practical fellowship with, the actual remaining in the Son and the Father, so conversely, together with the denial is necessarily given the *not-having*; together with the loss of the truth of the knowledge, the loss of the life which consists in that knowledge (John xvii. 3). In such a connexion, the *confession* of the truth is as essential on the one side, as the *denial* on the other. Each is the necessary manifestation of the belief or unbelief hidden in the heart. And this ὁμολογεῖν is not to be understood of the 'confessio cordis, vocis, et operis' (Bede), but only as ch. i. 9, of the confession of the mouth (στόματι ὁμολογεῖται, Rom. x. 10, see John xii. 42). It is parallel with φέρειν διδαχήν, 2 John 7, 10; and indicates the definite utterance of the doctrine which was made known by the apostolic preaching, ver. 24." Düsterdieck. **24, 25.**] ***Exhortation to perseverance in the truth delivered to them, and statement of the promise connected with it:*** connected with the foregoing by the ὁμολογεῖν, as involving an ἀκοῦσαι: see the concluding sentence of Düsterd. above. **Ye** (the ὑμεῖς stands alone, serving to mark more distinctly the change of person. We have a similar anacoluthon in ver. 27. Kühner, Gram. ii. p. 156, says: "The word which exceeds in significance the other members of the sentence, is sometimes with rhetorical emphasis not only put at the beginning of the sentence, but also expressed in a form calculated to shew that it is the subject underlying the whole sentence, although the grammatical structure would require another and dependent case. So Plato, Cratyl. p. 403, A, ὁ δὲ Ἅιδης, οἱ πολλοὶ μέν μοι δοκοῦσιν ἀπολαμβάνειν τὸ ἀειδὲς προσειρῆσθαι τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ: and ib. p. 404, Περσέφαττα δέ, πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ τοῦτο φοβοῦνται τὸ ὄνομα." Some however explain the position of ὑμεῖς here by a trajection: so Bengel, "antitheton est in pronomine, ideo adhibetur trajectio;" and so Beza, Socinus, and even De Wette. But the other is more probable),—**let that which ye heard from the beginning, abide in you** (i. e. not merely as Thl., φυλάττετε παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, but as in ch. iii. 9, σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, the truth respecting the Father and the Son once heard is regarded as a seed, dropt in and abiding in the man. **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**, necessarily bound here to the subjects of ἠκούσατε, just as it is necessarily bound in ch. i. 1, to the subject of ἦν,—as Beza, "Ex quo instituti cœpistis in primis christianæ religionis rudimentis"). **If that which ye heard from the beginning abide** (aor. in the sense of the futurus exactus, "shall have abode." The result in the apodosis will be brought about by the accumulative accomplishment of the supposition) **in you, ye also** (on your part;

[v] ἣν αὐτὸς [w] ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν, [v] τὴν [x] ζωὴν τὴν [x] αἰώνιον. [26] ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν [y] πλανώντων ὑμᾶς. [27] καὶ [z] ὑμεῖς τὸ [a] χρῖσμα ὃ [b] ἐλάβετε [b] ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μένει ἐν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐ [c] χρείαν ἔχετε [c] ἵνα τὶς διδάσκῃ ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὡς

v attr., 2 Cor. x 13.
w so James i. 12. ii. 5.
x Matt. xix. 16 ||, 29 ||. xxvi. 46. Luke x. 25. John iii. 15, and passim. Acts xiii. 46, 48. Paul, Rom. ii. 7 al[8]. Dan. xii. 2.
y ch. i. 8 reff.
z anacol., Luke xxi. 6. Rom. viii. 3 al. Winer, edn. 6, § 63. I. 2. d.
a ver. 20.
b ch. iii. 22 reff.
c John ii. 25. xvi. 30 only. see note.

25. υμιν B m[1] am: txt ACKL[P]ℵ rel vss Thl Œc Aug Bede. αιωνιαν B.
26. aft ταυτα ins δε ℵ Syr æth(*et hoc*).
27. for 1st χρισμα, χαρισμα B 10[2]. ελαβατε B[1]. rec εν υμιν bef μενει, with KL rel syr Œc: txt (A)BC[P]ℵ d[1] m 13 vulg (Syr) coptt æth arm Ath Cyr Did Thl Aug.—μενετω [P] a d m 13. 27-9. 66[2]. 68-9. 81. 137 vulg syr Thl Aug: ημιν A[1]? διδασκει (for -κῃ) CKL c d f m[1] n 13. for αλλ' ως, αλλα B 25 sah æth Aug Jer.

vicissim, as Bengel. If it abide in you, ye too shall abide . . . .) **shall abide in the Son and in the Father** (here again the rationalizing Commentators, Socinus, Grotius, Hammond, Semler, have endeavoured to explain away the close personal relation and immanence in God expressed by the Apostle's words: "ita cum Patre et Filio conjunctum esse, ut bonorum ab utroque proficiscentium quis sit particeps," Socinus,—and similarly Semler: "summo eorum favore et amicitia fruemini," Grot., Hamm. But here as every where else, they entirely miss the sense. He in whom abides the message of life in Christ which he has heard, not only has received the tidings of that life, but is transformed into the likeness of Him whose seed he has taken into him: is become a new creation: and the element in which and by which he lives and acts is even He in whom and by whom this new life comes, even Christ the Son of God. And thus living in the Son, he lives in the Father also: for Christ the Son of God is the manifestation and effulgence of the Father, himself abiding ever in the Father, as His people abide in Him. See the same truth declared John vi. 56; xv. 1 ff.; xvii. 23 (Eph. iii. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 17)). **And** (καί is the simple copula: not put αἰτιολογικῶς, as Œc., Thl.) **the promise** (the preceding μενεῖτε naturally carried the mind onwards into the future. The result of that abiding will be the fulfilment, not only in partial present possession but in complete future accomplishment, of Christ's promise to us. This taking up again and explaining of something expressed (see ch. iii. 23, v. 11) or implied (see ch. i. 5, iv. 21, v. 14) before, is often found in our Apostle's style) **which He Himself** (Christ; cf. ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, ch. i. 1: cf. αὐτῷ, ver. 8; αὐτοῦ, ver. 27; αὐτῷ, ver. 28) **promised to us** (in many passages of the Gospel: e.g., John iii. 15; iv. 14; vi. 40, 47, 57; xi. 25, 26; xvii. 2, 3) **is this, (even) eternal life** (accus. instead of nom., by a common attraction of the subject of the sentence into the case of the relative clause: "urbēm quam statuo vestra est." The fact of ζωὴν αἰώνιον being put in logical apposition with ἐπαγγελία must not make us suppose, that ἐπαγγελία means the *thing promised*. The aor. ἐπηγγείλατο plainly enough shews that ἐπαγγ. is to be taken in its usual sense of a spoken promise. Then, when the purport of this promise comes to be explained, it is not "that we should inherit eternal life," but, instead, the *subject* of the spoken promise is expressed, as very commonly in ordinary discourse. "He promised me such or such a price" is a case in point). **26, 27.**] *Conclusion of the section concerning antichrist.* **These things I wrote to you concerning them that deceive you** (ταῦτα, the whole since ver. 18. The pres. part. πλανώντων describes the occupation, the endeavour of the antichrists: what result it had had, is not expressed: some result seems implied by ver. 19). **And you** (the same anacoluthon rhetoricum as in ver. 24: again setting his believing readers in marked contrast to the deceivers just mentioned),—**the anointing which ye received from Him** (Christ, ver. 25: see above, ver. 20: as also on χρῖσμα) **abideth in you** ("habet hic indicativus perquam subtilem exhortationem, conferendam ad 2 Tim. iii. 14." Bengel), **and** ("et ideo," Beng.) **ye have no need that any one teach you** (the construction = χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, Heb. v. 12, or that with the simple infin., Matt. iii. 14, xiv. 16, al. See reff. The ἵνα in such cases cannot be pressed to its telic meaning; rather we should say that the clause beginning with ἵνα is epexegetical of the verb preceding. Some Commentators have understood the διδάσκειν of the teaching of the antichrists: so Corn.-a-lap., "non est necesse ut pseudo-apostoli et hæretici vos doceant veram fidem et doctrinam:" so Semler, Sander, al.: but manifestly from want of apprehension of the Apostle's meaning. His assertions here are so many delicate exhortations,

d so (art. bef. αὐτοῦ) Heb. ii. 4. James i. 18. 2 Pet. iii. 7.

[d] τὸ [d] αὐτοῦ [a] χρῖσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων, καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν [e] ψεῦδος, καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς

e ver. 21.

ABCKL PℵabcdfghjklmNo 13

rec (for αυτου) αυτο, with AKL rel copt Œc Thl Jer: txt B(see table at end of prolegg) C[P]ℵ k 36 vulg syr sah æth arm Ath Cyr Did Aug Fulg Bede. for 2nd χρισμα, χαρισμα 10^2. 13: πνευμα ℵ' 25. 81 copt æth Cyr_1. [ψευδες C(appy) P.] om last και A sah Aug.

veiled under the declaration of their true ideal state of unction with the Holy Spirit who guides into all truth. If that unction were abiding in them in all its fulness, they would have no need for his or any other teaching. And in what is said, he does not indeed say that it is not abiding in them; but the contrary, thus reminding them what their real state is): but (contrast to the οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε) **as his anointing teacheth you concerning all things** (if we read τὸ αὐτό, it is not, as Bengel, "semper idem, sibi constans:" but marks merely the identity of the anointing which they once received with that which was now abiding in them. On the reading, see the digest. Our διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων is parallel to ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν, John xvi. 13.

Two ways are open to us of taking what follows. Either 1) καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ψ., καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς is all part of the protasis, which begins with ὡς above, and the apodosis begins with μένετε,—or 2) the apodosis to ὡς κ.τ.λ. is καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν κ. οὐκ ἔ. ψ., and then comes a new protasis, κ. καθὼς ἐδ. ὑμ., with its apodosis μένετε κ.τ.λ. The former view is taken by Œc. and Thl., by Lücke, De Wette, Neander, Düsterdieck, al.: the latter by Luther, Calv., Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Brückner, Huther, and indeed most Commentators. If we take the former, we must regard καὶ ἀλ. ἐ. κ. οὐκ ἔ. ψ. as a parenthetical insertion, stamping the character of the διδαχὴ περὶ πάντων just mentioned, and then καὶ καθὼς ἐδ. ὑμ. as a resumption, slightly varied, of ὡς . . . διδάσκει ὑμ. before. To this it is objected, that it is harsh, and not so like St. John's style as the other: that καθώς does not naturally resume ὡς, nor καί, ἀλλά,—nor the aor. ἐδίδαξεν the pres. διδάσκει: that περὶ πάντων in the former clause has no correspondent in μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ in the latter. But it is answered on the other side, that these divergences from the former expression are entirely in accordance with the vivid and rapid movement of the thought in the Apostle's style, and cannot in any way tend to obscure the connexion. The ἀλλά above was occasioned by the preceding οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε ἵνα, whereas the καί before καθώς seems to take up again the construction broken by the parenthesis κ. ἀλ. . . . ψ. Again καθώς, the fuller and more precise conjunction, not only repeats but enforces the ὡς above. And the change of the pres. διδάσκει into the aor. ἐδίδαξεν is no objection, but a recommendation, to this view. For by it we have, as so often in St. John's repetitions, a new side of the subject brought out: viz. the absolute historical fact, that at a certain time this teaching came to them from Christ, viz. when they heard the apostolic preaching: so that the ὡς διδάσκει, its enduring teaching, is not only taken up again but placed in a new light, by its commencement being referred to. And as to the last objection, which is Huther's, of there being in the resumption no member corresponding to περὶ πάντων, it seems to me to amount to nothing. The correspondent member would be found not in the apodosis, μενεῖτε or μένετε,—but in the resumption of the protasis: and there it may be well understood to be implied in ἐδίδαξεν, there being no reason why it should be again expressed. But against the second view there are weightier objections. First, the καί before ἀληθές is in this case no natural introduction to an apodosis. Huther compares it with the καί before ὑμεῖς in ver. 24: but that, giving (see there) the sense of "ye too," is quite another thing. Here, there is no mutual correspondence, and the καί merely drags on the ear. Then, the apodosis thus introduced is no logical apodosis: "as it teaches you concerning all things, (so) it is true and is not a lie," is not a connected judgment: its being true and not a lie may be an authoritative assertion inserted by way of reminding, but cannot be a logical inference from its teaching being universal; for universal teaching may be false, as well as true. For these reasons I prefer, and adopt the former rendering), **—and is true, and is not a lie** (*what* is true, and not a lie? the anointing itself, or that which it teaches about all things? Œc. and Thl. understand the latter: ἀληθὴς γάρ ἐστι κ. οὐκ ἔστι ψεῦδος ὃ δηλονότι ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς. But the construction seems to require the other view: ἀληθές is in strict concord with τὸ χρῖσμα, and to supply τὸ διδασκόμενον would be very harsh. And this is quite correspondent to the fact

μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ. 28 [f] Καὶ [f] νῦν, [g] τεκνία, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐὰν [h] φανερωθῇ, σχῶμεν [ij] παῤῥησίαν καὶ μὴ [jk] αἰσχυνθῶμεν [l] ἀπ' αὐτοῦ [m] ἐν τῇ [m] παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

f = John xvii. 5. Acts iii. 17. vii. 34. x. 5. xx. 22, 25. xxii. 16. 2 Thess. ii. 6. Gen. xi. 6.
g ver. 1 reff. h = Col. iii. 4. 1 Pet. v. 4. ch. iii. 5. i = Eph. iii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 13. Heb iii. 6. iv. 16. x. 19, 35. ch. iii. 21. iv. 17. v. 14. Job xxvii. 10. j Phil. i. 20. Prov. xiii. 5 k as above (j). Luke xvi. 3. 2 Cor. x. 8. 1 Pet. iv. 16 only. Ps. xxxiv. 4. l Sir. xli. 17. xxi. 22. see ch. iii. 17. 2 Thess. i. 9. m = 1 Cor. xv. 23. 1 Thess. ii. 19. iii. 13. v. 23.

rec μενειτε, with KL rel Thl Œc: txt ABC[P]ℵ vss a d 40 Cyr Phot.

28. om και to αυτω (*homœotel*) ℵ a m. [for τεκνια, τεκνα P.] add μου K b l 40 coptt æth. rec (for εαν) οταν, with KL rel vulg syrr copt Thl Œc: txt ABC[P]ℵ d 13 sah æth arm. rec (for σχωμεν) εχωμεν, with KLℵ[1] rel Œc: txt ABC[P]ℵ[3] d 40 Thl. εν τη παρουσια αυτου bef απ' αυτου ℵ.

that the Spirit who is this anointing, is the Spirit of Truth (John xiv. 17) and therefore leads into all truth (ib. xvi. 13). As Düsterd. remarks, "the chrisma which abides in and teaches believers, is essentially true, is not a lie, and hence nothing can come from it which is a lie")—**and even as He** (or, *it?* so Erasmus, paraphrasing χρῖσμα by 'Spiritus' and adding "perseveretis in eo quod Ille vos semel docuit;" and so Düsterd.: but the change to the aor. seems necessarily to refer to Christ as the subject,—the ἅγιος from whom the χρῖσμα came, and who is ever in the Writer's mind, a subject ever ready to be supplied) **taught you, abide in Him** (or, "in *it*," as Erasmus? or, in that which it teaches, as Baumg.-Crus.? Neither of these: for the μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ is immediately after repeated, and the reference of αὐτῷ fixed, by what follows, to be to Christ. (But I see that Estius, holding it improbable that this αὐτῷ refers to Christ, makes that also to mean "in eo quod doctum fuerat:" supplying "Christ" as a subject before φανερωθῇ.)

As regards μένετε, Huther, who upholds this reading, takes it as indicative here, and imperative in the next verse. But, apart from the arbitrariness of such a distinction, would it be quite true or according to the Apostle's way of asserting as existent the ideal Christian state of his readers? True, he does assert that the chrisma μένει in them, and from that abiding, important consequences are hortatively deduced: one of the most important of which is, the enduring and ultimate abiding in Christ. Therefore I much prefer taking μένετε imperative. The reading μενεῖτε is variously understood: by Socinus, Corn.-a-lap., Estius, Lorinus, Semler, al., as an imperative: by others as a pure future: so Beza, "mihi videtur omnino servanda futuri propria significatio ut est optime sperantis:" and Bengel, "vim consolandi et hortandi habet hoc futurum." But see Digest). 28.] *Conclusion of this part of the Epistle:* forming also a transition to the next part: see below. **And now** (by καὶ νῦν, the preceding considerations are linked on to the exhortation regarding present practice which follows: see reff. On ἀλλὰ νῦν, νῦν δέ, νῦν οὖν see Düsterdieck's note), **little children** (the affectionate repetition of τεκνία binds this on to ver. 18, and to the ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ver. 17), **abide in Him** ("repetitio est præcepti cum blanda appellatione, qua paternum erga eos amorem declaret," Estius. αὐτῷ, Christ: as before, ver. 27: but here even more decidedly,—pace Estii, see above: and against the Socinian interpreters): **in order that if He should be manifested** (in case of His second coming taking place. The ἐάν differs from ὅταν, in marking, not time but reality only. We may supply, "*in our time*:" but it is better to leave it unsupplied), **we** (observe that he changes to the communicative way of speaking. This was not a matter in which Apostle and converts, teacher and hearer, were separate: but one in which all had a share: viz. the Christian hope of standing before the Lord with joy at His coming. This is far the most likely reason, and not as Seb.-Schmidt, mere modesty, still less, as Sander, because the failure of any of his τεκνία at that day would be a detraction from his full apostolic reward: for the relation between shepherd and flock, minister and people, is not in question here) **may have confidence** (παῤῥησία, subjective: not *freedom of speech*, but *confidence*,—see note on Heb. iii. 6; and the reff. Cf. also Suicer, sub voce), **and may not shrink with shame from Him** (the ἀπ' in ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, expresses the flying from His presence, which the shame in αἰσχυνθῶμεν would suggest: see reff. (Hammond renders, "turn with shame from Him.") It is not equivalent to *coram*, as many Commentators: nor to ὑπό, as Socinus: nor to both of these together, as Sander, who however quotes πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, Matt. xxv. 41: nor can the words mean, as Erasmus thought, "ut illum non pudeat nostri." "He who has not abode in the Lord (ἐν αὐτῷ), will flee

n see John xv. 18.
o ch. iii. 7, 10. Matt. vi. 1 only. Ezek. xviii. 17.
p ch. iv. 7 reff.

29 ἐὰν εἰδῆτε ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστιν, ⁿ γινώσκετε ὅτι καὶ πᾶς ὁ ° ποιῶν τὴν ° δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ ᵖ γεγέννηται.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

29. ιδητε AKL[P] b[1] f g m n o copt æth Thl: ηδητε j: οιδατε c. rec om και, with BKL rel am(and harl tol) syr copt æth arm Thl Œc Ambr Aug Vig: ins AC[P]ℵ a d 13 demid fuld Syr sah.

from Him (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ) with shame and confusion when He appears." Düsterd.) **at His coming** (Bengel remarks, "Epistolam igitur hanc prius scripsisse videtur quam apocalypsin, in qua demum adventus magis est dilatus." On this, see Prolegomena).

II. 29—V. 5.] The second great division of the Epistle: *the doing of righteousness, the sign of new birth from God: the opposite, the sign of not being of God.* This main subject, enunciated in verse 29, is carried onward throughout, and more especially with reference to brotherly love, which is the great and obvious example of likeness to God, and its absence the most decisive proof of alienation from Him. The various subdivisions see, as the exegesis proceeds. II. 29—III. 3.] Connected with the principle enounced ii. 29, is its obvious *application to ourselves, as children of God.* Hoping as we do to be entirely like Christ at His appearing, each one of us, in pursuance of this hope, is even now approximating to this perfect likeness by purifying himself even as He is pure.

29.] **If ye know** (appeal to their recognition of the divine character as that which he describes it) **that He is righteous** (of whom is this said? If of Christ, as seems most natural after αὐτοῦ . . . . αὐτοῦ preceding, we find a difficulty in ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται below, seeing that we are never said to be born anew of *Christ*, but always of God (through Christ), ch. iii. 1, 9; iv. 7; v. 1, 4, 18 &c. If on the other hand they are said of God, it seems strange that after a change of reference from the preceding αὐτοῦ, another subject should be expressed in ch. iii. 1 by the words ὁ πατήρ. In consequence of these difficulties, some, as Storr, Lücke, al., have referred δίκαιός ἐστιν to Christ, and ἐξ αὐτοῦ to God; which cannot well be. It would be possible, doubtless, to understand the whole of Christ, without change of subject from ver. 28; and to leave the γεγέννηται ἐξ αὐτοῦ as we find it. If it occurs no where else in reference to Christ, there is in it nothing abhorrent from our Christian ideas. And in St. John's sense of the intimate union between the Father and Son, he who is born of the Father might be said to be born of the Son al.o. Another reason for this might be the easily occurring reference, in δίκαιός ἐστιν, to Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν δίκαιον, ver. 1. This view is taken by Bengel, Corn.-a-lap., Lorinus, al. But after all, the other, which is that of most ancient expositors, of Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Neander, Düsterdieck, al., must, I apprehend, be adopted. The analogy of the passage, as shewn in ch. iii. 1, 2, 9, 10, fixes the ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται to birth from God: and the absence of a new expressed subject in δίκαιός ἐστιν must be accounted for by remembering that this verse, as ch. i. 5, is the opening, and general statement, of a new section of the Epistle. And the essential unity of the Father and the Son comes in on this side also: so that the judgment alluded to ver. 28, which shall be executed by the Son, being judgment committed to Him by the Father, brings to mind the justice and righteousness in which that judgment is founded.

The whole subject of the righteousness of God is fully treated by Düsterd. in his note here. The definition which seems to him to express it most fully, is that of Hollaz, one of the best of the old Lutheran dogmatists (died 1713),—in his Examen theologicum,—"Justitia Dei est attributum divinum ἐνεργητικόν, vi cujus Deus omnia quæ æternæ suæ legi sunt conformia, vult et agit; creaturis convenientes leges præscribit, promissa facta hominibus implet, bonos remuneratur et impios punit"): **ye know** (many, as vulg., which Aug., Bede, and the R.-C. expositors follow, also Luth., Calv., Socin., Episcop., Grot., Carpzov., Lücke, Sander, al., take γινώσκετε as *imperative*. But the whole tone of the Epistle is against this: which is one not of authoritative revelation of truth, but of inferring ethical truth from previously known theosophic facts. And with such a tone it is much more consonant to say, "If ye know the one, ye know—that knowledge sets forth and assumes—the other:" than to say, "If ye know the one, know the other." Not to insist, that γινώσκειν is more the apprehension, εἰδῆτε the possession, of knowledge; if ye are already aware, . . . ye thereby know . . .) **that also every one who doeth righteousness** (τὴν δικαιοσύνην, the righteousness which is implied in δίκαιος above: if it were not too strong, we might almost say,

III. [1] Ἴδετε [q] ποταπὴν ἀγάπην [r] δέδωκεν ἡμῖν [s] ὁ [s] πα-

q 2 Pet. iii. 11 reff. r so James iv. 6. s ch. i. 2, 3 reff.

CHAP. III. 1. for δεδ., εδωκεν AL c d 13: txt BCK[P]ℵ rel Thl Œc. υμιν

"that righteousness:" the art. shewing that there is no other. πᾶς, "omnis, et solus," says Bengel: every one, and no one else. The proposition will bear converting: not logically, but theologically. ποιῶν, for (see Hollaz's definition above) all righteousness is energetic: it springs out of holiness, truth, love: πρακτικαὶ γὰρ αἱ ἀρεταί, καὶ ἐν τῷ γίνεσθαι ἔχουσι τὸ εἶναι· παυσάμεναι γὰρ ἢ μέλλουσαι οὐδὲ τὸ εἶναι ἔχουσι. Œc. on ch. iii. 3), **is born** (=hath been begotten) **of Him** (God: see above: ὁ δίκαιος γὰρ δικαίους γεννᾷ. The inference here must be carefully kept to the Apostle's words and obvious sense. And those require that we should understand it thus: God is *righteous*. This is our axiom, from which we set out. And if so, then the *source* of righteousness. When therefore a man doeth righteousness, γινώσκομεν, we apprehend, we collect, from our previous knowledge of these truths, that the source of his righteousness is God: that in consequence he has acquired by new birth from God, that righteousness which he had not by nature. We argue from his ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην to his γεγεννῆσθαι ἐκ θεοῦ. And the right apprehension of this is the more important, because the whole mass of Socinian and Pelagian Commentators have reversed the members of the argument, and made it conclude that ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην is the condition, on our part, of *becoming* a child of God. So Socinus, Episcopius, Grot., Hammond, Semler, Rosenmüller, al. And the R.-C. expositors, while they avoid this error, making the good works spoken of to be, as Lyra, "opera justitiæ infusæ, quæ datur cum gratia, per quam homo constituitur in quadam participatione supernaturali esse divini," yet go equally wrong, in understanding γεγέννηται not as the statement of a past and abiding fact, but as the ground of a confidence as to the future: "habebit omnimodam fiduciam, quia judici suo justo similis, imo ex ipso natus est, hoc est, ipsius filius et hæres est." Corn.-a-lap.). III. 1—10.] *The true and distinguishing signs of the children of God and the children of the devil.* 1—3.] The foundation and source of all righteousness in us is, the essential righteousness of God. All our doing of righteousness is a mere sign that He has begotten us anew—that we are *His children*. And what great things are contained in this name—how precious treasures of faith, of hope, of love! On this thought the Apostle now enters. He places the whole glory of the children of God before his readers. The being righteous as He is righteous, is the token of that new birth, and the measure of the life which began with it: the striving to perfect and mature this token, to fill up this measure, is an additional proof that a man is of God. 1.] **Behold** (as in John i. 29; xix. 5, does not express the Writer's own astonishment, but directs the attention of those who are addressed: "commendat Apostolus his verbis magnum Dei beneficium," Estius. But there immediately follows ἡμῖν, the communicative address, so that in fact the Apostle does in a manner include himself among those addressed in ἴδετε), **what manner of** (thus the E. V., literally and rightly. ποταπός, properly ποδαπός, originally meant, "*of what country;*" and occurs in this sense continually in the classics: e. g. Herod. vii. 218, εἴρετο . . . ποδαπὸς (or ὁποδ-) εἴη ὁ στρατός, al. Its derivation is matter of dispute: whether from δάπος, τάπος, which forms enter into δάπεδον, ἔδαφος, τόπος; so Valcknaer: or from ἀπό, as Buttm. Lexil. comparing ἀλλοδάπος, παντοδάπος &c., δ being inserted as in *prodire, prodesse*. Then in later writers it came to signify "*of what kind,*" as e. g. in Demosth. p. 782, 8, τίς ὁ κύων καὶ ποδαπός; οἷος μὴ δάκνειν, al. The signification *quantus* seems never to have belonged properly to the word. It may of course be often included in *qualis*, as it undoubtedly is here: "what manner of" including "how great," "how free," "how precious"—in fact all the particulars which are afterwards brought out respecting this love: see ver. 16, ch. iv. 9, 16) **love** (is ἀγάπην here, joined as it is with the verb δέδωκεν, literally *love itself*, or does it import some gift, bestowal, or fruit of love? The latter (caritatis munus) is taken by Beza: and similarly, *beneficium*, or the like, by Socinus, Episcopius, Seb.-Schmidt, Grot., Est., Rosenm., Neander, al. But there seems no necessity for diverting the word from its proper meaning. As in ch. iv. 9, the proof of the love is that which is imported, not by the love itself, but by the verb joined with it; as by ἐφανερώθη there, so by δέδωκεν here. So that in fact δέδωκεν, which has been the motive for these renderings, speaks, as Düsterd. observes, most decidedly against them. He quotes from Luther's scholia, "Usus autem est Joannes singulari verborum pondere:

τὴρ ἵνα [t] τέκνα [t] θεοῦ [u] κληθῶμεν, καὶ ἐσμέν. [v] διὰ τοῦτο ὁ κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς, [v] ὅτι οὐκ [w] ἔγνω αὐτόν.

t here bis. ver. 10. ch. v. 2. John i. 12. xi. 52. Rom. viii. 16 (17), 21. ix. 8. Phil. ii. 15 only.
u Matt. v. 9. Hos. i. 10.
v Matt. xxiv. 44. John v. 16. xii. 39.
w ch. iv. 6 reff.

ABCK[L] P ℵ a b c d f g h k l m n o 13

BK¹ m¹(Scriv): txt ACL[P] rel vss. rec om *και εσμεν*, with KL rel arm-zoh Œc: ins ABC[P]ℵ a 13. 36 (vss) Thl Aug Bede. *υμας* KL[P]ℵ¹ b¹ f g k l m n o arm-ms Thl Œc. [*εγνωκατε* P 192(Sz): *εγνωτε* b (?) o.]

non dicit dedisse nobis Deum donum aliquod, sed ipsam caritatem et fontem omnium bonorum, cor ipsum, idque non pro operibus aut studiis nostris, sed gratuito." Cf. *χάριν διδόναι*, ref. James) **the Father** (*ὁ πατήρ*, spoken here not, as some, of God in general, the whole three Persons in the blessed Trinity, but personally, of the Father, as distinguished from the Son, in whom we have received our adoption. Even the Socinian Schlichting has recognized this: "Nempe Pater ille Jesu Christi et consequenter omnium in Jesum Christum credentium, unus ille Deus, qui si Pater Jesu Christi non esset, nec Jesus Christus ejus Filius ille singularissimus, neque nobis tanta ejus ac vere paterna gratia unquam obtigisset") **hath given** (see above) **unto us, that** (how is *ἵνα* here to be taken? is it to be kept to its strong telic sense, indicating that our being called the children of God is the purpose of that gift of love just spoken of, or does it, as so often in St. John, introduce the purport of that love, stated in the form of an end to be gained by its manifestation? Lange, Lücke, De Wette, and Brückner keep the strong telic sense. "What great love," says Lücke, "hath the Father shewn us (viz. in sending His Son, ch. iv. 10), in order to make us children of God!" But the objection to this is, that thus a proof of the divine Love is hinted at in our verse which is not expanded, but is left to be gathered from elsewhere: and the purpose introduced by *ἵνα* becomes the secondary and remote subject of the sentence, whereas, from *τέκνα θεοῦ* taking up the preceding *γεγέννηται*, and being again taken up in verse 2, it is evidently the primary subject. The other meaning of *ἵνα* is taken by the ancient Greek expositors, so Œc., Thl., *εἴδετε γὰρ ὅτι ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι τε καὶ κληθῆναι* (*λογισθῆναι* Thl.). And this is not to confound *ἵνα* with *ὅτι*. Of the latter construction we have a plain example with *ποταπός*, in Matt. viii. 27: *ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι . . . ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ*. There, the *matter of fact* is the ground of the wonderment expressed in the *ποταπός*—"What a man must this be, seeing that . . . :" whereas here the ground of the wonderment is in the *result*: "what manner of love . . . resulting in, proved by, our being, &c." The effect of the love, that at which it is aimed in its immediate bestowal (its Ziel), is, that we should be called children of God: its ultimate purpose (its Zweck) is another thing. Cf. vv. 11, 23, where we have the same construction) **we should be called children of God** (why has the Apostle rather used *κληθῶμεν* than *ὦμεν*? Probably to bring forward the title, the reality of which, notwithstanding its non-recognition by the world, he is about to assert immediately. It is not that *καλεῖσθαι*, as Baumg.-Crusius, = *ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν γενέσθαι*, John i. 12, so that the sense should be, "that we have a right to presume to call ourselves children of God," Neander: against this the aor. *κληθῶμεν* is decisive, signifying our reception of the title once for all, and identifying this reception with the gift of love spoken of above. In this definite reference to an actual bestower of the name, probably an allusion is made to such prophecies as that cited 2 Cor. vi. 18); **and we ARE** (so): **for this cause the world doth not know** (apprehend, recognize) **us; because it did not know Him** (viz. God: the Father. The insertion of *καὶ ἐσμέν* appears to serve the purpose of bringing out the reality of the state conferred upon us with this title, in spite of any non-recognition of it by the unbelieving world. To those, as Lücke and De Wette, who regard the preceding *ἵνα* as telic, the clause has no meaning, and they at once reject it as a gloss. Had it been, it would surely have been *καὶ ὦμεν*, as the vulg. *et simus*. But in our rendering of the passage, *καὶ ἐσμέν* is of the highest possible significance. On *ἐσμέν* depends *διὰ τοῦτο*: and we ARE God's children; *for this very reason*, because we bear not the name only but the essence, the world knows us not: and then, as a reason for this ignorance following on this reality of our derivation from Him,—because it knew Him not. The reality of a believer's sonship of God, and his non-recognition by the world, are thus necessarily connected together. But Whom did the world not know, and when? *αὐτόν* here, by the very requirements of the logic of the passage, must be the Father, who not

2 [x] ἀγαπητοί, νῦν [t] τέκνα [t] θεοῦ ἐσμέν, καὶ οὔπω [y] ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα. οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν [y] φανερωθῇ, ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ

x ch. ii. 7 reff. y ch. ii. 28 reff.

2. [θεου bef τεκνα P m.] rec aft οιδαμεν ins δε, with KL rel Syr copt æth $Orig_1$ Thl Œc $Ambr_1$ Jer_1 Quæst: om ABC[P]ℵ 13 vulg syr sah arm $Orig_2$ Did Tert $Aug_{sæpe}$.

being recognized, neither are His children: τὸν υἱοθετήσαντα, as Œc.; Aug., Benson, al., understand *Christ*: "ambulabat et ipse Dominus Jesus Christus, in carne erat Deus, latebat in infirmitate." But this can only be, if we understand that the world rejected that revelation of the Father which was made by Christ His Son. And if we introduce this element, we disturb the strictness of the argument. It is the world's ignorance of God, considered (and this is the force, if it is to be pressed, of the aor. ἔγνω) as one great act of non-recognition, disobedience, rebellion, hate (for all these are involved in St. John's οὐ γνῶναι, as their opposites in his γινώσκειν), which makes them incapable of recognizing, loving, sympathizing with, those who are veritably children of God: cf. ch. v. 1). 2.] **Beloved, now are we children of God** (the world recognizes us not: but our sonship is real: none the less real, that we ourselves know not our future condition in all its manifestation. So that the next member of the sentence is introduced not with an ἀλλά, but with a καί: the two are not contrasted, but simply put in juxtaposition as components of our present state. We are really sons of God, even *now*: and we look (this very word νῦν suggesting a future) for an inheritance in virtue of that sonship: it has not been yet manifested of what sort that inheritance shall be: thus much we know &c. Such seems to be the simple connexion, without any adversative particles expressed or understood), **and it was never yet manifested** (on any occasion: such is the force of the aor. And **ἐφανερώθη**, as so often in St. John, and as in the next sentence, does not mean, made manifest to *knowledge* or *anticipation*,—for that it is, as asserted below: but, shewn forth *in actuality*, come to its manifestation) **what we shall be** (understand, in virtue of this our state of sons of God: to what new development or condition this already existing fact will lead. But we must take care not to fall into Grot.'s error, "quo modo futuri simus filii Dei:" for as Calov. rightly remarks, "non dantur gradus υἱότητος:" we are as truly, and in the same sense, children of God now, as we shall be then: but now (cf. Gal. iv. 1) we are children waiting for an unknown inheritance—then we shall be children in full possession of that inheritance. And hence, from the reality and identity of that sonship, comes what follows,—our certain knowledge, even in this absence of manifestation in detail, that our future condition will consist in likeness to Him. As Œc., τὸ γὰρ νῦν ἄδηλον φανερὸν γενήσεται, ἐκείνου ἀποκαλυπτομένου. ὅμοιοι γὰρ αὐτῷ ἀναφανέντες τὸ τῆς υἱοθεσίας λαμπρὸν παραστήσομεν. οἱ γὰρ υἱοὶ πάντες ὅμοιοι τῷ πατρί). **We know** (no contrast—see above: what we know of this τί ἐσόμεθα is this. There is not even a *correction* of the preceding as Düsterd.: the connexion is simply, "This future condition of ours hath never yet appeared: thus much we know of it." οἴδαμεν, as always, of certain, well-assured cognition) **that if it were manifested** (viz. the τί ἐσόμεθα; this φανερωθῇ takes up again the former one. So Didymus (Aug. is quoted on both sides by the Commentators, but he does not really commit himself on the point), Œc. (τὸ γὰρ νῦν ἄδηλον φανερὸν γενήσεται), Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Socinus, Episcopius, Schlichting, Grotius, Spener, Bengel, Benson, Rosenm., Lücke, Sander, De Wette, Baumg.-Crus., Neander, Düsterd., Huther, and others: on the other hand, Bede, Calvin, Beza (and the E. V.: Tyndale and Cranmer had "*it*"), Aretius, Whitby, Calov., Estius, al., supply "*He*," understanding *Christ*: appealing to St. John's well-known usage which we have in ch. ii. 28, and below in our ver. 5. But it may be replied, that in the former case the subject was plainly suggested by ἐν αὐτῷ in the latter actually expressed in ἐκεῖνος: whereas here the reference of the verb is no less plainly given by the preceding ἐφανερώθη. Besides which, ἐκεῖνος in verse 5 clearly shews that the divine subject of these verses is not Christ but the Father. Estius and Lyra indeed seem to hold it possible to supply ὁ θεός as a subject to φανερωθῇ here, but not even themselves have propounded this for their own interpretation: indeed the former sets it aside, and the latter seems to be only paraphrasing when he says, "cum nobis se patrem ostenderit in possessione cœlestis hæreditatis." On the ἐάν, hypothetical, see above, ch. ii. 28. As there, the φανερωθῇ is the futurus exactus: "on its manifestation:" and here the hypothesis, from the repetition of the verb, necessarily gains emphasis, almost = that, *even if it were* manifested,

z Matt. v. 8. Heb. xii. 14. Rev. xxii. 4.

ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι z ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθώς ἐστιν. 3 καὶ πᾶς

. . . This consideration has an important bearing on what follows), **we shall be** (ἐσόμεθα taken up again from above, and the emphatic ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ corresponding exactly to τί above) **like Him** (*God;* as Œc. above, and most Commentators. See below), **because** (ὅτι must be kept firm to its causal meaning, and all the difficulties of the sentence met thus, not by explaining it away, as even Œc. (ἀλλὰ καί), Schol. ii. (ὅτε καί), Luther (*et*). Nor does it express merely the *mode* of the transformation, as Lyra. Still less must we, with Calvin ("neque enim docet similes ideo nos fore, quia fruemur adspectu, sed inde probat nos divinæ gloriæ fore participes, quia nisi spiritualis et cœlesti beataque immortalitate prædita esset natura, ad Deum nunquam tum prope accederet"), Seb.-Schmidt ("Qui visurus est Deum sicuti est, eum oportet esse perfecte similem Deo"), and Socinus ("neque enim fieri potest ut quis ipsum Deum videat, . . . nisi ei similis aliquo modo . . . . fuerit"), —and so even Huther, endorsing Calvin's statement, "ratio hæc ab effectu sumta est non a causa,"—reverse the causal connexion, and make the seeing Him as He is merely a proof that we shall be like Him (ὅτι = γάρ). Whatever consequences it may entail, it is philologically certain that the proposition introduced by ὅτι contains the real essential cause and ground of that which it follows) **we shall see Him** (God: see below) **as He is** (with St. John, the recognition and knowledge of God is ever no mere cognition, but the measure of the spiritual life: he who has it, possesses God, has the Father and the Son: becomes more and more like God, having His seed in him. So that the full and perfect accomplishment of this knowledge in the actual fruition of God Himself must of necessity bring with it entire likeness to God. And this is the part of the future lot of the sons of God which is certain. Because we shall see Him as He is,—which is taken for granted as a Christian axiom, —it of necessity follows that we shall be entirely like Him: ethically like Him: we shall behold, as Œc., δίκαιον δίκαιοι, ἁγνὸν ἁγνοί. The difficulty that no man can see God, is not in reality contained here, any more than it is in our Lord's "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall *see* God." The word, however understood, has for its limit, that no created eye even in the glorified body can behold the Creator: that beyond its keenest search there will be glory and perfection baffling and dazzling it: but this incapacity does not prevent the vision, as far as it can reach, being clear and unclouded: being, to the utmost extent of which our glorified nature is capable, ὡς ἔστιν—a true and not a false vision of God. And if it be again objected that we seem to be thus confounding the ethical sight of God which is the measure of our likeness to God, with corporeal sight of Him in the resurrection body, I answer that in the realm where our thoughts are now employed, I cannot appreciate that distinction between ethical and corporeal. We are speaking of things which eye hath not seen, nor mind conceived: what a σῶμα πνευματικόν may imply, our ideas now do not enable us to conceive: but I suppose it must at all events be a body, all of whose senses are spiritually conditioned and attuned: that what τὰ φυσικά are to our bodies here, τὰ πνευματικά will be there: and feeling this, however little I may know of the details of the great fact, it removes from me all insuperable difficulty as to the ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστιν. "I know that in my flesh I shall see God," may not be the right expression in Job, but it is the expression of my hopes as a son of God: it is the one expression of a hope in which all other hopes culminate and centre. And every son of God knows, that for it ever to be fulfilled, he must be growing onward in likeness to Him, pure, even up into His purity: for in His light only shall we see light. The literature of this verse would far surpass our limits, even in an abridged summary. It will be found in Düsterdieck's Commentary, vol. ii. pp. 56—82. One point only must be noticed before passing onward; the fact that several of the great interpreters understand αὐτῷ and αὐτόν of *Christ*. This has partly of course been occasioned by their supplying Christ as a subject to the verb φανερωθῇ above. Augustine has one of his most beautiful passages, explaining how at Christ's appearing, the impious shall see only *formam servi*, but we *formam Dei*. The whole view, however, does not satisfy the requirements of the passage. It is the τέκνα θεοῦ who are addressed: and the topic of exhortation is that they be righteous as God their Father is righteous. Christ is expressly introduced below in ver. 5 (see on ver. 3) by ἐκεῖνος. Augustine concludes with a burst of eloquence which describes just as well the true view of the vision: "Ergo visuri sumus quandam visionem, fratres, quam

ὁ ἔχων τὴν [a] ἐλπίδα ταύτην [a] ἐπ αὐτῷ [b] ἁγνίζει ἑαυτὸν καθὼς ἐκεῖνος [c] ἁγνός ἐστιν. [4] πᾶς ὁ [d] ποιῶν τὴν [d] ἁμαρ-

a Ps. lxi. 7. see 1 Pet. i. 13. iii. 5.
b James iv. 8 reff.
c 2 Cor. vii. 11. xi. 2. Phil. iv. 8. 1 Tim. v. 22. Tit. ii. 5. James iii. 17. 1 Pet. iii. 2 only. Ps. xi. 6.
d vv. 8, 9. John viii. 34. 2 Cor. xi 7. James v. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 22 only. 3 Kings xvi. 19.

nec oculus vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit: visionem quandam, visionem præcellentem omnes pulchritudines terrenas, auri, argenti, nemorum atque camporum, pulchritudinem maris et aëris, pulchritudinem solis et lunæ, pulchritudinem angelorum, omnia superantem, quia ex ipsa pulchra sunt omnia." Tract. in Ep. Joh. iv. 5, vol. iii. p. 2008).

3.] **And every one that hath this hope** (viz., that of being like Him hereafter) **on Him** (i. e. rested and grounded on God. In God, and grounded on His promises, is all our hope), **purifieth himself** (these words are not to be taken in any Pelagian sense, as if a man could of himself purify himself: "apart from me," says our Lord, "ye can do nothing." John xv. 5. The man who purifies himself has this hope, resting upon God. This mere fact implies a will to purify himself, not out of, nor independent of, this hope, but ever stirred up by, and accompanying it. So that the will is not his own, sprung out of his own nature, but the result of his Christian state, in which God also ministers to him the power to carry out that will in self-purification. So that Aug. who pleads strongly for free will here, is right when he says "castificas te, non de te, sed de illo qui venit ut inhabitet te." See 2 Cor. vii. 1, which is remarkably parallel: and 1 Pet. i. 21, 22. The idea of *ἁγνίζειν* is much the same as that of *καθαρίζειν*, ch. i. 9: it is entire purification, not merely from unchastity but from all defilement of flesh and spirit. "In the LXX, the word (*ἁγνός*) appears to be synonymous with *καθαρός*, being used for טָהוֹר and like words. Levitical purity of persons and things (Num. viii. 21, xxxi. 19, 23; 1 Chron. xv. 12), the pure life of the Nazarenes (Num. vi. 2, 3), the purity of God's word (Ps. xi. 7, xviii. 10), all these are expressed by *ἁγνός, ἁγνίζειν* &c. And correspondent to this is N. T. usage. The purity of the wisdom that cometh from above (James iii. 17), the purity of those who had to keep a vow (Acts xxi. 24, 26, xxiv. 18), the absence of moral stain in the Christian character generally, which includes above all things purity of heart (1 Pet. i. 22; James iv. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22: cf. Phil. iv. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 2), and the particular purity of chastity (Tit. ii. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 12, v. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 2),—all these are rightly included in the name *ἁγνεία*." Düsterdieck), **even as He is pure** (Who is intended by *ἐκεῖνος*? Clearly below in ver. 5, Christ, from the facts of the case. But is it as clear here? Almost all the modern Commentators assume it. And certainly, first appearances are greatly in its favour: the usual rule requiring that *ἐκεῖνος* shall point to a third person as yet not spoken of in the context, and differing from *αὐτός*. The inference is also upheld by a first view of ch. ii. 6, where much the same expression is used, and used of Christ. But there are some weighty considerations against the view. First, it is the *Father*, of whom it is written, "Be ye holy, for (or, as) I am holy," 1 Pet. i. 15, 16; Levit. xi. 44, xix. 2: cf. also Matt. v. 48. Secondly, it would be very harsh thus to introduce a new subject, in the face of this Scripture usage. Thirdly, it would be against the whole spirit of the context: in which sonship of God and likeness to God are joined together, and the hopes belonging to the state are made motives for the duty. Fourthly, if it be asserted that Christ is our Pattern, in whom we see the Father's purity shewn forth; I answer that this would be perfectly intelligible, if allusion was made, as in ch. ii. 6, to some historical manifestation in our Lord's life (*καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιεπάτησεν*): but being as it is in the present tense, it refers to the essential divine attribute of purity: and if so, then to that attribute in its primary inherence in the Father. Fifthly, the usage of *ἐκεῖνος* with *αὐτός* does not at all require the change of persons, only a change of the phase of predication regarding the same person, and the throwing up into emphasis some new particular which is brought into view. See this discussed on 2 Tim. ii. 26, and consult also the note on ch. ii. 6, where it is very doubtful whether *αὐτός* and *ἐκεῖνος* do not refer to the same divine Person. For these reasons, I would interpret *ἐκεῖνος* here of the Father, in whom essentially abides this perfection of purity, and after continual increase of likeness to whom his sons, having the ultimate hope of being completely like Him, will be striving. In ver. 5 the case is otherwise: see there, and also on ver. 7).

4—10.] *The irreconcileability of sin with the work of redemption, with communion with Christ, and with being born of God.* So De Wette: and the passage seems thus to be well described. But the difficulty has been, to mark distinctly the connexion

e Matt. xiii. 41 only. Ps. xxxvi. 1. f ch. i. 2 reff.

τίαν καὶ τὴν [e] ἀνομίαν [e] ποιεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. [5] καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος [f] ἐφανερώθη ἵνα τὰς

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

4. aft εστιν ins και (but marked for erasure) ℵ[1].
5. οιδαμεν ℵ 40. 98 sah arm Fulg.

with the foregoing. In order to discover this, we must go back to the theme of the whole section of the Epistle, in ch. ii. 29: "If God is righteous, then every one that doeth righteousness, is born of Him." Hitherto the positive side of this position has been illustrated: the inseparability of birth-from-God and likeness-to-God. Now, the Apostle comes to treat its negative side: the incompatibility of sin with birth-from-God. And this he deals with essentially and in the ideal, as always. The whole is in the closest connexion with the foregoing, and is developed step by step with the minutest precision, as will be seen in the exegesis. 4.] In this verse we have ver. 3 taken up (cf. πᾶς ὁ ἔχων . . . . πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν) ex adverso. There, God's essential purity formed a law, according to which the child of God, having hope of ultimate complete likeness to Him, purifies himself. Here we have it declared that the sinner goes counter to (this and all other) law: indeed the two terms, sin and lawlessness, are synonymous and convertible. **Every one that committeth sin, also committeth transgression-of-law: and sin** (abstract and in general) **is transgression-of-law** (abstract and in general. The assertion amounts to the identification of the terms, and the ἐστίν amounts to "is equivalent to." If either of the words were anarthrous, it would become predicative of quality,—"is of the nature of"—as in θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος: *both* having the article, both are *distributed* logically, and the one is asserted to be co-extensive and convertible with the other. And from the nature of the foregoing clause, which was to declare the ἀνομία of sin, it would appear here also that we must take ἡ ἁμαρτία as the subject and ἡ ἀνομία as the predicate, not the converse. This being so, *what is it exactly that our verse asserts* respecting these two things, sin, and transgression-of-law? First and obviously, no appropriation must be made, in this verse and throughout this passage, of ἁμαρτία to *one kind* of sin, whether it be mortal sin as distinguished from venial (so the R.-C. expositors, e. g. Estius, but hesitatingly, "loquitur præcipue de peccato mortali, quamquam et venalia sunt iniquitates quædam et legi divinæ alicui repugnant, et ab ingressu regni cœlestis ac similitudine Christi participanda remorantur, donec expurgata fuerint"), or notorious and unrepented sins, or sins against brotherly love (as Luther, and Aug. on ver. 9): "peccare contumaciter," Aret.: "peccato dare operam," Beza, Piscator: "peccare scientem et volentem," Seb.-Schmidt, Spener. The assertions are all perfectly general, and regard, in the true root and ideal, every sin whatever. Every sin whatever then is a transgression of God's law: as indeed its very name implies: ἁμαρτάνειν being to *miss a mark*, and the mark being that will of God which is the νόμος and σκοπός to him who ποιεῖ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ch. ii. 17. Œc. gives the meaning very well, except that he understands of the law of nature only, what ought to be understood of the law of God, the revelation of His will, in whatever way made: ἰστέον δὲ ὡς ἁμαρτία μὲν ἡ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀπόπτωσίς ἐστιν, ἀνομία δὲ ἡ περὶ τὸν θετὸν νόμον πλημμέλεια. καὶ ταύτην ἔχουσιν ἀρχὴν ἑκάτερον τούτων, τὸ μὲν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἔκπτωσιν, τὸ δὲ τὴν περὶ τὸν θετὸν νόμον πλημμέλειαν. συμφέρονται δὲ ταύταις καὶ κατὰ ταὐτόν. ὅ τε γὰρ ἁμαρτάνων τοῦ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν καὶ ἐν τῇ φύσει ἀπέτυχε σκοποῦ. σκοπὸς γὰρ τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ φύσει τὸ κατὰ τὸν λόγον ζῆν, τῆς ἀλογίας πόρρω ἀπῳκισμένη. ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ ἄνομος πλημμελεῖ περὶ τὸν ἐν τῇ φύσει δεδομένον νόμον, διαγινόμενος ἀκρατῶς, καλῶς οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ταὐτὸν ἀμφότερα περιέστησεν). 5.] *Additional argument* for the incompatibility of sin with the life of God's children; that He, Christ, in and by whom we have this adoption (John i. 12), and by being in whose likeness alone we can be perfectly like God, was manifested to take away all sins, being Himself sinless. **And ye know** (the Apostle assumes it as known by those who had an anointing from the Holy One and knew all things, ch. ii. 20) **that He** (now clearly Christ, from the context, which (see above on ἐκεῖνος, ver. 3) can alone decide the reference in each case) **was manifested** (viz. by His appearing in the flesh, and all that He openly and visibly did and taught in it, or may be known, by the Spirit, to have done and taught) **in order that He may (might) take away** (aor. "take away by one act and entirely." The meaning, "*take away*," and not "*bear*," is necessitated here by the context. Sin is altogether alien from Christ. He became in-

ἁμαρτίας [g] ἄρῃ, καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. [6] πᾶς ὁ [h] ἐν αὐτῷ [h] μένων οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει. πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων

g John i. 29. Col. ii. 14. 1 Kings xv. 25. xxv. 28. see Exod. xxviii. 34 (38). Levit. x. 17. h ch. ii. 24.

rec aft αμαρτιας ins ημων, with CKLℵ rel vulg-ed Syr sah Ath Thl Œc Bede: om AB[P] 13 am(with fuld demid harl tol) syr copt æth arm Tert Aug Fulg Cassiod.
ουκ εστιν bef εν αυτω ℵ coptt æth.

carnate that He might blot it out: He has no stain of it on Himself. If we render ἄρῃ "*bear*," this coherence is lost. Of course this fact is in the background, that He took them away by bearing them Himself: but it is not brought out, only the antagonism between Him and sin. See, on the word, the note on ref. John) **sins** (**τὰς ἁμαρτ.**, *all* sins, not merely certain sins. The object of his manifestation is stated not only categorically, but definitively. Compare the striking parallel Heb. ix. 26, εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται); **and in Him sin is not** (as His work, in being manifested, was, altogether to take away sin, so likewise is He himself free from all spot of sin. The καί serves to co-ordinate the last clause with the first, not to subordinate it, as many Commentators have supposed, and even Aug.: "In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum: nam si esset et in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret:" and Œc., τὸ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ διότι: and afterwards, ἵνα ὡς μὴ ἁμαρτίαν ποιήσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ: so also Corn.-a-lap., Lorinus, Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Neander. This interpretation is confuted by the ἔστιν, which should have been ἦν: and by the following context, in which this fact of the sinlessness of Christ serves as the foundation for what is said, verse 6. The most palpable violations of the construction and sense are made by the rationalists, of whom Grotius may serve as an example: "præsens pro præterito: peccatum in eo non erat, nempe cum vitam mortalem viveret." Socinus, feeling that this could not be, tries to explain away *peccatum*, as meaning "non vitium aliquid in moribus," but the consequences of sin, "omnia mala, omnesque perpessiones, una cum ipsa morte," from which Christ is now (hodie) for ever free, "utpote beatissimus, et impatibilis atque immortalis." And strange to say, Calvin so far misunderstands what is here said as to write "non de Christi persona hic agit, sed de toto corpore. Quocunque vim suam diffundit Christus, negat amplius locum esse peccato." This would deprive ἐν αὐτῷ μένων, verse 6, of all its meaning as referring back to the ἐν αὐτῷ here, and make it merely tautological. It is only by holding fast here the personal reference to Christ in himself, that we keep the logical coherence between that verse and this: the reasoning from that which He is not, and cannot be, to that which they that abide in Him are not and cannot be).

6.] The connexion see above. **Every one that abideth in Him** (**μένει ἐν αὐτῷ** is not to be weakened down, with Semler, Episcopius, al., by any rationalistic interpretation as "credere in Christum," "Christi discipulum esse:" still less as Œc., does ἀνενδότως τὰς ἀρετὰς μετιὼν express ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων. Grot. is better this time,—"qui vero amore Christo conjungitur;" but this is not enough. This a man might be to an earthly friend: but could not be said ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν. See the sense expanded in the note on ch. ii. 24. Nothing short of personal immanence in the personal Christ will satisfy the words: a living because He lives, and as receiving of His fulness) **sinneth not** (nor again is this to be tamed down, as has been done by far more and better interpreters than in the last case, by making it mean "does not persist in sin;" so Luther, "does not allow sin to reign over him"—so Hunnius: and similarly Socinus, Episcopius, Calvin, Beza, the Schmidts, Calov., J. Lange, Bengel ("bonum justitiæ in eo non separatur a malo peccati"), Sander, al. Against all such the plain words of the Apostle must be held fast, and explained by the analogy of his way of speaking throughout the Epistle of the ideal reality of the life of God and the life of sin as absolutely excluding one another. This all the best and deepest Commentators have felt: so Augustine and Bede, "in quantum in ipso manet, in tantum non peccat." The two are incompatible: and in so far as a man is found in the one, he is thereby separated from the other. In the child of God is the hatred of sin; in the child of the devil, the love of it; and every act done in virtue of either state or as belonging to either, is done purely on one side or purely on the other. If the child of God falls into sin, it is an act against nature, deadly to life, hardly endured, and bringing bitter repentance: it is as the taking of a poison, which if it be not corrected by its antidote, will sap the very springs of life. So that there is no real contradiction to ch. i. 8—10, ii. 2, where

l ch. iv. 6 reff. k ch. ii. 1 reff. l ch. i. 8 reff. m ch. ii. 29 reff.

οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲ [l] ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν. 7 [k] Τεκνία, μηδεὶς [l] πλανάτω ὑμᾶς. ὁ [m] ποιῶν τὴν [m] δικαιοσύνην δί-

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

7. for τεκνια, παιδια AC[P] 13 syr-mg copt arm, *filii* Lucif: txt BKLℵ rel sah Thl Œc, *filioli* vulg spec syrr Tert. for μηδεις, μη τις A. om την ℵ[1].

this very falling into sin of the child of God is asserted and the remedy prescribed. The real difficulty of our verse is in that which follows); **every one that sinneth hath not seen Him, neither hath known Him** (here it seems to be said that the act of sinning not only "in tantum" excludes from the life in God and Christ, but proves that that life *has never existed* in the person so sinning. That this cannot be the meaning of the Apostle, is evident from such passages as ch. i. 8—10, ii. 2, and indeed from the whole tenor of the Epistle, in which the νῦν τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμέν occurs in combination with μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς and the like: whereas if the above view were correct, the very fact of πεπλανῆσθαι not only would cause them to cease from being τέκνα θεοῦ, but would prove that they never had been such. If then this cannot be so, what meaning are we to put upon the words? First observe the tense in which the verbs stand: that they are not aorists but perfects: and that some confusion is introduced in English by our perfect not corresponding to the Greek one, but rather partaking of the aoristic sense: giving the impression "hath *never* seen Him nor known Him:" whereas the Greek perfect denotes an abiding present effect resting on an event in the past. So much is this so, that ἔγνωκα, and many other perfects, lose altogether their reference to the past event, and point simply to the abiding present effect of it: ἔγνωκα is the present effect of a past act of cognition, = "I know." In the Greek perfect, the *present* predominates: in the English perfect (and in the German still more), the *past*. Hence in very many cases the best version-rendering of the Greek perfect is by the English present. And so here, without for a moment letting go the true significance of the tense, I should render, if making a version, "*seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him.*" But manifestly such an interpretation would be philologically insufficient, and would only be chosen as the less of two evils, and as bringing out that side of the Greek perfect which, besides being the prevalent one, is less liable to mistake than the other. In exegesis, we must take in not merely the absence of such sight and knowledge in the present state of the sinner, but the significance of such present failure as regards the past: that his sight and knowledge are so far annulled as to their validity and reality. In fact, we get to much the same declaration as that in ch. ii. 19, εἰ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἦσαν, μεμενήκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν: and their very going out shewed that they were not (all are not) of us: so here: the cutting off by an act of sin of the sight and knowledge of Christ, shews, and shews in proportion as it prevails, unreality in that sight and knowledge.

As regards the relation of the words themselves, ἑώρακεν and ἔγνωκεν; some, with whom Düsterd. in the main agrees, hold that there is no perceptible difference: but that the latter word fixes and specifies the necessarily figurative meaning of the former: οὐδέ being simply copulative (= οὔτε). Lücke would understand ὁρᾷν of knowledge obtained by historical information, which matures and completes itself into γινώσκειν (edn. 3); taking οὐδέ also merely as copulative. But this seems hardly according to St. John's practice, who uses ὁρᾷν either of bodily sight (John i. 18, 1 John i. 1, &c., &c.),—or of an intuitive immediate vision of divine things, such as Christ has of the Father and heavenly things (John iii. 11, 32, vi. 46, viii. 38),—or of spiritual intuition gained by knowledge of Christ and the divine life (John xiv. 7, 9; 3 John 11): and there can be little doubt that this last is the meaning here: as Sander; and thus οὐδέ will retain its proper exclusive and climacteric force: ὁρᾷν is a further step than γινώσκειν: a realization of Christ's personality and of the existence of heavenly things which is the result of spiritual knowledge: and thus the sinner "hath not seen Him, nor yet known Him"). 7, 8.] *The contrast is again stated*, and introduced by a solemn warning not to be misled respecting it: and, as usually in St. John's repetitions, a new feature is brought in, which the following verses take up and further treat: viz. ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν. 7.] **Little children, let no one deceive you** (it does not seem that any particular false teacher is here in St. John's view; but he alludes to all who would sever ethical likeness to God from the Christian life): **he that doeth righteousness** (τὴν δ., perhaps as being abstract, but more probably because the righteousness spoken of is but one, and that God's: the righteousness which is His) **is righteous, even as He** (here apparently, God, notwithstanding

καιός ἐστιν καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν· 8 ὁ n ποιῶν τὴν n ἁμαρτίαν o ἐκ τοῦ o διαβόλου ἐστίν, ὅτι o ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ

n ver. 4.
o John viii. 44.

8. ins δε bef ποιων A k 25. 68 tol Syr(et) copt æth arm Lucif.

the apparent parallel of Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν δίκαιον in ch. ii. 2: for we are by this saying, as by that in verse 3,—where see note,—referred back to the great Source of our spiritual birth, ch. ii. 29, and our likeness to Him insisted on: ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἔγνωκεν τὸν δίκαιον, καὶ δίκαιός ἐστιν ὡς καὶ ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν, τουτέστιν ὁ θεός) **is righteous.**

This verse has absolutely nothing to do with the sense which the R.-Cath. expositors have endeavoured to extract from it, "adversus hæreticos hodiernos, simili ratione populum seducentes, cum negant per bona opera quemquam justum esse coram Deo," Est., and so Lyra, Corn.-a-lap., and Tirinus. But this is altogether to invert the proposition of the Apostle, who is reasoning, not from the fact of doing good works to the conclusion that a man is righteous, but from the hypothesis of a man's being a child of God, born of Him and like Him, to the necessity of his purifying himself and doing righteousness. And in doing this, he ascribes the ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην to its source, and the ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν to its source: the one man is of God, the other is of the devil. As Luther well says (in Düsterd. h. l.), "good works of piety do not make a good pious man, but a good pious man does good pious works. .... Fruits grow from the tree, not the tree from fruits").

8.] *Contrast to ver.* 7: cf. ὁ ποιῶν ... ὁ ποιῶν: but here by the necessity of the case, when a *positive* assertion comes to be made respecting the sinner, the new element ἐκ τ. διαβ. ἐστίν is introduced: see below. **He that doeth sin is of the devil** (notice first ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, as indicative not so much of individual acts as of a state, corresponding to ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην. And then ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν must not be rationalized away, as is done by those who deny the personal existence of the devil. It is the distinct opposite correlative of ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν (ver. 10 al. freq.), and implies a personal root and agency just as much as that other does. But again, it does not imply any physical dualism on the part of the Apostle. "Neminem fecit diabolus," says Aug. h. l. Tract. iv. 10, 11, vol. iii. p. 2011, "neminem genuit, neminem creavit; sed quicunque fuerit imitatus diabolum, quasi de illo natus, fit filius diaboli, imitando, non proprie nascendo .... Omnes peccatores ex diabolo nati sunt, in quantum peccatores. Adam a Deo factus est; sed quando consensit diabolo, ex diabolo natus est, et tales omnes genuit qualis erat. . . ." And below, § 11, "Ergo duas nativitates attendite, Adam et Christi. Duo sunt homines, sed unus ipsorum homo homo, alter ipsorum homo Deus. Per hominem hominem peccatores sumus, per hominem Deum justificamur. Nativitas illa dejecit ad mortem, ista nativitas erexit ad vitam: nativitas illa trahit secum peccatum, nativitas ista liberat a peccato: ideo enim venit Christus homo, ut solveret peccata hominum." Origen (in Joan. tom. xx. 13, vol. iv. p. 325 D) remarks that ἐστίν is said ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου, not ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, and on the other hand γεγεννημένος is said ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, not ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. This must not be urged too far, seeing that St. John does speak of εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, e.g. ch. v. 19, and places over against one another the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ and the τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου ver. 10: besides which, the devil is said to be ὁ πατήρ of the unbelieving (John viii. 44). All that we can say is, that the two are not strictly correspondent: that Origen's latter assertion is true—we have no γεγεννῆσθαι ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. In the case of the children of God, there is a definite time, known to Him, when they passed from death unto life (ch. ii. 29, iii. 14, v. 11; John i. 12, iii. 3 ff., v. 24, &c.): from which their new life unto God dates: but there is no such point in the life of those who are the children of the devil: no regeneration from beneath corresponding to that from above: the natural life of men is not changed by seed of the devil as it is by seed of God. Rather may we say, that in those who are of the devil this latter change has never taken place. Since sin has come to reign in the world by man's sin, our natural birth, which is properly and essentially a birth from God, a creation by the eternal Word, has become a birth from the devil: so that it is, as Bengel expresses it, "corruptio, non generatio," and there is no trace of a physical dualism in St. John's doctrine: nay, the idea is at once precluded by the fact that according to the Apostle (John i. 12) those who are children of God have become so from having been children of the devil. See this expounded, as usual, in Düsterd.'s note, from which much of the above is gathered): **because the devil**

διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει. [p] εἰς τοῦτο [q] ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα [r] λύσῃ τὰ [s] ἔργα τοῦ [s] διαβόλου. [9] πᾶς ὁ [t] γε-

ABCKL P ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

p John xviii. 37. Mark i. 38. Acts ix. 21. Rom. xiv. 9 al. q ver. 5. r = John ii. 19. Eph. ii. 14. 2 Pet. iii. 10, 11, 12. Esdr. i. 55 (52). s compare John viii. 41, 44. t ch. iv. 7 reff.

[λυθῃ P(sic, Tischdf).]

sinneth from the beginning (= 'sinned in the beginning, and has never ceased to sin since:' as Bede: "cum præmitteret 'ab initio,' subjunxit verbum præsentis temporis 'peccat:' quia ex quo ab initio cœpit diabolus peccare, nunquam desiit." But the question meets us, what is ἀπ' ἀρχῆς? Bede, al., understand it of the beginning of all creation: "neque enim dubitandum est inter primas creaturas angelos esse conditos; sed cæteris ad laudem Creatoris gloriam suæ conditionis referentibus, ille qui primus est conditus, mox ut altitudinem suæ claritatis aspexit, contra conditorem cum suis sequacibus superbus intumuit, perque eandem superbiam ex initio peccans, de archangelo in diabolum est versus." Many Commentators, to avoid all chance of dualism, make it mean not from the time of his creation, but from that of his fall: so Estius, understanding the ἀρχή of the beginning of *our world:* "statim a mundi creatione diabolum peccasse, cum prius nullum esset in mundo peccatum:" Calvin, "nihil aliud vult Johannes, quam diabolum statim a creatione mundi fuisse apostatam." But again, others suppose the term to mark the beginning of the devil's own apostasy: so Bengel, "ex quo diabolus est diabolus," Sander, al. And lastly, Lücke, De Wette, Brückner, Düsterd., Neander, take it with Seb.-Schmidt, "ab initio τοῦ peccare," from the time when any began to sin. And this seems, when we compare John viii. 44, to be the true interpretation. He has ever been the depositary, as it were, of the thought and the life of sin: the tempter to sin: the fountain out of which sin has come, as God is the fountain out of which has come righteousness. See on this subject, my Sermons on Divine Love, Serm. v. pp. 68 ff., "the First Sinner;" and Sartorius, "Lehre von der heiligen Liebe," i. pp. 115 ff.). **To this end was the Son of God manifested** (viz. in His incarnation, pregnant with all its consequences), **that He might destroy** (do away, break up, pull down: see reff.: of a building, or a law, or an organized whole) **the works of the devil** (what are these? Clearly, in the first place, works whereof the devil is the *author:* not as Baumg.-Crus., merely *devilish works*. And then, are we to include in the list not only sins, which manifestly belong to it, but also the consequences of sin, pain, sorrow, death? The *fact* would be true if we did: for Christ hath abolished death (2 Tim. i. 10): and Estius's objection need not have any weight with us, "mors peccatum non est, sed pœna peccati, Deum habens auctorem. . . . Destruitur mors per Christum, non quod ipsa sit opus diaboli sed quod ex opere diaboli justo Dei judicio subsecuta:" for even thus considered, it would be implicitly one of those works. But the context seems to require that we should at all events keep death and the results of sin in the background, as no mention is made of them here, and sinful works are clearly in the Apostle's mind. These works the whole φανέρωσις of Christ went directly to nullify: more especially His Death, in which His power over Satan reached its highest point,—the bruising of His heel, in which He bruised the Enemy's head:—for it was in that, that He won for us that acceptance which is sealed by His glorification, and in virtue of which the Holy Spirit is given us, of whose work in us it is said that we πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦμεν, Rom. viii. 13).

9, 10.] *The contrast taken up again*, and from the converse: he that is born of God cannot sin: he that does not righteousness, is not of God: i.e. is a child of the devil. Then we have the usual new particular, to give the transition note to that which is to follow,—including in this last category him that loveth not his brother. **Every one that is begotten of God, doeth not sin** (the meaning of this declaration has been treated of above, ver. 6. Here we meet it in its barest and plainest form—the two states, being begotten of God, and sin, absolutely excluding one another), **because His seed abideth in him** (i.e. because that new principle of life from which his new life has unfolded, which was God's seed deposited in him, abides growing there, and precludes the development of the old sinful nature. So the majority of the better expositors, defining somewhat differently, when they come to explain in detail this germ of spiritual life: Œc.,—ἤτοι (1) τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ διὰ τοῦ χαρίσματος ἐλάβομεν, . . . ἢ (2) καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ χριστός, ὃς ἐνοικῶν ἐν τοῖς πιστοῖς ποιεῖ αὐτοὺς υἱοὺς θεοῦ: Severus in Cramer's Catena, ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις δι' ἧς ἀνεγεννήθημεν: so (1) Lücke, Düsterd.;

γεννημένος [t] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ [u] ἁμαρτίαν οὐ [u] ποιεῖ, ὅτι [u] σπέρμα [u = here only.]

—"Spiritus sanctus et virtus ejus," Calvin, Beza; "gratia," Lyra, Tirinus, Corn.-a-lap.; "nativitas spiritualis," Estius, Luther; "vires regenerationis quæ a Spiritu sancto fit," Seb.-Schmidt; "the power of the divine life," De Wette (= τὸ πν. τοῦ θ.), Baumg.-Crus., Neander, Erdmann, De W.; "the spirit of man new begotten by the Spirit of God, in contrast to the flesh," Sander. Some of the ancients understood it of the *word* of God, as in the parable of the sower, Matt. xiii. 3 ff. So Clem. Alex. (but not as exegesis on this passage: at least if the passage in Strom. i. 1. 1, p. 317 P be meant,—ὁ Σαλομῶν (Prov. ii. 1) . . . σπειρόμενον τὸν λόγον κρύπτεσθαι μηνύει καθάπερ ἐν γῇ τῇ τοῦ μανθάνοντος ψυχῇ, καὶ αὕτη πνευματικὴ φυτεία), Aug. (Tract. v. § 7, vol. iii. p. 2016, "Semen Dei, id est, verbum Dei: unde dicit apostolus, Per evangelium ego vos genui, 1 Cor. iv. 15"), Bede (h. l.), Luther (1), Spener, Grotius, Calov., Bengel, Benson, Whitby, Socinus, Schlichting, Rosenmüller, al. This last interpretation has been impugned by all the moderns, but I cannot see that they have made good their objection: the force of which, as stated by Huther and Düsterd., amounts to this; that the word of God is not so much the *Seed*, as *the means whereby the begetting to the new life takes place* ("das Mittel der Erzeugung des neuen Lebens," Huth.). But whether we regard the generation of plants, or animal procreation, which latter is more in question here, what words can more accurately describe the office of the seed, than these? and what is the word of God but the continually abiding and working seed of the new life, in the child of God? Nay, it seems to be that exactly of which we are in search: not the Holy Spirit, the personal agent; not the power of the new life, the thing begotten; but just that which intervenes between the two, the word, the utterance of God—dropt into the soul of man, taking it up by divine power into itself, and developing the new life continually. This is in the most precise and satisfactory sense the σπέρμα τοῦ θεοῦ: and on this all Scripture symbolism is agreed: cf. 1 Pet. i. 23, James i. 18. In fact the very passage which is the key to this, is John v. 38, τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα. Nor should any exception have been taken by Huther and Düsterd. to the comparison with the parable of the Sower ("wie viele ältere Ausleger mit ungeschickter Vergleichung von Matt. xiii. 3 ff.," Düsterd.), for though the attendant circumstances of generation are different, the analogy is the same.

There is a novel and extraordinary rendering proposed by Bengel, who, after explaining σπέρμα by "verbum Dei cum sua virtute," says, "vel potius sic: Semen Dei, i. e. is qui natus est ex Deo, manet in Deo. σπέρμα, natus. Tales sunt vere זֶרַע אֱלֹהִים, semen Dei: Mal. ii. 15:"—and adopted by Sander,—see above. This hardly needs refutation: we can only say that any one who can persuade himself that σπέρμα αὐτοῦ, anarthrous, and loco subjecti, can mean ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγεννημένος, has, both philologically and exegetically, much yet to learn. The reason of this absence of the article is plain: the seed is thought of not individually, but categorically: q. d., "because seed of His abideth in him"); **and he cannot sin** (there is no climax in καὶ οὐ: if there is any, it rests entirely with δύναται. No explaining away of this declaration must be attempted, as is done by Corn.-a-lap., who understands it of *deadly* sin; by Aug. and Bede, who confine the ἁμαρτάνειν to the violation of brotherly love: or as Grot. "res de qua agitur aliena est ab ejusmodi ingenio." The Apostle is speaking not only of the ideal, but of the real state of those born of God: drawing the strongest possible contrast between the life of God and the life of sin, as excluding one another absolutely. And there is no contradiction between what is here said and ch. i. 8, 9; nay, rather that passage shews, by the strong desire to be cleansed from all sin, which it assumes, the same incompatibility as is here insisted on), **because he hath been begotten of God** (almost all the expositors, from the first times until now, make this ὅτι more or less represent ἐφ' ὅσον, *in quantum*, *quamdiu*, *quatenus*, and the like. And where τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν was the matter to be measured, as in ver. 6, no doubt this might be: but τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγεννῆσθαι is an absolute fact, to which an ἐφ' ὅσον refuses to be applied: it either has been, or it has not been: its effect either endures, or does not endure. And in this last consideration lies the true solution of the difficulty. As before in ver. 6, so now, the Greek perfect is especially to be held firm in our exegesis. The Apostle does not say οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθη: this would testify to a past fact, once for all occurring, without any reference to its present permanence: but he has said ὅτι ἐκ τ. θ. γεγέννηται,—because he *has abiding in*

αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει· καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται. 10 ἐν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστιν τὰ

u see ch. ii. 3, reff.

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

him that his birth from God. So that the ἐφ' ὅσον explanation, though falling far short of the real meaning, has at least a feeling after the truth of the Apostle's assertion in it. The abiding force of this divine generation in a man, excludes sin ("qui eam indolem retinebit, non peccabit," as Grotius, thus far right): where sin enters, that force does not abide: the γεγεννῆσθαι is in danger of becoming a γεννηθῆναι, a fact in the past instead of a fact in the present: a lost life, instead of a living life. And so all such passages as this, instead of testifying, as Calvin would have this one do ("Johannes non solum docet quam efficaciter agat semel Deus in homine, sed clare affirmat, Spiritum suum gratiam in nobis ad extremum usque persequi, ut ad vitæ novitatem inflexibilis perseverantia accedat"), to the doctrine of final perseverance of the regenerate, do in fact bear witness to the very opposite: viz., that, as the Church of England teaches, we need God's special grace every day to keep us in the state of salvation, from which every act and thought of sin puts us in peril of falling away. Jerome, advers. Jovin. ii. 1, vol. ii. p. 321, quotes Jovinian as maintaining, from this verse, "eos qui fuerint baptizati a diabolo non posse tentari: quicunque autem tentati fuerint, eos aqua tantum et non spiritu baptizatos;" which view Lücke ascribes to his desire, in a spirit of ethical reform, to bring back men's minds to the fundamental and ideal contrasts of Scripture itself. But surely in such a case, "a diabolo non posse tentari" was rather beyond the mark. Before leaving this important passage, I must quote Düsterdieck's concluding remarks. "The difference between the older and more modern expositors (as Lücke, Rickli, De Wette, and Neander) lies in this, that the former are more anxious to moderate the details of the Apostle's sentiment, and to tone down his assertion to the actual life of Christians, while the moderns recognize the full precision of the text as it stands, but then remind us that the ideal truth of the principle announced by St. John continually so to speak floats above the actual life of believers as their rule and aim, and that, in so far, the Apostle's saying finds in such actual life only a relative fulfilment. None however of all the expositors, who in any way has recognized the ideal character of St. John's view, has overlooked the fact, that even in the actual life of all that are born of God there is something which in full verity answers to the ideal words 'they cannot sin.' The children of God, in whom the divine seed of their eternal life abides, have, in reality, a holy privilege, as Steinhofer says,—they sin not, and they cannot sin, just in proportion as the new divine life, unconditionally opposed to all sin, and manifesting itself in godlike righteousness, is present and abides in them. Expositors of all theological tendencies, in all times, e. g. Didymus, Œc., Est., Schlichting, Luther, Hunnius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Bengel, Joachim Lange, Rosenm., Lucke, Neander, &c. point to this, that the new life of believers, veritably begotten by regeneration from God, is simply incompatible with sin (ἀνακόλουθον καὶ ἀνάρμοστον, Didymus);—the life which essentially alienates the spirit from all sin (ἀνεπίδεκτον ἁμαρτίας τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν ποιεῖ, Œc.), fills it with an irreconcilable hate against every sin, and urges it to an unceasing conflict against all unrighteousness. Luther excellently says, that a child of God in this conflict receives indeed wounds daily, but never throws away his arms or makes peace with his deadly foe. Sin is ever active, but no longer dominant: the normal direction of life's energies in the believer is against sin, is an absence of sin, a no-will-to-sin and a no-power-to-sin. He that is born of God has become, from being a servant of sin, a servant of righteousness: according to the divine seed remaining in him, or, as St. Paul says, according to the inner man (Rom. vii. 15 ff.), he will, and he can work only that which is like God,—righteousness, though the flesh, not yet fully mortified, rebels and sins: so that even in and by the power of the new life sin must be ever confessed, forgiveness received (ch. i. 8 ff.), the temptation of the evil one avoided and overcome (ch. v. 18), and self-purification and sanctification carried on"). **10.**] "*Epilogus superioris argumenti,*" as Luther: with the insertion, in the latter half, of the new particular which is to form the argument of the next section. But this latter half belongs not only to that next section, but to this as well: its assertion πᾶς ὁ μὴ κ.τ.λ., is requisite for the carrying out fully of the ἐν τούτῳ, which at the same time looks backward and forward: backward, for the children of God have already been designated by the absence of sin, ver. 9: forward, for the children of the devil are designated below by the presence of sin in the second half of the verse. In this

^{v} τέκνα τοῦ ^{v} θεοῦ καὶ τὰ ^{w} τέκνα τοῦ ^{w} διαβόλου. πᾶς ὁ μὴ ^{x} ποιῶν ^{x} δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ^{y} ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· [11] ὅτι ^{z} αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ^{a} ἀγγε-

v vv. 1, 2 reff.
w see Acts xiii. 10.
x ch. ii. 29 reff.
y ch. ii. 26 reff.
z ver. 23 reff.
a ch. i. 5 only. Prov. xii. 25. xxvi. 16.

10. [See Tischdf Cod. Ephr. p. 344.] ins την bef δικαιοσυνην (*from ver* 7) ACK[P] c f g k m: om BLℵ rel.

11. επαγγελια C[P]ℵ a n 40 syr-mg-gr coptt Cyr Lucif: txt ABKL rel vulg Thl Œc-comm Aug Bede: *mandatum* harl Syr æth arm.

(fact, circumstance: *in* better than *by*, which gives the idea that this is the *only* sign) **are manifest** (it has been asked, *to whom?* Lücke, Sander, and Düsterd. say, to God's unerring eye alone. True, in the full and deep truth of the saying: but surely in degree and proportion to those whom the unction from the Holy One enables to know all things: in proportion as sin is manifested, or hatred and avoidance of sin is manifested, in a character. And the especial sign which follows, the sin of hate, is one which is plainly open to men's eyes, at least in its ordinary manifestations) **the children of God and the children of the devil** (see these expressions explained and vindicated from the charge of dualism, above, ver. 8. Cf. John viii. 44, Acts xiii. 10. Socinus remarks well, "Ex Apostoli verbis satis aperte colligi potest, quod inter filios Dei et filios diaboli nulli sint homines medii"): **every one that doeth not righteousness** (see ch. ii. 29: the difference here being that δικαιοσ. having no art. is more general, whereas it was τὴν δικαιοσ. there in reference to the δίκαιος which was predicated of God. It is natural that, in a recapitulation, the language should be more general, though the same thing is intended) **is not of God** (= is not a child of God. It may be observed that Orig., Tert., Cypr., al. read ὁ μὴ ὢν δίκαιος, which is edited by Lachmann), **and he that loveth not his brother** (see below, these words pointing on to the next section).

11—24.] Of *brotherly love*, as the sum and essence of δικαιοσύνη: as Christ's command (ver. 11): whereas in the world there is hate (12, 13): bound up with life, as hate with death (14, 15): finding its great pattern in Christ (16); to be testified not in word only but in deed (17, 18); as the ground of confidence toward God and the granting of our prayers to Him, being obedience to His will (19—22); which obedience consists in faith and love (23), and is testified to by the witness of His Spirit (24).

Before entering on ver. 11, the latter half of ver. 10 must be considered, as belonging properly, in its sense, to this section, though in arrangement inseparable from the last. The καί, which binds on the additional particular in the last clause, serves, as in ver. 5, to co-ordinate that clause with the foregoing: not in this case as excluded from the forementioned category, but as one particular, taken out from among the general category, and put into a co-ordinate position with it. And it is thus put, as being the most eminent, and most of the nature of a summary, and criterion, of the rest, of any of those graces which are necessarily involved in δικαιοσύνη. Aug. beautifully says, "Dilectio sola discernit inter filios Dei et filios diaboli. Signent se omnes signo crucis Christi: respondeant omnes Amen: cantent omnes Halleluia: baptizentur omnes, intrent ecclesias, faciant parietes basilicarum: non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis diaboli nisi caritate." And this love, thus constituted into "magnum indicium, magna discretio" (Aug.), is necessarily the family love of brother for brother within the limits of those who are begotten of God. Universal love to man is a Christian grace—but it is not that here spoken of: it neither answers the description of the ἀγγελία given in ver. 11, nor corresponds to the context here in general, the drift of which is that a test of our belonging to God's family is our love towards His children who are our brethren in that family: cf. ch. v. 1 ff. But, while there can be no doubt that this is the right understanding of the brotherly love here insisted on, we incur at once a formal difficulty in applying this meaning to the negative or exclusive side of the test. He who does not love his brother, has in strict fact *no brother to love*, for he is not a child of God at all. Hence we must understand, strictly speaking, τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ in this case as importing his hypothetical brother: him, who would be, were he himself a true child of God, a brother, and if so, necessarily beloved. That this love does not exist in him, demonstrates him not to be of God's family.

11.] **Because** (proof that absence of love of the brethren excludes from God's family) **the message which ye heard from the beginning** (the announcement which from the beginning of the preaching of the Gos-

λία ἣν ἠκούσατε [b] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, [z] ἵνα [c] ἀγαπῶμεν [c] ἀλλήλους· [12] οὐ καθὼς Κάϊν [y] ἐκ τοῦ [d] πονηροῦ ἦν, καὶ [e] ἔσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ [f] χάριν τίνος [e] ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν; ὅτι τὰ [gh] ἔργα αὐτοῦ [g] πονηρὰ ἦν, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ [h] δίκαια. [13] Μὴ [i] θαυμάζετε, ἀδελφοί, [i] εἰ μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ

ABCKL P℞ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

b ch. ii. 7 reff. c John xiii. 34. xv. 12, 17. ch. iv. 7, 11, 12 al. John only, exc. Rom. xiii. 8. 1 Thess. iv. 9. 1 Pet. i. 22. d ch. ii. 13 reff. e here bis. Rev. v. 6 al7. only. J. Gen. xxii. 10. f John, here only. Luke vii. 47. Gal. iii. 19. Eph. iii. 1, 14. 1 Tim. v. 14. Tit. i. 5, 11. Jude 16 only. 3 Kings xiv. 16 A &c. (B def.) only. Sir. xxxiv. (xxxi.) 6. g 2 John 11 reff. h here only. see Phil. iv. 8. Matt. xxiii. 35. Heb. xi. 4. i Mark xv. 44. see Sir. xxvi. 11.

13. at beg ins *και* (C¹ ?)[P]ℵ 29. 66². 98. 191 Syr æth arm. rec aft *αδελφοι* ins *μου*, with KL rel syrr coptt Thl Œc: om ABC[P]ℵ d m 13. 36(sic) vulg arm Did-int Lucif Aug Ors Bede.

pel was made to you. **ἀγγελία** is not here = *ἐντολή*, though that which is cited *is* a commandment: but it is an *ἐντολή* conveyed in words and by messengers, and thus become an ἀγγελία) **is this** (in all such sentences as this, the demonstrative pronoun which begins them is in reality the predicate, and often might in English be transposed to the end with advantage), **that we love one another** (on *ἵνα*, see note, ver. 1. It is impossible here, as there, to press the strong telic sense. The particle carries that combination of purpose and purport which we have so many times had occasion to notice: see e. g., note on 1 Cor. xiv. 13). **12, 13.**] See summary above: *example of the first instance of the world's hate*, by way of contrast. **12.**] **Not as Cain was of the wicked one and slew his brother** (the construction is elliptic, or rather brachylogic, for nothing is to be supplied, as *ἐσμέν* (Sander), or *ὦμεν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*, as Grot., Lücke, or *diligamus*, as Corn.-a-lap.; or a relative *ὃς* before *ἐκ τ. πον. ἦν*, as Beza and Socinus. The construction is just as in John vi. 58, and in the passage of Demosth. p. 415 A, which Winer adduces, *οὐ γὰρ ἐκ πολιτικῆς αἰτίας, οὐδ' ὥσπερ Ἀριστοφῶν . . . ἔλυσε τὴν προβολήν*. It would be simpler, *οὐ καθὼς Κάϊν ἔσφαξε τὸν ἀδ. αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ὤν*. The word **σφάζω** properly means to kill by cutting the throat. It is said to occur in LXX and N. T. in the general sense of killing (so Düsterd.); but I cannot find any instances which will not bear the precise meaning as well as a more general one. It is remarkable however, that St. John only of N. T. writers uses the verb, and that in every place there is nothing *requiring* the proper sense: so that any inference from its occurrence here as to the manner of Cain's murder of Abel would be unsafe. In **ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν** we have a resumption of *ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν* from above, ver. 8: the word **πονηροῦ** being used probably on account of *τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν* following. Observe, the *ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν* is the inference from that great proof which he gave of it by killing his brother: as is also the reason given in what follows: see below. So that here the assertion of his being of the wicked one is, as above, strictly ethical, and in no way physical or dualistic: "Cain erat filius non Dei sed diaboli, non generatione, sed imitatione et suggestione," Corn.-a-lap.). **And for what reason** (reff.) **slew he him? because his (own) works were wicked, and those of his brother righteous** (it has caused some difficulty, that no mention of this ethical difference is made in the narrative in Genesis. It has been supposed, e. g. by Socinus, that the Apostle gathers it from God's differing acceptance of the offerings of the two: others, as Lyra, have called the ethical characters of the two the "occasio prævia," whereas the immediately exciting cause was the "occasio propinqua," of the murder. But properly considered, the Apostle's assertion here is only a "deductio ex concesso." Cain murdered his brother: therefore he hated him: and hate belongs to the children of the evil one,—classes him at once among those whose works are evil, and who hate those who, like Abel, are testified to (Heb. xi. 4) that they are of the children of God who work righteousness. Whatever might be the exciting occasion of the murder, this lay at the root—the hatred which the children of the devil ever bear to the children of God. The various legends, about Cain being the child of the serpent by Eve, and the characters of Cain and Abel, see in Lücke, edn. 3, pp. 317, 318, notes; and the former in Huther, p. 148). **13.**] The connexion with verse 12 is close: the world (= the children of the devil) began so, and will ever go on as it began. **Marvel not, brethren, if** (no *doubt* is expressed by this **εἰ**. The hypothesis is set forth as actually fulfilled. See on this (originally Attic) use of *εἰ* after *θαυμάζω*, and like verbs, in Kühner, § 771. Among his examples are the following: *οὐ δὴ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν εἰ στρατευόμενος κ. πονῶν ἐκεῖνος . . . ἡμῶν μελλόντων . . . περιγίγνεται*,

κόσμος. [14] ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι [k] μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ [k] θανάτου εἰς τὴν [k] ζωήν, ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν μένει ἐν τῷ θανατῳ. [15] πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν

k John v. 24.

14. μεταβεβηκεν(sic) ℵ. aft αδελφους ins ημων ℵ lect-58 Syr. rec aft αγαπων ins τον αδελφον, with CKL[P] rel syrr copt sah-woide æth Thl Œc Cassiod: om ABℵ 13 vulg sah-mnt arm Did-int Lucif Aug Bede.

Demosth. p. 24. 23: ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο θαυμάζω, εἰ Λακεδαιμονίοις μέν ποτε ... ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δικαίων ἀντῆρατε νυνὶ δὲ ὀκνεῖτε, κ.τ.λ., ib. p. 52. 43: in both which places *matters of fact* follow the εἰ. Kühner ascribes the idiom to the Attic urbanity, which loved to give to speech a certain tinge of doubt and uncertainty) **the world hateth you** ("magis esset mirabile si diligerent eos," says Didymus. This verse is in close sequence on the example just given: Cain being taken as the prototype and exemplar of such hate).

14, 15.] See summary above on ver. 11. The connexion with the foregoing is very close. We learnt from ver. 10, that the love of the brethren is that which makes manifest the children of God and the children of the devil. And now again, having spoken of the hate of the world as a thing to be looked for, the Apostle brings up this sign as one tending to comfort the child of God, and shew him that, notwithstanding the world's hate, he has more to rejoice at than to fear from the fact: he is in life, they in death. **We** (ἡμεῖς, emphatic: we whom the world hates: we, as set over against the world) **know** (see above, ver. 2 al.: of certain knowledge) **that we have passed over out of death into life** (notice both times the articles after the prepositions, removing the nouns in this case out of the abstract, and giving them a concrete totality—*the death*, which reigns over the unregenerate: *the life*, which is revealed in Christ), **because** (ὅτι gives the ground and cause, not of the μεταβεβήκαμεν, but of the οἴδαμεν) **we love the brethren** (here distinctly, our Christian brethren: the term οἱ ἀδελφοί being that well-known one by which the body of Christians was represented. It is curious to follow Düsterdieck in his recension of the R.-Cath. and Socinian interpretations of this verse, and to see how they both run into one in wresting it to their own doctrines. First, the former begin with οἴδαμεν. Lyra would confine it to the *Apostles; they* knew "certitudinaliter, de hoc per divinam revelationem certificati;" but "si ad alios refertur, tum hoc *scire* accipitur pro probabili conjectura." Similarly Corn.-a-lap., Tirinus, and Estius (and I may add, Justiniani, even more strikingly; see below), denying that St. John speaks of the certainty of assurance grounded on faith by the heretics, but "de certitudine morali et conjecturali, concepta ex testimonio bonæ conscientiæ, innocentia vitæ et consolatione Spiritus Sancti." (Justiniani's words are, "Recte ait (Didymus) nos *disciplinabiliter* id scire, ut formidinem quidem excludat, nihil tamen præter probabilitatem ex scientia offerat.") Estius predicates the knowledge indeed simply of Christians respecting all the "boni fideles," "quorum e numero nos esse singuli confidimus." On the other hand Socinus, remarking that the Scripture writers (and even our Lord Himself, for which he refers to the Beatitudes) often "hyperbolicis quibusdam amplificandæ rei causa loquutionibus utuntur," says of the test here proposed, "nam qui tali animo est præditus, vix fieri potest quin alias etiam Christianas qualitates habeat, quæ necessariæ sunt ad vitam æternam consequendam." This remark brings us on common ground with the R.-Catholics, who would do violence to the express perfect tense μεταβεβήκαμεν to suit their purpose. So even Didymus, "quoniam qui diligit fratres secundum Deum, ad vitam ex morte *transit*:" (so Justiniani, making brotherly love the instrument of our μετάβασις, instead of the sign of its having taken place: "amor itaque ex caritate a morte nos ad vitam *traducit*:") so Bede, who having explained rightly μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ below, "quod in anima mortui omnes in hanc lucem nascimur," goes on to say, "in illa utique morte, ... si fratres perfecte amaret, *exsurgere posset*:" so Lyra,—"opera ex caritate facta sunt meritoria;" so the Socinians, e. g. Schlichting ("docet quid maxime Deum impellat, ut nos ex morte transferre velit in vitam æternam"), adding, as we might expect, "dicit *transivimus*, per enallagen temporis pro *transibimus*:" so the rationalists, Grotius ("juri ad rem sæpe datur nomen rei ipsius"), and Carpzov. It is very remarkable, that the fine exegetical tact of Estius causes him on the one hand to deliver a clear and decided interpretation of the verse as it really is ("non hic significatur meritum aut omnino causa dictæ translationis, quasi prius sit, diligere fratres, posterius autem, et effectus illius, transferri de morte ad vitam, id est, justificari.

l here bis. John viii. 44 only †.
m ch. ii. 21 reff.
n ch. ii. 25 reff.

ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ [l] ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστίν, καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι [m] πᾶς [l] ἀνθρωποκτόνος [m] οὐκ ἔχει [n] ζωὴν [n] αἰώνιον ἐν * αὐτῷ μένου-

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

15. εαυτου B. * ἑαυτῷ AC[P]ℵ rel 40 vulg Cypr: αυτω BKL (c?) m 13. 36(sic) Thl Œc.

Neque enim opera bona præcedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum, ut concinne B. Augustinus dicit, de fid. et op. c. 14 (21, vol. vi. p. 211)..... Sed causalitas hæc referenda est ad cognitionem. Nam ex dilectione fraterna velut effectu et signo cognoscimus, nos de morte ad vitam translatos esse: et quantum de illa certi sumus, tantum et de isto"), while his doctrinal bias leads him, a few lines after, to strike out the whole of this sound exposition by saying, "Veruntamen etsi dilectio Dei et proximi justificationem nostram totam, cujus initium est a fide, nec mereatur, nec præcedat, sed sub ea comprehendatur tanquam pars ejus, impetrat tamen remissionis gratiam, juxta verbum Domini Luc. 7, *Remittuntur ei peccata multa quoniam dilexit multum*: sed et *augendæ justificationis* est causa, ut *qui justus est*, opera caritatis exercendo *justificetur adhuc*, Apoc. ultimo." I have not considered it beside my purpose to spend even a long note on recounting the above interpretations. It may conduce to a right estimate of the doctrines of men and churches, and put younger Scripture students on their guard, to see the concurrent habits and tendencies of interpreters apparently so opposite. When Pilate and Herod are friends, we know what work is in hand. But as a conclusion, I will quote the clear and faithful exposition of a greater and better man: "Quid nos scimus? quia transivimus de morte ad vitam. Unde scimus? quia diligimus fratres. Nemo interroget hominem: redeat unusquisque ad cor suum: si ibi invenerit caritatem fraternam, securus sit quia transiit a morte ad vitam. Jam in dextera est: non attendat quia modo gloria ejus occulta est; cum venerit Dominus, tunc apparebit in gloria. Viget enim, sed adhuc in hyeme: viget radix, sed quasi aridi sunt rami: intus est medulla quæ viget, intus sunt folia arborum, intus fructus: sed æstatem exspectant." Aug. in 1 Joan. Tract. v. § 10, vol. iii. p. 2017): **he that loveth not** (there is this time no qualifying object, as τὸν ἀδελφόν: the absence of love from the character is the sign spoken of. τὸν ἀδελφόν is right enough as a gloss, but the Apostle's saying is more general), **abideth in death** (ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ: on the art., see above: in that realm of death, in which all men are by nature: see Bede, quoted above. Here again, the absence of love is not the reason, why he remains in death; but the sign of his so remaining. The μετάβασις has not passed upon him. The words have no reference to *future* death any further than as he who is and abides in death, can but end in death: "notandum quod non ait qui non diligit, venturus est in mortem, quasi de pœna perpetua loqueretur, quæ restat peccatoribus in futurum: sed 'qui non diligit,' inquit, '*manet*' in morte." Bede). **15.**] **Every one that hateth his brother is a manslayer** (in these words, (1) the ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν which preceded is taken up by πᾶς ὁ μισῶν: shewing, as most Commentators have remarked, that the two are identical: the living spirit of man being incapable of a state of indifference: that he who has banished brotherly love has in fact abandoned himself to the rule of the opposite state. In the ethical depth of the Apostle's view, love and hate, like light and darkness, life and death, necessarily replace, as well as necessarily exclude, one another. He who has not the one, of necessity has the other in each case. (2) He who hates his brother is stated to be an ἀνθρωποκτόνος. The example given, ver. 12, shewed the true and normal result of hate: and again in the Apostle's ethical depth of view, as in our Lord's own (Matt. v. 21 ff., 27 ff.), he who falls under a state, falls under the normal results of that state carried out to its issue. If a hater be not a murderer, the reason does not lie in his hate, but in his lack of hate. "Quem odimus, vellemus periisse," says Calvin. Some would make ἀνθρωποκτόνος mean, a destroyer of *his own* soul: so Ambrose (partly), precat. ad Missam: Lyra (not Corn.-a-lap., as Düsterd. implies), Tirinus. But this, as well as the view (Corn.-a-lap., al.) that it is the murder of his brother's *soul* which is intended, "provocando eum ad iram et discordiam,"—errs by pressing the reference to the example of Cain above. Some again, as Sander, would interpret it by a reference to John viii. 44, understood as pointing to the ruin of Adam by the Tempter. But as Düsterd. remarks (referring to a paper on John viii. 44, by Nitzsch, in the Theolog. Zeitschrift, Berlin, 1822, Heft. 3, p. 52), far rather should we say that this passage throws back a light on that passage, and makes it likely that the case of Cain, and not that of Adam, is there referred to); **and ye know that**

σαν. 16 [o] ἐν τούτῳ [o] ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην, [p] ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν [q] ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ [q] ἔθηκεν· καὶ ἡμεῖς [r] ὀφείλομεν

o ch. ii. 3, 5 reff.
p ch. iv. 9, 10, 13.
q here bis. John x. 11, &c. xiii. 37, 38. xv. 13 only. J.
r = ch. ii. 6 reff.

every manslayer hath not (is without the possession of) **eternal life abiding in him** (οἴδατε, viz. by your own knowledge of what is patent, and axiomatic in itself. We must not fall into the error of referring the saying to the future lot of the murderer, as Bede, "Etsi hic per fidem inter sanctos vivere cernitur, non habet in se perpetuo vitam manentem; nam ubi retributionis dies advenerit, cum Cain . . ., damnabitur:" it regards his present state, and is another way of saying that he μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, ver. 14. Eternal life, which abides in God's children, which is the living growth of the seed of God in them, is evidenced by love: if the very crown and issue of hate, homicide, be present, it is utterly impossible that this germ of life can be coexistent with it; can be firmly implanted and abiding (cf. John v. 38) in the man.

Socinus (and Corn.-a-lap.) gives the syllogism contained in these verses thus: "nullus homicida habet vitam æternam in se manentem: verum qui fratrem suum odit est homicida: ergo qui fratrem suum odit, non habet vitam æternam in se manentem. Hoc syllogismo probat Apostolus eum qui non diligit fratrem suum manere in morte"). **16—18.**] *Description and enforcement of true love.* "Exposui hactenus et probavi, quod dilectio fratrum verissima et optima nota sit discernendi filios Dei et filios diaboli. Sed ne quis hic loci vel seipsum decipiat, vel ab aliis decipiatur, ... exponendum etiam erit, ... quæ sit vera et christiana caritas." Seb.-Schmidt, in Düsterd. **16.**] *Example of true love in Christ, and enforcement of it on us.* **In this** (on ἐν τούτῳ, see above, ver. 10, and note, ch. ii. 3) **we have the knowledge of** (ἐγνώκαμεν, "we have arrived at and possess the apprehension of:" γινώσκειν implying knowledge as an act of the understanding proceeding on intellectual grounds. Here however it is used entirely within the sphere of the Christian life of union with Christ. None can understand true love as shewn in this its highest example, but he who is one with Christ, and has felt and does feel that love of His in its power on himself. See note on ch. ii. 3) **love** (i. e. what love is: the nature of love true and genuine: "amoris naturam," Bengel; "veram indolem amoris," Rosenmüller. And Aug., "perfectionem dilectionis dicit, perfectionem illam quam commendavimus." And so most of the Commentators. Some have held to the insertion of τοῦ θεοῦ after ἀγάπην, which has hardly any authority (only one cursive ("52") vulg. arm-usc). So Beza, Socinus, Whitby, Grot., Seb.-Schmidt, Calov. And others, as Spener, Carpzov., Episcopius, though they do not read θεοῦ, yet would supply it, or χριστοῦ, in the sense of Rom. v. 8, John iii. 16. But there can be but little doubt that the other is the right view. The love of God to us is not that which would, *as such*, be adduced as a pattern to us of brotherly love; it is true that in the depth of the matter, all true love is love after that pattern: but in a passage so logically bound together it is much more probable that the term common to the two, Christ and ourselves, would be, not divine love, which as such is peculiar to Him, but love itself simply, that of which He has given the great example which we are to follow), **that He** (Christ, as the words beyond question shew) **laid down His life for us** (ψυχὴν τιθέναι, as "vitam ponere" in Latin, to lay aside life, to die: not as Grot., who in all the places where it occurs maintains that it is only "vitam objicere periculis," which would entirely enervate the Apostle's saying here. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν carries in it and behind it all that we know of the nature of the death which is spoken of: but the vicariousness and atoning power of Christ's death are not here in consideration: it is looked on here as the greatest possible proof of love, as in John xv. 13. It is the very perversity of unsound reasoning to maintain, as Paulus (in Düsterd.), that because our imitation of Christ's example, insisted on below, cannot have the virtue commonly ascribed to his death, therefore his death had in reality no such virtue): **and we** (ἡμεῖς, emphatic: we on our part, as followers of Christ) **ought on behalf of the brethren to lay down our lives** (on ψυχάς, Socinus says well: "Non dicit nos debere *animam* ponere, quasi ut unus pro multis morti sit obstrictus, sed *animas*, quia singuli pro singulis mori debemus." The Apostle states the duty generally: and thus stated it is clear enough. As Christ did in pursuance of His love, so ought we to do in pursuance of ours, bound as we are to Him not by the mere force of an outward example, but by the power of an inward life. But naturally and necessarily the precept finds its application only in those cases where our Heavenly Father's will sets the offer-

ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς [q] ψυχὰς [q] θεῖναι. [17] ὃς δ' ἂν ἔχῃ τὸν [s] βίον τοῦ κόσμου καὶ [t] θεωρῇ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ [u] χρείαν [u] ἔχοντα καὶ [v] κλείσῃ τὰ [w] σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ [x] ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, πῶς ἡ [y] ἀγάπη τοῦ [y] θεοῦ μένει ἐν αὐτῷ; [18] [z] τεκνία,

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

s = Luke viii. 43. xv. 12, 30. xxi. 4 ‖. Prov. xxxi. 14 B℞l F(not A℞ℵ).
t John ii. 23 al23. Rev. xi. 11, 12. N. T. passim, but chiefly John, Paul never, exc. in Acts. Heb. vii. 4. Prov. xxxi. 16.
u absol., Mark ii. 25. Eph. iv. 28.
v = here only. (John xx. 19, 26.)
w John, here only. = 2 Cor. vi. 12. Col. iii. 12 al. Prov. xii. 10.
x see ch. ii. 28 reff.
y = ch. ii. 5 reff.
z ch. ii. 1 reff.

16. [for 2nd υπερ, περι P.] rec (for θειναι) τιθεναι, with KL (13 appy) rel Œc: txt ABC [P(θηναι)] ℵ 36 Thl.
17. εχει L d f k 13. θεωρει KL a[1] c h[1] k m 36(sic). for κλειση, κλησει L 13. μενεῖ B[2]KL d f j.
18. rec aft τεκνια ins μου, with KL rel vulg-ed æth Thl Œc Bede: om ABC[P]ℵ

ing of such a sacrifice in the course and pursuance of our brotherly love, which He has ordained. Of such an occasion the aor. θεῖναι gives perhaps a hint: not τιθέναι, as a habit of mind ever ready: but θεῖναι, once for all, on occasion given. It is not the place here to enter on, or even to enumerate, the various cases of conscience which casuists have raised as to the question, *when* a Christian ought to lay down his life for a brother. The subject will be found discussed in such commentaries as those of Corn.-a-lap., Justiniani, Estius, Episcopius; and a summary is given by Düsterdieck h. l.). **17.**] **But** ("by the adversative connexion of ver. 17 with ver. 16 the Apostle marks the passage from the greater, which is justly demanded of us, to the lesser, the violation of which is all the more a transgression of the law just prescribed." Düsterd.) **whosoever hath the world's sustenance** (βίος, as in ch. ii. 16, and in reff., for that whereon life is sustained. Grotius quotes the classical proverb, βίος βίου δεόμενος οὐκ ἔστι βίος. Œc. and some others have misunderstood τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου as if it meant excessive wealth: Œc. even making τοῦ κόσμου a gen. of apposition: οὐ τοὺς βίου σπανίζοντας λέγω, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον σχεδὸν ὕπαρξιν ἔχοντας πλούτου. And Piscator makes it mean "victus, cui acquirendo mundus est deditus." But there can be little doubt that most Commentators are right in explaining the expression to mean, with Beza, "mundanæ facultates," "les biens de ce monde;" as E. V., "this world's good"), **and beholdeth** (θεωρῇ gives more than the casual sight: it is the standing and looking on as a spectator: so that it ever involves not the eye only, but the mind also, in the sight: it is *contemplari*, not simply *videre*. So Chrys. in Joh. Hom. lxxv. 1, vol. viii. p. 405, οἶδεν ἡ γραφὴ ἐπὶ ἀκριβοῦς γνώσεως θεωρίαν λέγειν· ἐπειδὰν γὰρ τῶν αἰσθήσεων τρανοτέρα ἡ ὄψις, διὰ ταύτης ἀεὶ τὴν ἀκριβῆ παρίστησι γνῶσιν. St. John is very fond of the word (reff.), and wherever it occurs, this its meaning may be more or less traced. There is then in this unmerciful man not merely the being aware of, but the deliberate contemplation of the distress of his brother) **his brother having need, and shutteth up** (by the slight addition of "*up*," we faintly represent the force of the Greek aor. κλείσῃ, as implying that the shutting is then and there done, as the result of the contemplation: not a mere constitutional hardness of heart, but an act of exclusion from sympathy following deliberately on the beholding of his brother's distress) **his bowels** (= his heart, the seat of compassion: as so often in the N. T. See reff., and Luke i. 78, 2 Cor. vii. 15, Phil. i. 8, ii. 1, Philem. 7, 12) **from him** (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ is pregnant, as in ch. ii. 28, "aversandi notionem habens." There is no Hebraism: nor is any supply such as ἀποστρεφόμενος wanted. κλείειν ἀπό is just as good Greek as κρύπτειν ἀπό, John xii. 36 al. As Düsterd. remarks, the fact that a man shuts up his heart against his brother, includes in it the fact that that brother is excluded *from* the heart thus shut up), **how** (can it be that; as in ch. iv. 20, πῶς δύναται ἀγαπᾷν;) **doth the love of God** (i. e. from the very express filling out of the thought in ch. iv. 20, "*love to God;*" not God's love to us. See also ch. ii. 5, where we have the same expression and reference to the love of God being in a man. The context indeed here might seem, as the mention of Christ's love to us has so immediately preceded, to require the other meaning; or at least, that of "the love whereof God hath set us a pattern:" and accordingly both these have been held: the former by Luther, in his second exposition, and Calov., the latter by Socinus and Grotius. But I see not how we can escape the force of the passages above cited) **abide in him** (Lücke and Düsterd. are disposed to lay a stress on the μένει here, thereby opening a door for the view that the love of God may indeed be in him in some sense, but not as a firm abiding principle; that at all events

μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν [a] λόγῳ μηδὲ τῇ [b] γλώσσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν [a] ἔργῳ καὶ [c] ἀληθείᾳ. [19] [καὶ] [o] ἐν τούτῳ [o] γνωσόμεθα ὅτι [d] ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας [d] ἐσμέν, καὶ [e] ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ [f] πείσομεν τὰς

a Rom. xv. 18. 2 Cor. x. 11. Col. iii. 17. b see note. c 2 John 1, 3. 3 John 1. Matt. xxii. 16. 2 Chron. xix. 9. d John xviii. 37. see Rom. ii. 8. e = Matt. xxv. 32. Luke xxi. 36. 2 Cor. v. 10. 1 Thess. ii. 19. f = (see note) 2 Cor. v. 11. Gal. i. 10 al.

a d 36 am spec syr arm Clem Damasc Aug. (13 def.) for μηδε, και ℵ Syr æth. rec om τῃ, with [P]ℵ d n 13. 36 arm Clem Œc: ins ABCKL rel 40 Thl. (αλλα Aℵ.) rec om εν, with K rel Œc: ins A B(sic: see table at end of Prolegg) CL[P]ℵ a b g h k l m o 40 arm Clem Thl. (40 also ins εν bef λογω.)

19. rec ins 1st και, with CKL[P]ℵ rel Syr sah æth arm Thl Œc Aug: om AB d 40 vulg syr copt Clem. (αλλ' εκ τουτου a.) rec (for γνωσομεθα) γινωσκομεν, with KL rel vulg syrr æth Thl Œc Aug Bede: txt ABC[P]ℵ a j 36. 40 coptt arm Clem Damasc, *cognoscemur* syr. (13 def.) εκπροσθεν(sic) ℵ. for τας καρδιας, την καρδιαν

at the moment when he thus shuts up his bowels of compassion, it is not *abiding* in him. But this would seem to violate the ideal strictness of the Apostle's teaching, and the true sense rather to be, "How can we think of such an one as at all possessing the love of God in any proper sense?" giving thus much emphasis to μένει, but not putting it in opposition to ἐστίν, as Lücke does; for it is, in the root, equivalent to it. Here again, many questions of casuistry have been raised as to the nature and extent of the duty of almsgiving, on which it is impossible to enter here, and for which I must refer my readers as before. The safest answers to them all will be found in the Christian conscience enlightened by the Holy Spirit, guiding the Christian heart warmed by the living presence of Christ)? 18.] *Exhortation to true brotherly love:* following naturally on the example of the want of it given in the last verse. **Little children, let us not love with word nor yet with tongue, but** (let us love) **in deed and truth** (there is some little difficulty in assigning these words their several places in the contrast. We may notice first, that the two former, λόγῳ and γλώσσῃ, are simple datives of the instrument, whereas the two latter are introduced by the preposition ἐν, denoting the element in which. The true account of the arrangement seems to be, that the usual contrast of λόγῳ and ἐν ἔργῳ is more sharply defined by the epexegetic τῇ γλώσσῃ and ἐν ἀληθείᾳ: τῇ γλώσσῃ giving, by making the mere bodily member the instrument, more precisely the idea of absence of truth than even λόγῳ, and (ἐν) ἀληθείᾳ more definitely the idea of its presence than even ἐν ἔργῳ. Similar contrasts are adduced by the Commentators from the classics: especially from Theognis; e.g. 973 f., μή μοι ἀνὴρ εἴη γλώσσῃ φίλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔργῳ· χερσίν τε σπεύδοι χρήμασί τ' ἀμφότερα: 63, ἀλλὰ δοκεῖ μὲν πᾶσιν ἀπὸ γλώσσης φίλος εἶναι: 96, ὃς κ. εἴπῃ γλώσσῃ λῷστα, φρονῇ δ' ἕτερα. As connected with the exhortation in this verse, I may cite the tradition reported by Jerome in his Commentary on Gal. vi. 10, vol. vii. p. 528 f.: "Beatus Joannes Evangelista cum Ephesi moraretur usque ad extremam senectutem, et vix inter discipulorum manus ad ecclesiam deferretur, nec posset in plura vocem verba contexere, nihil aliud per singulas solebat proferre collectas, nisi hoc: 'Filioli, diligite alterutrum.' Tandem discipuli et fratres qui aderant, tædio affecti, quod eadem semper audirent, dixerunt: Magister, quare semper hoc loqueris? Qui respondit dignam Joanne sententiam: Quia præceptum Domini est, et si solum fiat, sufficit"). 19—24.] See the summary at ver. 11. *The blessed effects of true brotherly love as a test of the Christian state.* 19, 20.] [**And**] **in this** (on ἐν τούτῳ, see above, vv. 10, 16. It here refers to what had gone before: viz. to the fulfilment of the exhortation in ver. 18, as the future shews: q. d., which thing if we do, ... This has been very generally acknowledged: some Commentators mentioning, but only to repudiate, the connexion with what follows, ὅτι ἐὰν κ.τ.λ. Some, as De W., refer ἐν τούτῳ back to vv. 10, 16; others, as Lücke, to ver. 14. But to whichever of these it is referred, the sense is much the same. The context which follows is best satisfied by taking it as above: see on ἐξ ἀληθείας ἐσμέν below) **we shall know** (on the *future*, see above. It is the result consequent on the fulfilment of the condition implied in ἐν τούτῳ. De Wette's idea, after Bengel, that the rec. γινώσκομεν has been altered to the future to suit the following future πείσομεν, is not to be thought of, in the presence of the common formula ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν, ch. ii. 3, iii. 24, iv. (2, 6,) 13, v. 2. The prevalent form was adopted by the transcribers, *regardless* of the future following) **that we are of the truth** (ἐν τίνι; ἐν τῷ μὴ λόγῳ ἀγαπᾷν, ἀλλὰ ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· . . . . καὶ πῶς; ὁ γὰρ ἄλλο μὲν

g here bis. Gal. ii. 11 only. Deut. xxv. 1. Sir. xiv. 2.

καρδίας ἡμῶν· [20] ὅτι ἐὰν [g] καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία,

...καρδιας ημων P.

A[1](originally) B Syr sah æth Aug: txt A(as anciently corrd, perhaps 1. m.) CKL[P]ℵ rel syr copt arm Thl Œc Bede.

λέγων, ἄλλο δὲ ποιῶν, μὴ σύμφωνον ἔχων τῷ λόγῳ τὴν πρᾶξιν, ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ οὐκ ἀληθής. Œc. But, true as this is, and self-evident, it does not reach the depth of the meaning: as of course do not the many rationalistic paraphrases which have been given: "congruere evangelio," Grot., Whitby, &c. To be ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, is a different matter from to be truthful or true men. Estius *approaches* the meaning, understanding ἀλήθεια to be the truth of God in His promises, and so ἐκ τῆς ἀλ. ἐσμέν to mean "are of the number of the elect." Bede's interpretation, "ex veritate quæ Deus est," in which Lyra, Tirinus, Calvin agree, is nearer still: but had the Apostle intended this, he surely would have written ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. The Lutheran Commentators have come nearer still, making ἡ ἀλήθεια to be "verbum veritatis" by which we are begotten anew unto God: so Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Spener, Bengel, Lücke, De Wette. But why stop at that which after all is itself ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας? Why not mount up to the ἀλήθεια itself, that pure and objective Truth which is the common substratum and essential quality of the Spirit Himself, of the Word, of those who are born of the Word by the Spirit? and thus Düsterd., Huther, al.), **and shall persuade our hearts before him** (i. e. and in and by this same sign, shall still the questionings of our hearts before God, by the assurance that we are His true children. This meaning has been acquiesced in by almost all Commentators both ancient and modern. Fritzsche alone maintains a different one: "Et coram Deo, i. e. Deum intuiti et reveriti, animos nostros flectemus (viz. ad amorem vita factisque ostendendum), quia, si animus nos hujus officii prætermissi condemnet, quia major est, inquam, Deus animo nostro et omnia scit." He denies that πείσομεν is to be referred to ἐν τούτῳ, and, as above, interprets that by the consideration of God's greatness and omniscience we are to persuade our hearts to love in truth. This view is impugned and satisfactorily confuted by Lücke, on the following grounds: 1. that after so solemn an exhortation to brotherly love on the deepest grounds, it is not likely that the Apostle would subjoin another, grounded on less deep and more general motives: 2. that every thing said by way of a motive in ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ has been included in what has been said before: 3. (And this is the weightiest objection of all, enlarged on and pressed further by Düsterdieck) in this case τὰς καρδίας here must denote the heart as the seat of the affections, whereas in ver. 20 ἡ καρδία must denote the heart as the seat of the conscience. Whereas on the common view, καρδία is, throughout, the heart as the seat of the conscience, giving rise there to peace or to terror, according as it is at rest or in disquietude: nearly as Thl., πείσομεν τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν, τοῦτο γὰρ βούλεται σημαίνειν διὰ τὰς καρδίας:—only that this view of the *identity* of the conscience with the καρδία is not correct. St. John uses καρδία for the innermost seat of our feelings and passions: of alarm (John xiv. 1, 27), of mourning (xvi. 6), of joy (xvi. 22); it was into the καρδία of Judas that the devil put the intent of betraying the Lord (xiii. 2): and the καρδία here is the inward judge of the man,—whose office is, so to say, promoted by the conscience, accusing or else excusing (Rom. ii. 15). Then, as to πείσομεν, there is no need to give to the verb any unusual meaning. It does not mean "quiet" or "assure," except in so far as its ordinary import, "persuade," takes this tinge from the context. And so it is, in every instance cited by the Commentators for this unusual meaning: e.g. in Matt. xxviii. 14, Acts xii. 20, and reff.: in Jos. Antt. vi. 5. 6, where Samuel ὑπισχνεῖται καὶ παρακαλέσειν τὸν θεὸν συγγνῶναι περὶ τούτων αὐτοῖς καὶ πείσειν: in the passage in Plutarch, where one says ἀπολοίμην εἰ μή σε τιμωρησαίμην, and the other answers, ἀπολοίμην εἰ μή σε πείσαιμι.

It must be plain from what has been said, that the future πείσομεν is not, on account of ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, to be taken as referring to the future day of judgment, as some (e. g. Benson, Lücke, De Wette) have done. In ch. iv. 17, which is in some respects parallel with this, that day is expressly named: whereas in our passage, an equally clear indication is given, by the parallelism of γνωσόμεθα and πείσομεν, that no such reference is intended. ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ is not, at His appearing, but, *in His sight*, as placed before His all-seeing eye: ὡς ὑπὸ θεῷ μάρτυρι, as Œc., though misunderstanding the whole: see above: so Aug. ("ante Deum es: inter-

...της καρδι n. ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

[h] ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν καὶ γινώσκει [h (see note) ch. v. 9.]

20. for εαν, αν A (34. 96 Sz). καταγινωσκει L f k n 13. om 2nd οτι A d 13. 33-4. 63 vulg coptt æth arm Œc Aug Bede: ins BCKLℵ rel syrr Thl. for θεος, κυριος C.

roga cor tuum .... si persuademus cordi nostro, coram ipso persuademus"), Bede, Corn.-a-lap., Luther, Calov., Bengel, Neander, Huther, Sander, Erdmann, Düsterd. It may be remarked finally, that by ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ being thus put first, it has evidently the emphasis: and this is important for that which follows. **20.**] *takes up this matter of the persuading our hearts before God*, and *shews its true importance* and rationale. This is carried on in the following verses, but is here and in ver. 21 placed as its ground. If our heart, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, judges us unfavourably —we may be quite sure that He knowing more than our heart does, judges us more unfavourably still: if our heart condemn us not, again ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, judging and seeing in the light of His countenance, then we know that we are at one with Him, and those consequences follow, which are set forth in ver. 22.

But before arriving at this sense, there are several difficulties of no slight weight to be overcome. With these it will be best to deal, before translating the verse. Three principal questions must be answered: 1. What is the first ὅτι? 2. What is the second ὅτι? 3. What is the meaning of μείζων? 1, 2. Some monstra of exegesis must first be eliminated. It has been tried to make ὅτι ἐάν = ὅταν, "whensoever." For this is quoted *Sam. Andreä*, of whom I can discover nothing. This of course is impossible. Equally impracticable are the endeavours to alter the text; by striking out the 2nd ὅτι as Grot., or making this one into ἔτι (H. Stephanus, Pricæus, Piscator). Again it is quite out of the question to supply before the second ὅτι, "eheu nobis," as Episcopius,—"scimus, aut scire debemus," as Calov., al. Of other interpretations, the first requiring notice is that upheld by De Wette, and pronounced the only tenable one by Brückner, which would make the second ὅτι independent of the first, and regard it as containing the reason of the final clause, καὶ γινώσκει πάντα. The objection to this is, not the καί before γινώσκει, which would be natural enough, —"because God is greater than our heart, it follows that . . .;" such an apodosis being very commonly introduced by καί,— but 1) the sense thus obtained, which would be illogical, as it would not follow, *because* God is greater than our heart, that He knows all things: and 2) that brought by Düsterd., the exceeding harshness and clumsiness thus introduced into the style, whereas St. John is singularly lucid, and has but very few inversions, none indeed at all approaching the harshness of this. Bengel, Hoogeveen, Morus, Nösselt, Baumg.-Crus., Huther, regard the first ὅτι as the pronoun relative, ὅ τι: "coram ipso secura reddemus corda nostra quocunque tandem crimine damnat nos cor," as Hoogeveen. The objection to this is not N. T. usage, as alleged, e. g. by Düsterdieck against ὅστις ἐάν, for we read ὅστις ἐάν Gal. v. 10, and ἥτις ἐάν Acts iii. 23: but sense, context, and analogy. Sense,—for it would surely be monstrous to make the Apostle say that if we have brotherly love, we may make ourselves easy, whatever else our consciences accuse us of: context,—for in this sentence no logical reason would thus be given by the following ὅτι, which Hoog. renders *quia*: analogy, as shewn in the parallelism ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ and ἐὰν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ, which we thus altogether destroy. Another interpretation is given, and, as usual, defended with extreme fervency and bitterness against those who differ, by Sander. He would make the whole of ver. 20 depend on ἐν τούτῳ γνωσόμεθα and on πείσομεν (some others had done the same before, e.g. Meyer. See also Erdmann below); and regard it as meant in a consolatory sense: by thus loving in deed, &c., we shall know, &c., and shall persuade our hearts that if our heart condemn us, God (he is troubled with the second ὅτι, and offers to his readers the alternative of erasing it with Lachmann or reading ἔτι with Stephens) is greater than our heart and knoweth all things: i.e. knows us to be His children and better than we seem to ourselves. With this in the main Erdmann agrees: "Hoc igitur apostolus dicit: filiis Dei, si forte in peccata inciderint, et conscientiæ accusatione perterriti fuerint, quum e conscientia veræ caritatis erga Deum et fratres pro certo sciant se ex veritate esse, vitæque novitatem in Dei patris societate accepisse, persuasum fore, τὸ καταγινώσκειν, conscientiæ magnitudine et potestate gratiæ divinæ illoque Dei γινώσκειν πάντα superari."

But how any exegete of tact and discernment can hold this, I am at a loss to imagine. Leaving for the present the question respecting the sense of μείζων ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ., can we conceive the Apostle to write so loosely as this—"we shall per-

1 ch. ii. 7 reff. πάντα. 21 ¹ ἀγαπητοί, ἐὰν ἡ καρδία [ἡμῶν] μὴ ᵍ καταγι- ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

21. for αγαπητοι, αδελφοι ℵ. for εαν, αν A. rec ins 1st ημων, with CKLℵ rel vulg syrr coptt æth arm Thl Œc Cypr Aug₁ Jer₁ Hesych: om AB 13 fuld Aug₁ Jer₁. καταγινωσκει AL c f k 13: -σκω ℵ¹(sic).

suade our hearts, that if our heart condemn us . . . ?" For, in this case, the καρδίας of the former clause has no connexion with the καρδία of the latter, but, as Erdmann confesses, is equivalent to ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, whereas in the latter, καρδία is the "conscientia reatus." And besides, the πείσομεν has already had its emphatic completion in the words ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, declaring its meaning to be absolute, and preventing its passing on to the ὅτι.

It would seem then that the first ὅτι cannot be "that," but must be causal. And if the first, then the second, which, as far as I know, no one has attempted to render "*that*" after rendering the other "because." How then is the repetition to be interpreted? The first ὅτι furnishes the reason for introducing the clause: what purpose is served by the second? The old scholium says, τὸ δεύτερον ὅτι παρέλκει. And so several of the Commentators, adducing instances of a repeated and superfluous ὅτι from Xenoph. Anab. v. 6. 19, λέγουσιν ὅτι, εἰ μὴ . . . . ὅτι κινδυνεύσει . . . . : and so Anab. vii. 4. 5: Eph. ii. 11, 12 in N. T. But in all these places ὅτι is "*that*," not "*because*:" nor can an instance be produced of the repetition of a causal ὅτι. This resource thus seems taken from us. The second ὅτι must have its distinct place and meaning assigned it. And, reserving the consideration of the meaning thus obtained, till we treat of μείζων ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.,—there is one legitimate way of taking it, which does not seem to have been suggested: viz., that there is an ellipsis of the verb substantive before the 2nd ὅτι, and that the clause, thus introduced, forms the apodosis to the ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.: "because if our heart condemns us, (it is) because God, &c." Instances of similar ellipses after εἰ or ἐάν are of course common enough: εἴ τις ἐν χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις, 2 Cor. v. 17: εἴτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου, κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς κ. εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός· εἴτε ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, δόξα χριστοῦ, ib. viii. 23. Nearer to the point is 2 Cor. i. 6, εἴτε θλιβόμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας: 1 Cor. xiv. 27, εἴτε γλώσσῃ τὶς λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο . . . .

But this brings us to consider (3) the meaning of the words **μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν καὶ γινώσκει πάντα.** Two ways of taking them have been prevalent: the ancients regarded them as intensifying the ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία: as the Schol. in Cramer's Catena, εἰ γὰρ ἁμαρτάνοντες, τὴν καρδίαν ἑαυτῶν λαθεῖν δυνάμεθα (qu. οὐ δυνάμ.?) ἀλλὰ νυττόμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸν θεὸν πράττοντές τι τῶν φαύλων δυνήθωμεν (οὐ δυν.) λαθεῖν; and so Aug., &c., and of the moderns, Calvin, Beza, Socinus, Grot., Corn.-a-lap., Castalio, Estius, Calov., Semler, Lücke, Neander, al. On the other hand, Luther, Bengel, Morus, Spener, Nösselt, Rickli, Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Besser, Düsterd., Huther, Erdmann, regard them as consolatory in their tendency, and as softening our self-condemnation by the comforting thought of God's greatness and infinite mercy. Erdmann remarks, "Respondet his sententia S. Pauli ad Rom. v. 20 sq.: οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις. Luther ad h. l. dicit: Das Gewissen ist ein einziger Tropfen, der versöhnte Gott aber ist ein Meer voller Trostes." He compares John xxi. 17, κύριε, πάντα σὺ οἶδας, σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε.

But beautiful and true as this is, and the similar considerations which have been urged by others of the above Commentators, it is to me very doubtful whether they find any place in the context here. That context appears to stand thus. The Apostle in ver. 19 has said that by the presence of genuine love we shall know that we are of the truth, and shall persuade our hearts in God's presence. He then proceeds to enlarge on this *persuading* our hearts, *in general*. If our heart condemn us, what does it import? If our heart acquit us, what? The ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ, and the ἐὰν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ, are plainly and necessarily *opposed*, both in hypothesis and in result. If the *consolatory* view of ver. 20 is taken, then the general result of vv. 20, 21 will be, whether our heart condemn us or not, we have comfort and assurance: and then what would be the import of πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν at all? But on the other interpretation, taken with some modifications, all will be clear. I say, taken with some modifications: because the sense has been much obscured by the introduction of the particular case treated in ver. 18 into the general statements of vv. 20, 21. It is not, If our heart condemn us *for want of brotherly love*, as Lücke for instance, calling it a statement 'e contrario' to ver. 19: but this test is dropped, and the general subject

νώσκῃ ἡμῶν, [kl] παῤῥησίαν [kl] ἔχομεν [km] πρὸς τὸν θεόν, [22] καὶ ὃ ἐὰν [n] αἰτῶμεν [op] λαμβάνομεν [p] ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς [q] ἐντολὰς

k ch. v. 14. l ch. ii. 28. iv. 17. Eph. iii. 12. Heb. x. 19. Job xxvii. 10. see 2 Cor. iii. 12. vii. 4. Heb. iii. 6. m = Rom. v. 1. 2 Cor. vii. 4. n ch. v. 14, &c. reff. o = Matt. vii. 8. xxi. 22 ||. John xvi. 24. p Matt. xvii. 25. ch. ii. 27. 3 John 7 only. 4 Kings v. 20 Ed-vat.(παρά, AB.) q ch. ii. 3, 4 reff.

om 2nd ημων BC (Orig$_1$): ins AKLℵ rel vss. for εχομεν, εχει B 29.
22. for εαν, αν B a m Orig. αιτωμεθα ℵ Orig. λαμβανωμεν A k m, *accipiemus* vulg syr sah Cypr Lucif. rec (for απ') παρ', with KL rel Orig Thl Œc: txt ABCℵ a 13.

of the testimony of our hearts is entered upon. Thus we get the context and rendering, as follows): **because** (q. d., and this ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πεῖσαι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν is for us a vital matter, seeing that condemnation and acquittal by our own hearts bring each such a weighty conclusion with it) **if our heart condemn** (notice the words γνωσόμεθα . . . . καταγινώσκῃ . . . . γινώσκει: for the meaning, see reff. It is a word especially appropriate to self-consciousness: "know (aught) against us") **us, it is because** (our self-condemnation is founded on the fact, that) **God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things** (i.e. the condemning testimony of our conscience is not alone, but is a token of One sitting above our conscience and greater than our conscience: because our conscience is but the faint echo of His voice who knoweth all things: if it condemn us, how much more He? and therefore this πεῖσαι, for which this verse renders a reason, becomes a thing of inestimable import, and one which we cannot neglect, seeing that the absence of it is an index to our standing condemned of God. And then, having given the reason why the καταγινώσκειν should be set at rest by the πεῖσαι, he goes on to give the blessed results of the πεῖσαι itself in verses 21, 22). **Beloved** (there is no adversative particle, because ἀγαπητοί throws up the contrast quite strongly enough, as introducing the very matter on which the context lays the emphasis, viz., the πεῖσαι τὰς κ. ἡμῶν), **if our heart** (so it will stand, whether ἡμῶν be read or not) **condemn us not, we have confidence towards God** (reff.: said generally: not with direct reference to that which follows, ver. 22, which indeed is one form of this confidence: see ch. v. 14, where the connexion is similar. The confidence here spoken of is of course present, not future in the day of judgment, as Estius. πρὸς τὸν θεόν, with reference to God: but more than that: to God-ward, in our aspect as turned towards and looking to God. It must be remembered that the words are said in the full light of the reality of the Christian state,—where the heart is awakened and enlightened, and the testimony of the Spirit is active: where the heart's own deceit does not come into consideration as a disturbing element), **and** (such another καί as that in ver. 10 above, where, after πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, we have καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, i.e. after the general statement, καί introduced the particular instance in which the general truth was carried forward. So here: By dwelling and walking in love, we can alone gain that approval of our conscience as God's children, which brings real confidence in Him and real intercommunion in prayer, which is a result and proof of that confidence) **whatsoever we ask, we receive** (pres.: not for future, as Grot. The Apostle is setting forth actual matter of fact) **from Him** (these words must be taken in all their simplicity, without capricious and arbitrary limitations. Like all the sayings of St. John, they proceed on the ideal truth of the Christian state. "The child of God," as Huther says, "asks for nothing, which is against the will of its Father"), **because** (ground of the above λαμβάνομεν) **we keep His commandments, and do the things which are pleasing in His sight** (on the last expression (and parallelism) see Exod. xv. 26; also Deut. vi. 18, xii. 25, Ezra x. 11, Isa. xxxviii. 3. It is added, not as epexegetical of τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηροῦμεν, as Sander, but as Düsterd., to connect with His granting our prayers, since our lives are in accord with His good pleasure. This however brings us to the theological difficulty of our verse, wherein it would seem at first sight as if the granting of our prayers by God depended, as its meritorious efficient, on our keeping of His commandments and doing that which pleases Him. And so some of the R.-Catholic expositors here: Corn.-a-lap., with the curious peculiarity of distinguishing τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρεῖν, the keeping of the moral law of the decalogue, from τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπ. αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, the doing of "consilia evangelica, viz. continentia, obedientia et paupertas," the observance of which goes "augere gratiam Dei et merita." This is refuted by the parallelism, in which (see above) the second clause takes up the first and applies it to the matter in hand. And it is further refuted

r John viii. 29. Acts vi. 2. xii. 3 only. see note.
s = John, here only. Luke xvi. 15. Acts iv. 19. 1 Tim. ii. 3. v. 4.

αὐτοῦ [q] τηροῦμεν καὶ τὰ [r] ἀρεστὰ [s] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν. [23] καὶ [t] αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, [t] ἵνα [u] πιστεύ[σ]ωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ [v] ἀγαπῶμεν [v] ἀλλήλους καθὼς [w] ἔδωκεν [w] ἐντολὴν ἡμῖν. [24] καὶ ὁ [q] τη-

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

t ver. 11. ch. (iv. 17.) v. 3. John vi. 29, 39. (xv. 8.) xvii. 3 al. John only. u w. dat. of ὄνομ. here only. (see ch. v. 13 reff.) of pers. = John viii. 31 (?). v ver. 11 reff. w John xi. 57. xii. 49. xiii. 34. xiv. 31 only. Sir. xlv. 5.

τηρωμεν AKℵ 40.

23. rec πιστευσωμεν, with BKL rel Œc: πιστευωμεν ACℵ a f l 13 Thl; -ομεν c. om του υιου A 43: om ονοματι του υιου 13 æth; τω υιω, omg τω ονοματι, d. χριστω A d 13. om ημιν KL rel 40: ins ABCℵ a m 13. 36 vulg Syr copt Thl Œc-ms Lucif Bede.

by the usage of the expression τὰ ἀρεστά, by which never "consilia evangelica," but always things ethically pleasing to God, as commanded by Him, are denoted: cf. ref. John, Rom. xii. 1, xiv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 9, Eph. v. 10, Phil. iv. 18, Col. iii. 20. Estius again has pressed the words as against the heretics, who say "omnia justorum opera esse peccata;" "nisi," he adds, "dicant, quod absque blasphemia dici non potest, peccata esse Deo placita." But both here and elsewhere the solution of the difficulty is very easy, if separated from the party words of theology, and viewed in the light of Scripture itself. Out of Christ, there are no good works at all: entrance into Christ is not won nor merited by them. In Christ, every work done of faith is good and is pleasing to God. The doing of such works is the working of the life of Christ in us: they are its sign, they its fruits: they are not of us, but of it and of Him. They are the measure of our Christian life: according to their abundance, so is our access to God, so is our reward from God: for they are the steps of our likeness to God. Whatever is attributed to them as an efficient cause, is attributed not to us, but to Him whose fruits they are. *Because* Christ is thus manifested in us, God hears our prayers, which He only hears for Christ's sake: *because* His Spirit works thus abundantly in us, He listens to our prayer, which in that measure has become the voice of His Spirit. So that no degree of efficacy attributed to the good works of the child of God need surprise us: it is God recognizing, God vindicating, God multiplying, God glorifying, His own work in us. So that when, e.g., Corn.-a-lap. says, "congruum est et congrua merces obedientiæ et amicitiæ, ut si homo faciat voluntatem Dei, Deus vicissim faciat voluntatem hominis," all we can reply is that such a duality, such a reciprocity, does not exist for Christians: we are *in God*, He in us: and this St. John continually insists on. We have no claim ab extra: He works in us to do of His good pleasure: and the works which He works, which we work, manifest before Him, and before all, that we are His children. The **ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν, λαμβάνομεν**, I reserve to be treated of on ch. v. 14, 15, where it is set forth more in detail). **23.]** *Summing up of all these commandments in one: faith in Christ, and brotherly love according to Christ's command.* **And** (see καί similarly used, ch. i. 5, ii. 17, ver. 3) **His commandment** ("singulari numero mandatum præmisit, et duo subsequentia adjungit mandata, fidem scilicet et dilectionem, quia nimirum hæc ab invicem separari nequeunt. Neque enim sine fide Christi recte nos alterutrum diligere, neque vere in nomine Jesu Christi sine dilectione possumus credere," Bede: and Œc., ἔχοντες ἐντολήν, ἵνα τῇ πίστει τῇ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησ. χρ. ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους) **is this, that** (see on ἵνα, ver. 11) **we should believe** (the aor. imports one act of receptive faith: the present, a continuing habit) **the name** (this unusual expression, πιστεύειν τῷ ὀνόματι (reff.), is well explained by Calvin and Beza,—"nomen ad prædicationem respicit:" so that, as Seb.-Schmidt, it is "credere merito, satisfactioni, omnibusque promissionibus Christi et de Christo:" to believe the Gospel message concerning Him, and Him as living in it, in all His fulness. We have similar expressions, πιστεύειν τῇ γραφῇ, John ii. 22; τοῖς ῥήμασι, v. 47; τῇ ἀκοῇ, xii. 38) **of His Son Jesus Christ, and love one another** (pres., of a continued habit), **even as He gave us commandment** (some Commentators have referred these words to both πιστεύσωμεν and ἀγαπῶμεν, and understood ὁ θεός as the subject of ἔδωκεν. So Estius, Hunnius, Bengel, Sander. But this would seem to introduce too much of a tautology: "God's commandment is, that we should, &c. . . . . . as He gave us commandment." It seems more natural, with the generality of Commentators, to understand Christ as the subject to ἔδωκεν, and by the commandment, John xiii. 34, xv. 12, 17). **24 a.]** *General return,*

ρῶν τὰς [q] ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ [x] ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ αὐτὸς [x] ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ [y] ἐν τούτῳ [yz] γινώσκομεν ὅτι μένει [x] ἐν ἡμῖν, [z] ἐκ τοῦ [a] πνεύματος [b] οὗ ἡμῖν [a] ἔδωκεν.

IV. [1] [c] Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ παντὶ [d] πνεύματι [e] πιστεύετε,

x John xv. 4, 7. ch. ii. 27 al. fr.
y ch. ii. 3, 5 reff.
z Matt. xii. 33. Luke vi. 44. ch. iv. 6. see John i. 49.

a Luke xi. 13. Acts viii. 18. xv. 8. b attr., John vii. 39. Acts i. 1. Jude 15 bis. Rev. xviii. 6 al. fr. c ch. ii. 7 reff. d = 1 Cor. xii. 10. xiv. 32. 1 Tim. iv. 1. e = John ii. 22. iv. 21 al. fr.

24. om last και ℵ[1] c g h 80 sah. εδωκεν bef ημιν Kℵ a b d m o Ath Cyr Thl Œc lat-ff.

with reference to what has been said in the last verses, *to the great key-note of the Epistle, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ*, with which the former part of it concluded, ch. ii. 28. This keeping of His (God's) commandments is the abiding in God: this of which brotherly love is the first and most illustrious example and summary. So that the exhortation given at the beginning of this portion of the Epistle is still in the Apostle's mind, as again ch. iv. 15, 16, and v. 20; see also ch. ii. 6, iii. 6, 9. **And he that keepeth His** (God's) **commandments abideth in Him** (God), **and He** (God) **in him** (Sander, Neander, al., hold that αὐτός, αὐτῷ are to be referred to Christ. And no doubt they would be perfectly true, and according to our Lord's own words, when thus applied: cf. John xiv. 15, xv. 5 ff. Still, from the context (cf. on ἔδωκεν below), it is better to refer them to the chief subject, viz. to God. In the sense, the difference is not important. It is one of the most difficult questions in the exegesis of this most difficult of Epistles, to assign such expressions as the present definitely to their precise personal object).

24 b.] And of one part of this mutual indwelling there is *a sign and token*, given us by God Himself, viz. *the Holy Spirit*. By the mention of the Spirit, the Apostle makes these words the note of transition to the subject of the next section, ch. iv. 1—6, which is parenthetical, of the discerning of true and false spirits, and after which the main subject of brotherly love is resumed again. **And in this we** (all the children of God; not as the R.-Cath. expositors, Lyra, Corn.-a-lap., Estius, the Apostles, or the apostolic church, only) **know that He abideth in us, from the Spirit** (the change of construction is unusual. It arises from the Apostle having combined together two ways of speaking in this connexion,—ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν, ὅτι . . ., see vv. 16, 19, and ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν, ch. iv. 6. The knowledge is ἐν τούτῳ, in this element or department of fact, and it is ἐκ τούτου, derived from, as its source, that which follows) **which He gave us** (ἔδωκεν, aor.; at a certain time, by a definite act, viz. on the day of Pentecost, when the Father bestowed the Holy Spirit on the Church. And this ἔδωκεν is one sign that the whole is to be referred to the Father: seeing that our Lord says, κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν . . . τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, John xiv. 16, 17. This indwelling Spirit of God is to the child of God the spring and source of his spiritual life, the sure token of his sonship, Rom. viii. 14, 15, Gal. iv. 6, and of his union with God in Christ).

CHAP. IV. 1—6.] *Warning against, and criteria whereby to distinguish, false teaching.* This passage takes up again, with reference to this portion of the Epistle, the similar warning given in the former portion, ch. ii. 18 ff. It is intimately connected with what has immediately preceded. By brotherly love we are to know that we are of the truth, ch. iii. 19,—and the token that He abideth in us is to be the Spirit which He gave us. This Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, it becomes then all-important for us to be able to distinguish, and not to be led astray by any false spirits pretending to his character and office. Such false spirits there are, which are not of God, but of the world, and which make up that spirit of antichrist, of which prophecy had already spoken.

1.] **Beloved** (so verse 7, and ch. iii. 2, 21, marking a transition to a subject on which the Apostle affectionately bespeaks their earnest attention), **believe not every spirit** (the expressions πᾶν πνεῦμα, τὰ πνεύματα, indicating plurality of spirits, are to be explained by the fact that both the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error speak by the spirits of men who are their organs. So we have, in reference to prophecy, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται. By the nature of the testimony of the human spirits, we shall know whether they are of God or not; whether they are organs of the πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας or of the πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης. It will be observed that this interpretation of πᾶν πνεῦμα, and the Apostle's way of speaking, rest on the assumption of there being One Spirit of Truth, from God, and one spirit of error, from the world; as opposed to all rationalizing interpretations, such as "*sensus*

ἀλλὰ [f] δοκιμάζετε τὰ [d] πνεύματα, εἰ [g] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, ὅτι πολλοὶ [h] ψευδοπροφῆται [i] ἐξεληλύθασιν [i] εἰς τὸν κόσμον. 2 [k] ἐν τούτῳ [k] γινώσκετε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ [l] ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν [mn] ἐν σαρκὶ [mo] ἐληλυ-

ABKL Nabc fgh l m o

f = Luke xiv. 19. 1 Cor. iii. 13. 2 Cor. viii. 8. 1 Thess. ii. 4 (2nd). v. 21 al. Prov. xvii. 3. g ch. ii. 16 reff. h Matt. vii. 15. xxiv. 11, 24 ‖ Mk. Luke vi. 26. Acts xiii. 6. 2 Pet. ii. 1. Rev. xvi. 13 al[2]. only. Jer. vi. 13. Zech. xiii. 2. i 2 John 7. so John i. 44. Matt. xi. 7. xxii. 10 al. (see John vi. 14. xvi. 28. xviii. 37.) k ch. ii. 3, 5 reff. l constr., John ix. 22. 2 John 7. see Wisd. xviii. 13. m 2 John 7. n Rom. ii. 28. 2 Cor. x. 3. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2. see John i. 14. o see ch. v. 6. Matt. xvi. 27, 28. xxi. 9. Mark ix. 1 al.

Chap. IV. 1. ins παντα bef τα πνευματα K. γευδοπροφηται(sic) ℵ[1].

2. γινωσκεται (*itacism*) K rel vulg Syr Cyr Thl Did-int Aug Bede: -κομεν ℵ[1] a 9. 14[2]. 69 arm: txt ABCLℵ[3] 1 13 syr coptt æth Œc Iren-int Lucif. χριστον bef ιησουν C: om χρ. a Orig. for εληλυθοτα, εληλυθεναι B 99 Thdrt; *venisse* vulg Iren-int Cypr.

hominis aliquo modo inspiratus," Socinus; "*doctrina,"* Episcopius: as opposed also to all figurative understanding of the word, as Calv., "metonymice accipio pro eo qui spiritus dono se præditum esse jactat ad obeundum prophetiæ munus," Beza, Grot., Whitby, Wolf, and even Lücke, who explains it by λαλοῦντες ἐν πνεύματι. It is not the men themselves, but their spirits as the vehicles of God's Spirit or the spirit of antichrist, that are in question. In πιστεύετε some have seen a figure drawn from the physical meaning of πνεῦμα; so Corn.-a-lap.,—"Respicit ad nautas, qui non credunt omni spiritui, id est, vento." But this is far-fetched and unlikely, in the universal acceptance of the spiritual meaning of both words), **but try the spirits** (this δοκιμάζειν is enjoined not on the "ecclesia in suis prælatis," as Estius and the R.-Cath. expositors, but on all believers, as even he reluctantly admits: and the test is one of plain matter of fact, of which any one can be judge. The Church by her rulers is the authoritative assertor of this δοκιμασία in the shape of official adoption or rejection, but only as moved by her component faithful members, according to whose sense those her formularies are drawn, of which her authorities are the exponents) **whether they are of God** (bear the character of an origin from Him): **because** (ground for the necessity of this trial) **many false-prophets** (= ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί, ch. ii. 18: προφῆται, not as foretelling future things, but as the mouth-pieces of the πνεῦμα which inspires them. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1, where the N. T. false teachers are called ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, and compared to the O. T. ψευδοπροφῆται) **are gone forth** (scil. from him who sent them: even as Jesus Himself is said, John viii 42, xiii. 3, xvi. 27, 28, ἐξεληλυθέναι from God. Or we may take it as in ch. ii. 19, ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον,—from the Church: but the other is more likely. Socinus and Grotius take it of "prodire ad munus suscipiendum:" but it certainly means more than this) **into the world** (cf. John xvi. 28, which tends to fix the ἐξεληλύθασιν above).

2, 3 a.] *Test, whereby the spirits are to be tried.* **In this** (see above, ch. iii. 10, &c.) **ye know** (apprehend, recognize. γινώσκετε is taken as imperative, on account of the preceding πιστεύετε and δοκιμάζετε, by Huther, De Wette, Lücke (most Commentators do not touch it). But on account of the very frequent ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν, I should let analogy prevail, and take it as indicative) **the Spirit of God** (the Holy Spirit, present, inspiring, and working in men's spirits). **Every spirit which confesseth** ("spiritui tribuitur actio quæ hominis est per spiritum." Schlichting. The confession is necessarily, from the context here, not the genuine and ascertained agreement of lips and life; but the outward and open profession of faith: see 2 John 7—10, where ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν . . . . φέρειν is its equivalent) **Jesus Christ come in the flesh** (Ἰ. χρ. primary predicate: ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, secondary predicate: = Ἰ. χρ. ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί, 2 John 7. Cf. the same arrangement of predicates 1 Cor. i. 23, κηρύσσομεν χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον: 2 Cor. iv. 5, κηρύσσομεν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κύριον. In all these cases it is important to observe, that the construction is not equivalent to an accusative with an infinitive, Ἰ. χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι. If it were, the confession, or the preaching, would be simply of the fact announced: whereas in each case it is the Person who is the object or primary predicate: the participle carrying the attributive or secondary predicate. This is abundantly shewn here, by the adversative clause, where it is simply μὴ ὁμολογοῦν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. The confession required is, "Jesus Christ come in the flesh;" ἐληλυθώς here standing midway between the ἐρχόμενος of 2 John 7, which is altogether timeless, and the ἐλθών of ch. v. 6, which is purely historical. This perfect gives

θόντα, [g] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν. [3] καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ [1] ὁμο-

3 KLN b c d f h j k l o 13 — 3. for ο μη ομολογει, ο λυει old-MSS-mentioned-by-Socr vulg Iren Orig Tert₁ Fulg₁: *qui negat* Did-int Tert₁ Cypr: *qui destruit* Lucif: txt all-known-Greek-manuscripts vss Polyc Cyr Thdrt Thl Œc Fulg₁. (Socr. H. E. vii. 32 states γέγραπτο ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ὅτι πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν ἰησοῦν, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν. That Irenæus and Origen really had this reading before them is evident from the whole context as given by their interpreters. Iren. (iii. 16. 8, p. 207) says, *Igitur omnes extra dispositionem sunt, qui sub obtentu agnitionis alterum quidem Jesum intelligunt, alterum autem Christum, et alterum Unigenitum, et alterum Salvatorem. . . Sententia enim eorum homicidalis, Deos quidem plures confingens et Patres multos simulans. Comminuens autem et per multa* dividens *Filium Dei; quos et Dominus nobis cavere prædixit et discipulus ejus Ioannes in prædicta epistola fugere eos præcepit dicens: "Multi seductores exierunt in hunc mundum, qui non confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse. Hic est seductor et Antichristus. Videte eos, ne perdatis quod operati estis." Et rursus in epistola ait: "Multi pseudoprophetæ exierunt de sæculo. In hoc cognoscite Spiritum Dei. Omnis spiritus qui confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse, ex Deo est. Et omnis spiritus* qui solvit *Jesum, non est ex Deo, sed de Antichristo est." Hæc autem similia sunt illi quod in evangelio dictum est, quoniam "Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis."* Orig on Matt xxv. 14 thus writes (Com. Ser. 66, vol. iii. p. 1703 f.): *Secundum hanc divinitatis suæ naturam non peregrinatur, sed peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis quod suscepit. . . . Hæc autem dicentes non* solvimus *suscepti corporis hominem, cum sit scriptum apud Joannem "Omnis spiritus qui* solvit *Jesum non est ex Deo:" sed unicuique*

the present endurance of a past historical fact. If we enquire what that fact is, we are met by two widely divergent interpretations. On the one side we have the Socinian view, which, while it keeps to the strict philological sense of the words, ἐν σαρκί and ἔρχεσθαι (see below), distorts the meaning to bring the Apostle into accord with the tenets of that school: e.g. Socinus: "Jesum Christum, i. e. Jesum qui dicitur Christus, non modo mortalem hominem fuisse, sed etiam innumeris malis et denique ipsi cruentæ morti obnoxium:" and Grotius,—"non cum regia pompa et exercitibus, sed in statu humili, abjecto, multisque malis ac postremum cruci obnoxio." But no such sense of ἐν σαρκί can be or has been attempted to be adduced. On the other hand we have many of the orthodox expositors, who strive to make the words not implicative only, but directly assertive of the Incarnation. So Piscator, who plainly asserts that ἐν σαρκί = εἰς σάρκα: so others who waver between ἐν and εἰς, e.g. Hunnius,—"tunc venire in carne dicitur Jesus Christus, quando λόγος ex sua velut arcana sede prodiens assumta visibili carne se in terris manifestat:" so Bengel (apparently), al. And among this number must proximately be reckoned Augustine, who introduces in the train of the Incarnation the death and redeeming love of Christ, and makes the confession or denial depend on "caritatem habere:" "Deus erat et in carne venit: Deus enim mori non poterat, caro mori poterat: ideo ergo venit in carne ut moreretur pro nobis. Quemadmodum autem mortuus est pro nobis? Majorem hac caritatem nemo habet, quam ut animam suam ponat pro amicis suis. Caritas ergo illum adduxit ad crucem. Quisquis ergo non habet caritatem, negat Christum in carne venisse." As between these two, the recent Commentators, Lücke, De Wette, Düsterd., Huther, appear to have taken the right path, in keeping ἐν strictly to its proper meaning, '*in*,' 'clothed with,' = διά, ch. v. 6: and ἔρχεσθαι also to its proper meaning, to "*come forward*," "*appear*," "*prodire*:" and in interpreting the words as directed against the Docetæ, who maintained that the Son of God had only an apparent, not a real human body. I cannot however agree in Huther's view, that Ἰησοῦν is here to be taken alone as the object, and χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλ. together as predicate: Jesus as Christ come in the flesh. For first, it would be against the usage of our Apostle, see ch. v. 1, in this case, to leave out the article before χριστόν: secondly, Ἰησοῦν χριστόν thus in conjunction, could hardly but express the joint Name so well known: and thirdly, the sense required, that Jesus is the Christ, is assumed, by the very juxtaposition of the names. The words imply the præ-existence and incarnation by their very terms: but they do not *assert* these doctrines, only the verity of our Lord's human nature), **is of God** (has its origin and inspiration from Him by His Spirit):

3 a.] ex adverso: **and every spirit which does not confess** (as Huther rightly remarks, μή sets forth, not only the *non*-confession as matter of fact, but the opposition to, the denegation of the confession:

λογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ˢ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ εστιν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ᵖ ἀντιχρίστου, ὃ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ᵖ ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἤδη. ⁴ ὑμεῖς ˢ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστέ, ᵍ τεκνία, καὶ νενικήκατε αὐτούς, ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἢ ὁ ἐν

ABKLℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

p ch. ii. 18 (reff.). q ch. ii. 1 reff.

substantiæ proprietatem servamus Si enim omnis homo fidelis "qui conjungitur Domino unus spiritus est:" quanto magis homo ille quem secundum dispensationem carnis Christus suscepit non est solvendus *ab eo, nec alter est dicendus ab eo? Et vide quomodo ait: "sicut homo peregre futurus" quoniam non erat homo, sed sicut homo et quasi homo peregrinabitur, qui erat ubique secundum divinitatis naturam.*

On the other hand Polycarp (Ep. ad Phil. cap. 7, p. 1112) seems to quote, though loosely, the received text—Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστι· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστί· καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας καὶ λέγῃ μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν εἶναι, οὗτος πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ Σατανᾶ.) om τον Kℵ b c d g h l 40 Polyc Thl: ins ABL rel Cyr Thdrt Socr. rec aft ιησουν ins χριστον, with KL rel am demid sah Polyc Thl Œc Aug; κυριον ℵ: om AB a 13 fuld syrr copt arm Cyr Thdrt Socr Iren-int Orig-int Did-int Lucif $Fulg_1$ Tich. rec further adds εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα, with KLℵ rel syrr arm Thl Œc Iren-int Cypr; εν σαρκι εληλυθεναι 13(-ηναι) Polyc Thdrt: om AB vulg coptt æth-rom(omg τ. ιησ.) Iren Cyr Socr Orig-int Did-int Lucif $Fulg_1$ Bede. om εκ KL k 36. for ὁ ακηκοατε, οτι ακηκοαμεν ℵ 5.

q. d. "*refuseth to confess*") **Jesus** (τὸν Ἰησοῦν, in the complex of all that He is and has become, involved as it is in His having come in the flesh), **is not of God.** Some notice must be taken of the remarkable reading ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν. The words of Socrates (see Digest) hardly seem to amount to an absolute assertion that the reading was found in any mss. extant in his time, and it appears to have been regarded rather as an interpretation against the Nestorians than as a part of the ancient text. Bengel says well of it, "humanam potius artem quam apostolicam redolet sapientiam." The appearance of it in the vulgate is remarkable, seeing that not one of our present mss. has it, and not one version besides. **3 b.]** This has been already virtually explained on ch. ii. 18. **And this is the (spirit)** (so nearly all the Commentators supply the ellipsis, and rightly. Episcopius, Valla, Zeger, the R.-Cath. Mayer, and Huther, render it, this is "proprium antichristi." But this would not surely be τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, but τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου only. None of the passages cited by Huther touch the point, Matt. xxi. 21, τὸ τῆς συκῆς, "this of the fig-tree;" 1 Cor. x. 24, τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου, "that which belongs to his brother;" 2 Pet. ii. 22, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, "that of the proverb;" James iv. 14, τὸ τῆς αὔριον, "the event of to-morrow." In every one of these the genitive belongs to the subject: but Huther would attach it to the predicate, "hoc est proprium antichristi," in which case I cannot see how the article could be there. Besides, the ὃ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται would be awkwardly said as applied merely to an abstract fact, the τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, to which it must be referred if τοῦτο is subject, and the genitive imports *proprium antichristi*) **of antichrist (of) which ye have heard** (the reference is not to ch. ii. 18 (ἠκούσατε), but to the course of their Christian instruction in which this had been taught them) **that it cometh** (the present used as so often of that which is a thing fixed and determined, without any reference to time: "*that it should come*" of the E. V. is in sense very good, but does not quite suit the perf. ἀκηκόατε, which seems grammatically in English to require "that it shall come:" "*that it must come*" would perhaps be better), **and now it is** (not, *now is:* this ἐστίν is not dependent on the preceding ὅτι, but introduces a fresh assertion) **in the world already** (viz., in the person of these ψευδοπροφῆται, who are its organs). **4.] Ye** (so we had ὑμεῖς ch. ii. 24, 27: his readers clearly and sharply set against the antichristian teachers) **are of God, little children** (thus he ever speaks to his readers, as being children of God, see ch. iii. 1 ff.), **and have overcome** (there need not be any evading or softening of this perfect: see ch. ii. 14. It is faith outrunning sight: the victory is certain in Him who said ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον, John xvi. ult. The ground of this assurance follows) **them** (αὐτούς, the false prophets, thus identified with antichrist. The vulg. has the unjustified reading *eum*, which is naturally referred to antichrist (Aug., Bede, and the R.-C. expositors generally); to the *world*, "devincendo con-

τῷ κόσμῳ. [5] αὐτοὶ [r] ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου [r] εἰσίν· διὰ τοῦτο [r] ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου [r] λαλοῦσιν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν ἀκούει. [6] ἡμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμέν· ὁ [s] γινώσκων τὸν θεὸν ἀκούει ἡμῶν· ὃς [t] οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ [t] οὐκ ἀκούει ἡμῶν. [u] ἐκ τούτου [u] γινώσκομεν τὸ [v] πνεῦμα τῆς [v] ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς [w] πλάνης.

r John iii. 31. s John viii. 55. xvii. 3, 25. Rom. i. 21. 1 Cor. i. 21. Gal. iv. 9. ch. ii. 4, 13, 14. iii. 1, 6. Jer. ix. 3. t John viii. 47. u ch. iii. 24 reff. v John xiv. 17. xv. 26. xvi. 13. w 1 Thess. ii. 3. 2 Thess. ii. 11. Prov. xiv. 8. see 1 Tim. iv. 1.

6. om *ος ουκ* to *ημων* (*homœotel*) AL. Bede. for *εκ τουτου*, *εν τουτω* A vulg coptt

cupiscentiam," by Lyra; to "antichrist and the world," by Erasmus), **because greater is He (that is) in you than he (that is) in the world.** ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν is most naturally understood of God, seeing that ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστέ preceded; for he who is ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ has God dwelling in him. Though, as Düsterd. remarks, it matters not much whether we take it thus, or of the indwelling of God by His Spirit, or of the life of Christ in believers. The former of these is taken by Lücke, al., the latter by Aug., Bede, Grot., Corn.-a-lap., al. ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is the devil, the prince of this world. Having said this, he proceeds in the next verse to identify these false prophets with the κόσμος of which he has spoken. **5.] They are of the world** (this description is not ethical, as Socinus and Grot.,—"affectus habent, quales habet mundus, i. e. pars longe maxima humani generis: amant splendorem hujus vitæ, opulentiam et voluptates:"—but betokens the origin and source of that which they are and teach, as ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστέ did on the other side. That origin and source is the world, unregenerate human nature, ruled over and possessed by the devil, the prince of this world): **for this cause they speak of** (not *concerning*, but of, as *out of* and *from*; the material of what they say being cosmic: "ex mundi vita et sensu sermones suos promunt," Bengel) **the world, and the world heareth them** (loving as it does its own, who are of it, John xv. 19, from which our verse is mainly taken: see also John viii. 47, xviii. 37). **6.]** *contrast.* **We** (emphatic, as opposed to them: but who are meant? The Apostles and their companions in the ministry, or all believers? Or again, all teachers of God's truth, the Apostles included? It is hardly likely that the wider meaning has place here, seeing that 1) he has before said ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστέ, and 2) he is here opposing one set of *teachers* to another. On the other hand, it is not likely that he should confine what is said to the Apostles only: such as are mentioned with praise in 3 John 5—8 would surely be included) **are of God** (see above): **he that knoweth** (pres.: apprehendeth: hath any faculty for the knowledge of. The Apostle sets ὁ γινώσκων τὸν θεόν in the place of ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, as belonging more immediately to the matter in hand, the hearing, and receiving more knowledge. This γινώσκειν τὸν θεόν, the apprehension and recognition of God, is the peculiar property of God's children, not any natural faculty in which one unrenewed man differs from another. All rationalistic interpretations of these words, e. g., that of Socinus, Schlichting, al. "animi probitas et studium ea faciendi quæ Deo probantur," are quite beside the purpose) **God heareth us: he who is not of God doth not hear us** (here we must remember carefully, what the context is, and what its purpose. The Apostle is giving a test to distinguish, not the children of God from those who are not children of God, but the spirit of truth from the spirit of error, as is clear from the words following. And this he does by saying that in the case of the teachers of the truth, they are heard and received by those who apprehend God, but refused by those who are not of God. It is evident then that these two terms here, ὁ γινώσκων τὸν θεόν, and ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, represent two patent matters of fact,—two classes open and patent to all: one of them identical with the κόσμος above: the other consisting of those of whom it is said above, ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα, . . . ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ch. ii. 13, 14. How these two classes are what they are, it is not the purpose of this passage to set forth, nor need we here enquire: we have elsewhere tests to distinguish them, ch. iii. 9, 10, and have there gone into that other question. We have a striking parallel, in fact the key to these words, in the saying of our Lord to Pilate, John xviii. 37). **From this** (viz., not, as Düsterd., al., the whole foregoing train of circumstances; nor, those tests proposed in vv. 2, 3: but the facts set forth in vv. 5, 6: the reception of the false teachers by the world

x ch. ii. 7 reff.
y ch. iii. 11 reff.
z ch. ii. 26 reff.
a Matt. i. 3, 5, 6, 16 (xix. 12). John i. 13. iii. 5, 6 bis, 8. viii. 41. ch. ii. 29. iii. 9 bis, v. 1 bis, 4, 18, bis only. Ezra x. 44.

7 [x] Ἀγαπητοί, [y] ἀγαπῶμεν [y] ἀλλήλους, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη [z] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν [a] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ [a] γεγέννηται καὶ [s] γινώσκει τὸν θεόν. 8 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν οὐκ [s] ἔγνω

ABKLℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

7. aft *ο αγαπων* ins *τον θεον* A, *fratrem* demid tol Fulg (Did-int).
8. om 1st clause (*homœotel*) ℵ[1](ins, exc *τον θεον*, ℵ[3]) d. for *ουκ εγνω*, *ου γινωσκει* A 13: *εγνωκεν* ℵ[3] m.

the reception of the true teachers by those that apprehend God, and their rejection by those who are not of God: as Schlichting, who however means the words in his rationalistic sense, "ex assensu et dissensu proborum et improborum." The same point is touched by our Lord in John x. 8, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα) **we know** (in this unemphatic first person the Apostle includes his readers: we, all God's children. γινώσκομεν, *distinguish*, *recognize*, as so often) **the Spirit of truth** (the Spirit that cometh of God and teacheth truth: see reff.) **and the spirit of error** (the spirit that cometh of the devil, teaching lies and seducing men into error: see ch. i. 8, ii. 26).

7—21.] The Apostle again takes up his exhortations to brotherly love, but this time in nearer and deeper connexion with our birth from God, and knowledge of Him who is Himself Love, vv. 7, 8. This last fact he proves by what God has done for us in and by His Son, vv. 9—16: and establishes the necessary connexion between love to God and love to man, vv. 17—21. The passage is in connexion with what went before, but by links at first sight not very apparent. The great theme of the whole was enounced ch. ii. 29. The consideration of that has passed into the consideration of that δικαιοσύνη in its highest and purest form of love, which has been recommended, and grounded on His love to us, in ch. iii. 11—18, where the testimony of our hearts came in, and was explained—the great test of His presence in us being the gift of His Spirit, ch. iii. ult. Then from the necessity of distinguishing and being sure of that His Spirit, have been inserted the foregoing tests and cautions respecting truth and error. And now he returns to the main subject. The γινώσκει τὸν θεόν, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν and γεγέννηται, the taking up again of God's love to us in Christ at ver. 9 from ch. iii. 16, the reiteration of the testimony of the Spirit in ver. 13, all serve to shew that we are reading no collection of spiritual apophthegms, but a close and connected argument, though not in an ordinary style.

7, 8.] **Beloved** (as before, marks the fervency and affection of the Apostle turning to his readers with another solemn exhortation. Here the word is especially appropriate, seeing that his own heart is full of that love which he is enjoining), **let us love one another: because** (he at once rests the exhortation on the deepest ground) **love** (ἡ ἀγάπη, abstract, in the widest sense, as the following words shew) **is from God** (has its origin and source in God: He is the wellspring and centre of all love. No such weakening as "Deo maxime placet" (Grot.) must be thought of. It is remarkable that Didymus understood ἀγάπη here of Christ,—ἥντινα οὐκ ἄλλην εἶναι νομιστέον ἢ τὸν μονογενῆ, ὥσπερ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, οὕτω καὶ ἀγάπην ἐξ ἀγάπης ὄντα:—and Augustine, fitting together "Dilectio est ex Deo," and "Dilectio est Deus," infers that "Dilectio est Deus ex Deo," which comparing with Rom. v. 5, he infers that love is the Holy Spirit: Tract. vii. 6, vol. iii. p. 2032): **and every one that loveth** (there is no need to supply an object after ἀγαπῶν, as τὸν θεόν in A, "his brother" as some latt., and Lücke: indeed to do so would be to narrow the general sense of the Apostle's saying: all love is from God: every one that loveth, taking the word of course in its pure ideal sense in which the assertion follows from the former), **hath been begotten of God** (has truly received within him that new spiritual life which is of God: see note on ch. ii. 29), **and knoweth** (pres.: in his daily walk and habit, recognizes and is acquainted with God: by virtue of that his divine birth and life) **God**:

8.] (*Contrast*, but with some remarkable variations) **he that loveth not** (general, as before: no object: he that hath not love in him) **hath never known God** (aor.: hath not once known: has never had in him even the beginnings of knowledge of God: as Lücke, "noch gar nicht kennen gelernt hat." So that the aorist makes a far stronger contrast than the present οὐ γινώσκει would. That is excluded, and much more); **because** (reason why he who loveth not can never have known God. ὅτι cannot well be "*that*," dependent on ἔγνω, as e.g. Tirinus (cited by Düsterd.) seems to make it: "non novit, saltem practice non ostendit se nosse et agnoscere, Deum esse . . . caritatem:" in that case

τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη [b] ἐστίν. 9 [c] ἐν τούτῳ [d] ἐφανερώθη ἡ [e] ἀγάπη τοῦ [e] θεοῦ [d] ἐν ἡμῖν, [c] ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν [f] μονογενῆ [g] ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεὸς [g] εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα [h] ζήσωμεν [h] δι᾽ αὐτοῦ. 10 [ci] ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐχ [c] ὅτι

b see ch. i. 5.
c ch. iii. 16.
d = John ix. 3. see 2 Cor. viii. 7.
e gen. subj., Rom. v. 5. viii. 35. Eph. iii. 19 al. see ch. ii. 5.
f of Christ, John i. 14, 18. iii. 16, 18 (Luke vii. 12 al2. Heb. xi. 17) only. (Ps. xxi. 20.)
g John iii. 17. x. 36.
h John vi. 57 (but acc.).
i so ἐν, Luke i. 77. Eph. i. 17. Heb. iii. 12.

9. for απεσταλκεν, απεστειλεν K Ath. for ζησωμεν, ζωμεν א[1].
10. aft αγαπη ins του θεου א coptt.

it would be either οὐκ ἔγνω, ὅτι ὁ θεός . . . or οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀγ. ἐστίν) **God is love** (**ἀγάπη**, not ἡ ἀγάπη: love is the very essence, not merely an attribute, of God. It is co-essential with Him: He is all love, love is all of Him: he who has not love, has not God. It is not the place here to enter on the theological import of this weighty and wonderful sentence. It will be found set forth in Augustine, de Trinitate, ix. 2 ff., vol. viii. p. 961 ff.: in Sartorius, die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe, i. 1, and in the first of my Sermons on Divine Love, which are founded on Sartorius's work. Düsterd. refers also to Nitzsch, über die wesentliche Dreieinigkeit Gottes, in the Studien u. Kritiken for 1841, 2, p. 337: and Liebner, Christologie, p. 135. But it may be necessary to put in a caution against all inadequate and shallow explanations of the saying: such as that of Grotius (after Socinus), "Deus est plenus caritate,"—Benson, "God is the most benevolent of all beings: full of love to all His creatures,"—Whitby, "The Apostle intends not to express what God is in his essence . . but what He is demonstrativè, ἐνεργητικῶς, shewing great philanthropy to men:"—Hammond, "God is made up of love and kindness to mankind:"—Calvin, "hoc est quod ejus natura sit, homines diligere . . . de essentia Dei non loquitur, sed tantum docet qualis a nobis sentiatur:" &c. &c. In all these,—in the two last by supplying an object, "homines," which is not in the sacred text,—the whole force of the axiom as it stands in the Apostle's argument is lost. Unless he is speaking of the essential being of God, quorsum pertineat, to say that he that loveth not never knew God, because "God is love?" Put for these last words, "God is loving," and we get at once a fallacy of an undistributed middle: He that loveth not never knew what love is: God is loving: but what would follow? that in as far as God is loving, he never knew Him: but he may have known Him in as far as He is just, or powerful. But take ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν of God's essential being,—as a strict definition of God, and the argumentation will be strict: He that loveth not never knew love: God is love (the terms are co-essential and co-extensive): therefore he who loveth not never knew God).

9, 10.] *Proof of this* as far as we are concerned, in God's sending His Son to save us. **In this** (viz. which follows: the ὅτι is the apodosis, as in ch. iii. 16) **the love of God was manifested in regard to us** (**ἐν ἡμῖν** must be taken with the verb, not with **ἡ ἀγάπη**, which in this case (*pace Huther*: being the case of a particular manifestation of that which has been before generally stated. The combination of anarthrous predicatory clauses only takes place when the whole will bear running together into one idea, as τοῖς κυρίοις-κατὰ-σάρκα) would require the article ἡ ἐν ἡμῖν. Many Commentators have thus wrongly connected it, and in consequence have been compelled to distort ἐν into εἰς: so Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Spener, Beza, Socinus, Schlichting, Episcop., Grot., Benson, Neander, al. Bengel has fallen into the former fault, though not into the latter: "amor Dei qui nunc *in nobis* est, per omnem experientiam spiritualem." This is upheld also by Sander, who defends it by Gal. i. 16, where a totally different matter is treated of. Connected then with the verb, it must not be taken as = εἰς, but as in reff., especially John ix. 3, where the same phrase occurs: "in," i. e. "in the matter of," in regard of: cf. ver. 16 below: the manifestation not being made *to us* as its spectators, but in our persons and cases, as its "materies." **ἡμῖν**, communicative, believers in general), **that God hath sent** (perf. The manifestation is regarded as one act, done implicitly when God sent His Son: but the sending is regarded in its present abiding effects, which have changed all things since it took place) **His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him** (no words can be plainer than these and need less explanation to any one acquainted with St. John. The endeavours of the old rationalists, Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, to escape from the assertion of Christ's præexistence, by rendering εἰς τὸν κόσμ. "ad mundum," μονογ., "dilectissimum," &c.,

s ch. iii. 24 reff. t = ch. ii. 5 (reff). u ch. ii. 3, 5 reff. v so Matt. xxv. 8. w ch. iii. 24 reff. x ch. i. 2 reff.

θεὸς [s] ἐν ἡμῖν [s] μένει, καὶ ἡ [t] ἀγάπη [t] αὐτοῦ [t] τετελειωμένη ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστιν. 13 [u] ἐν τούτῳ [u] γινώσκομεν ὅτι [s] ἐν αὐτῷ [s] μένομεν καὶ αὐτὸς [s] ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι [v] ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ [vw] δέδωκεν ἡμῖν. 14 καὶ ἡμεῖς [r] τεθεάμεθα καὶ [x] μαρτυροῦ-

ABKLℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

12. rec εστιν bef 2nd εν ημιν, with KL rel syrr coptt æth arm Œc Aug: εν ημιν bef τετελειωμενη A a m vulg Thl: εν ημιν τετελειωται και τετελειωμενη εστιν 13: txt Bℵ.
13. for δεδ., εδωκεν A c 13 Did Ath$_2$ Chr$_2$: txt BKLℵ rel Thl Œc.
14. for τεθεαμεθα, εθεασαμεθα A Cyr: txt BKLℵ rel Thl Œc.

towards our brethren whom we have seen. By our love to them are we to know, how far we have love to Him: if that be present, He dwelleth in us, and ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν. And thus (see below) the way is prepared for vv. 15, 16, which take up and bring to a conclusion the reasoning): **if we love one another, God abideth in us** (for the reason already stated in ver. 8, and restated in immediate connexion with this very matter in ver. 16, that God is Love, and every one that loveth is born of God, knows God, abides in God and God in him), **and** (simply the copula: not as Calvin, "copulam accipit causalis particulæ loco") **the love of Him** (i. e. ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ, as in ch. ii. 5, where we had the same expression, *our love to Him*, not, as Beza, Bengel, Sander, al., *His love to us*. This is evident not merely from ch. ii. 5, but from the context here: see it explained above, and remember that it is our love to God which is here the subject, as evinced by our love to our brethren. This is further shewn by the recurrence of the same expression in ver. 17, ἐν τούτῳ τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν, and ver. 18, ὁ φοβούμενος οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. And so the majority of Commentators. Calvin proposes as a possible alternative, "caritas, quam nobis inspirat." Socinus renders "dilectio quam ipse Deus nobis præscripsit." But both these are forced, and agree neither with usage nor with the context) **is perfected** (see note ch. ii. 5. Here, as there, it signifies, has reached its full maturity: the ἀγαπᾷν ἀλλήλους being the token and measure of it. The form τετελειωμένη ἐστίν, like all resolved forms of verbal tenses, brings out more strongly the peculiar temporal force of the verb substantive united with the import of the participle as a predicate. Hence in this case, the *present* sense always contained in the perfect, predominates, and there is more reason than ever for rendering "is," not "hath been") **in us** (on the view above maintained of ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἡμῖν keeps its primary and obvious sense, "*in us*," "within us," as in ch. ii. 5).

13.] **In this we know that we are abiding in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit** (nearly repeated from ch. iii. 24. But why introduced here? In the former verse, the *fact* of His abiding in us was assured to us, if we love one another. Of this fact, when thus loving, we need a token. Him we cannot see: has He given us any testimony of His presence in us? He has given us such a testimony, in making us partakers of His Holy Spirit. This fact it is to which the Apostle here calls our attention, as proving not the external fact of the sending of the Son (ver. 14), but one within ourselves,—the indwelling of God in us, and our abiding in Him. It is obvious that all inferences from the expression ἐκ τοῦ πν. against the personality of the Holy Ghost are quite beside the purpose: compare Acts ii. 17 with Joel ii. 28 (Heb. and E V.). We each have the indwelling of one and the same personal Spirit, but each according to our measure, 1 Cor. xii. 4, 11. One only had the Spirit without measure, in all His fulness: even Christ; John iii. 34. And the presence of the Holy Spirit is most aptly adduced here where love is in question, His first fruit being love, and His presence being tested by His fruits).

14, 15, 16.] The connexion seems to be this: the inward evidence of God's abiding in us and we in Him, is, the gift of His Spirit. But this is not the only evidence nor the only test which we have. This internal evidence is accompanied by, nay, is itself made possible (see ver. 19) by, our recognition of the Father's love in sending His Son as our Saviour: which last is a fact, testified by human evidence. This recognition of God's love is a condition of abiding in Him and He in us: in a word, is the μένειν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, which is equivalent to abiding in Him. **And we** (this ἡμεῖς brings up in sharp relief the apostolic body whom Christ appointed His witnesses, John xv. 27, Acts i. 8. The assertion is of the same kind as that in ch. i. 1) **have beheld** (τεθεάμεθα is joined closely to μαρτυροῦμεν, and in common with it belongs to the ὅτι following. No object must be supplied after it, as "Deum ejusque virtutes imprimis carita-

μεν ὅτι [y] ὁ [y] πατὴρ [k] ἀπέσταλκεν [ks] τὸν υἱὸν [a] σωτῆρα τοῦ [a] κόσμου. [15] ὃς ἂν [b] ὁμολογήσῃ [b] ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ θεὸς [s] ἐν αὐτῷ μένει καὶ αὐτὸς [s] ἐν τῷ θεῷ. [16] καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ [c] πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχει ὁ θεὸς [d] ἐν ἡμῖν. ὁ θεὸς [e] ἀγάπη ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ [s] μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ [s] ἐν τῷ θεῷ μένει, καὶ ὁ θεὸς [s] ἐν αὐτῷ μένει. [17] [f] ἐν τούτῳ [t] τετελείωται [tg] ἡ ἀγάπη [h] μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἵνα

y ch. i. 3 reff. z absol., Matt. xi. 27 ||. John, passim.
a John iv. 42 only. see Eph. v. 23.
b constr., Matt. vii. 23. John i. 20. Heb. xi. 13.
c constr., John xi. 26. Acts xiii. 41 (from Hab. i. 5). 1 Cor. xiii. 7 only.
d ver. 9. e ver. 8. f with ἵνα, John xv. 8. (ch. iii. 23 reff.) g = (gener.) ver. 16.
h so 2 John 2.

15. εαν B a k. for ομολογηση, ομολογη A. aft ιησους ins χριστος B spec arm.
16. for πεπιστευκ., πιστευομεν A 13 am tol copt Aug: txt BKLℵ rel demid harl Thl Œc. om 4th ὁ ℵ. rec om 2nd μενει, with A rel vulg æth Thl Œc Cypr, Bede: ins BKLℵ b[1] f g j k l m 36(sic) 40 syr coptt Cypr, Aug. (coptt add it also at end of ver 15.)
17. aft ημων ins εν ημιν ℵ.

tem." Piscator. The construction of θεᾶσθαι with ὅτι is found John vi. 5) **and do testify that the Father hath sent** (not merely to the historical fact as a thing past, but to its abiding influence as implied by σωτῆρα τ. κόσμου below: q. d., that the Father sent the Son, and that the Son is the Saviour of the world) **the Son** (better here than "*His* Son:" ὁ πατήρ, τὸν υἱόν, are *termini theologici*) **as Saviour of the world** (σωτῆρα, anarthrous, is not appositive but predicatory = in meaning "to save the world," but one degree removed back from it in telic force: σώζειν τὸν κόσμον would express more strongly the ultimate view of His mission; σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου gives the mediate aim, leaving it possible that another may be yet behind. τοῦ κόσμου here, as in ch. ii. 2, John iii. 16, in its widest sense: no evasion of this sense, such as the "electorum in omnibus populis" of Piscator and Aretius, is to be endured). 15.] And recognition of this fact is a condition and proof of the life of God. **Whosoever confesseth** (the aorist can only be given by the English present and an exegesis,—viz. that this present betokens not a repeated act and habit, but a great act once for all introducing the man into a state of ὁμολογῆσαι. All futures, "*shall confess*," and futuri exacti, "*shall have confessed*," are objectionable; the one as losing the retrospective tinge, the other as making it unduly prominent, and indeed imparting a slight hue of transitoriness, which least of all belongs to the word.

The same remark holds good of this confessing, as before with regard to denying, ch. ii. 23: viz., that we must not bring into it more than the Apostle intends by it: it is not the "confession of the *life*" which is here spoken of, but that of the lips only. Of course it would be self-evident that this is taken by the Apostle as ruling the life: but simply *as* a matter of course. He speaks of the ideal realized) **that Jesus is the Son of God** (i. e. receives the testimony in the last verse as true), **God abideth in him, and he in God.**

16.] a) **And we** (not now the apostolic body only, but communicative, the Apostle and his readers. This is evident and necessary (against Episcopius, Huther, al.), because on the other view the ἐν ἡμῖν which follows, interpreted as it must necessarily be of the same persons, would fit awkwardly on to the repeated general proposition with which the verse concludes) **have known and have believed** (the two roots which lie at the ground of ὁμολογεῖν, ἐγνώκαμεν and πεπιστεύκαμεν, are in St. John's language, most intimately connected. "True faith is, according to St. John, a faith of knowledge and experience: true knowledge is a knowledge of faith." Lücke. Cf. John vi. 69) **the love, which God hath in regard to us** (ἐν ἡμῖν as above, ver. 9: not "towards us," as Beza (and E. V.), Estius, Luther, Socinus, Grot., &c. b) **God is Love, and he that abideth in love abideth in God and God (abideth) in him** (this is the solemn and formal restatement of that which has been the ground-tone of the whole since ver. 7. And here, as there, ἀγάπη is in its widest abstract sense. Its two principal manifestations are, love to God, and love to one another: but this saying is of Love absolute). 17, 18.] These verses, which are parallel with ch. iii. 19—21, set forth the confidence with which perfect love shall endow the believer in the great day of judgment. **In this is love perfected with us** (for ἐν τούτῳ, see below. ἡ ἀγάπη, not, as Luther, Calv., Spener, Grot., Calov., Bengel, Sander, al., *God's love to us*: this is forbidden by the whole

i ch. iii. 21 reff. k John, here only. 2 Pet. ii. 9 reff. l Isa. xxxiv. 8. l ch. iii. 3.

[i] παῤῥησίαν [i] ἔχωμεν ἐν τῇ [k] ἡμέρᾳ τῆς [k] κρίσεως, ὅτι [l] καθ-ὼς [l] ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ.

ABKℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

for ημερα, αγαπη ℵ. εχομεν Kℵ c f. for εσμεν, εσομεθα ℵ.

context: our verse is introduced by ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, and continued by φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ: it is love dwelling and advancing to perfection in us. And again, not love to God merely, nor love to our brethren merely; these are concrete manifestations of it: but love itself in the abstract—the principle of love, as throughout this passage. This sense of ἀγάπη will point out that of μεθ' ἡμῶν, which belongs not to ἡ ἀγάπη but to the verb, as in ver. 12. Love is considered as planted in us; its degrees of increase take place μεθ' ἡμῶν—not merely "bei uns," "chez nous," πρὸς ἡμᾶς, but as *concerned with us*; in a sense somewhat similar to that in which ἐμεγάλυνεν κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτῆς, Luke i. 58. See 2 John 2, where however the idea of dwelling with is more brought out than here), **that we have confidence in the day of judgment** (ἵνα gives not the purpose of the τετελείωται, but the apodosis to the ἐν τούτῳ, as in reff.: "in this love is perfected in us, viz. that we, &c." So most, and nearly all the best Commentators. Beza (and E. V.), Socinus, Grot., Mayer, give ἵνα its telic force, regarding ὅτι as the apodosis (not so E. V.), and assuming a trajection: the objection to which is, not the transposition, but the sense so gained, as belonging to the context. On this view, the aim given by the ἵνα comes in altogether disjointed from the context, and the perfection of love in us is stated to be found in a fact which is objective, not subjective. It is only necessary to cite Grotius's exegesis to shew the incongruity, even in his understanding of ἡ ἀγάπη. "Hic est summus gradus dilectionis Dei erga nos, si qualis in hoc mundo Christus fuit, i. e. mundi odiis et propterea plurimis malis expositus tales et nos simus (Joh. xv. 18; 1 Pet. ii. 19, iv. 16). Ideo hoc Deus ita disponit, ut cum bona fiducia appareamus in die judicii. Nam constans perpessio malorum ad exemplum Christi efficit, ut a Christo optima exspectemus, quippe ipsi similes." Can any thing be more broken and far-fetched than such a connexion? to say nothing of its "si simus" for ὅτι ἐσμέν.

On the right interpretation, the confidence which we shall have in that day, and which we have even now by anticipation of that day, is the perfection of our love; grounded on the consideration (ὅτι καθὼς κ.τ.λ.) which follows: casting out fear, which cannot consist with perfect love, ver. 18): **because even as He** (Christ, see below) **is, we also are in this world** (this is the reason or ground of our confidence: that we, as we now are in the world, are like Christ: and in the background lies the thought, He will not, in that day, condemn those who are like Himself. In these words, the sense must be gained by keeping strictly to the tenses and grammatical construction: not, as e. g. Œc. ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, by changing the tenses (so also Thl., Tirin., Corn.-a-lap., Mayer, Grot., Luther, Calov., Rickli, al.), nor by referring the words ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ to Christ, as several of the above, and Socinus. And when we have adhered to tense and grammar, wherein is the likeness spoken of to be found? Clearly, by what has been above said, not in our trials and persecutions. Nor by our being not of the world as He is not of the world (Sander, who however adds, 'clothed with His righteousness'): nor in that we, as sons of adoption through Him, are beloved of God, even as He is beloved (Tirinus, Neander); nor as Huther, in that we live in Love, as He lives in Love: but in that we are righteous as He is righteous, ch. ii. 29, iii. 3 ff., 10, 22: this being evinced by our abiding in Love. And so mainly (Œc., Thl., with the mistake pointed out above), Beza, Corn.-a-lap., Mayer, Socinus, Lücke, De Wette, Rickli, Düsterd., al. Many indeed of these approach to Huther's view impugned above, and make it to be *love* in which we are like Christ: but Düsterd. brings rightly this logical objection,—that St. John does not say that Love is perfected in confidence in us, because we resemble Christ in Love; but he refers to the fundamental truth on which our Love itself rests, and says; because we are absolutely like Christ, because we are in Christ Himself, because He lives in us, for without this there cannot be likeness to Him; in a word, because we are, in that communion with Christ which we are assured of by our likeness to Him in righteousness, children of God, therefore our love brings with it also full confidence. Essentially, the reason here rendered for our confidence in the day of judgment is the same as that given ch. iii. 21 f. for another kind of confidence, viz., that we keep His commandments. This also betokens the δικαιοσύνη, of which Christ is the essential exemplar and which is a necessary attribute of those who

[18] φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἀλλ' ἡ [m] τελεία ἀγάπη [n] ἔξω [n] βάλλει τὸν φόβον, ὅτι ὁ φόβος [o] κόλασιν [p] ἔχει, ὁ δὲ φοβούμενος οὐ [q] τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. [19] ἡμεῖς

m = Rom. xii. 2. 1 Cor. xiii. 10. James i. 4. n Matt. v. 13. xiii. 48. Luke xiv. 35. John xv. 6. o Matt. xxv. 46 only. Ezek. xliii. 11. p so Matt. vi. 1. q ch. ii. 5 reff.

18. αλλα B. 19. aft ημεις ins ουν A g k m 13 vulg Syr Pel Leo Bede.

through Christ are children of God).

18.] Confidence in (or as understood, as to) that terrible day presupposes the absence of fear: and this casting out of fear is the very work of love, which in its perfect state cannot coexist with fear. **Fear** (**φόβος**, abstract and general: anarthrous, on account of the negative predication) **existeth not in love** (**τῇ ἀγάπῃ**, abstract and general also, as in ver. 17: not "*God's love to us,*" as Calv., Calov., Spener, al.: nor "*brotherly love,*" as Lücke, al.), **nay perfect** (see on τετελείωται in ver. 17) **love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment** (see below): **but he that feareth hath not been perfected in (his) love.** The points here to be noticed are, 1) the emphatic **οὐκ ἔστιν**, which is better rendered as above, than "There is no fear in love," in order to keep **φόβος**, which is the subject in the Greek, also the subject in the English: 2) **ἀλλά**, which is not here the mere adversative after a negative clause, in which case it would refer to something in which fear *is*, e. g. φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἀλλ' (ἔστιν) ἐν τῷ μίσει: but it is the stronger adversative, implying "nay far otherwise:" "tantum abest ut . . . ut:" 3) the argument in **ἀλλ' . . . ἔχει**, which is doubly enthymematic, having in it two assumptions or suppressed premisses, *α*) that nothing having κόλασις can consist with perfect love: *β*) that fear is in us by nature and needs *casting out* in order to its absence: 4) the meaning of **κόλασιν ἔχει**. There are two opinions: a) that κόλασις is merely pain or torment; so Aug. ("tormentum habet"), Erasmus ("punitionem seu potius cruciatum habet"), Tirinus ("parit animi perturbationem cruciatum et tormentum, ob impendens, quod metuit, malum seu pœnam"), Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Beza (and E. V.), Piscator, Aretius, Episcopius, Rosenm., Bengel ("nam diffidit, omnia inimica et adversa sibi fingit ac proponit, fugit, odit"), Joach. Lange (who interprets it, compunction at the preaching of the law), Sander, al.: b) that **κόλασις** is properly *punishment*. So Lyra (but mistaking κ. ἔχει; "debetur pœna timori servili"), Corn.-a-lap., Estius (well: "pœnam, quam commeruit, semper animo versat"), Mayer, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Spener, Benson, Whitby, Baumg.-Crus., Neander, Lücke (includes in itself punishment, i. e. consciousness of deserving it), De Wette, Düsterd., Huther. And this last is certainly the sense, both from the usage of the word (reff.), and from the context, in which the day of judgment is before us. Fear, by anticipating punishment, has it even now; bears about a foretaste of it and so partakes of it: 5) the last clause, ὁ δὲ φοβούμενος οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, is intimately connected with what follows (see on ver. 14) as well as with what went before. The **δέ** is adversative to the whole preceding sentence, ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη κ.τ.λ., and mainly to the idea of τελεία ἀγάπη therein expressed. As regards the absence of fear from the love of the Christian believer, it has been well observed by Œcum., that there are two kinds of godly fear, φόβος προκαταρκτικός, which afflicts men with a sense of their evil deeds and dread of God's anger, and which is not abiding: and φόβος τελειωτικός, of which it is said, "The fear of the Lord is clean and endureth for ever," Ps. xix., and which δέους τοιούτου ἀπήλλακται. And Bengel says in his brief pointed manner, "Varius hominum status: sine timore et amore: cum timore sine amore: cum timore et amore: sine timore cum amore." The difference is finely wrought out by Augustine, in loc. Tract. ix. 5—8, vol. iii. p. 2048 ff.

19.] I am sorry to be obliged here to differ from the best modern Commentators, Lücke, De Wette, Düsterdieck, Huther, as well as from Episcop., Grot., Luther, Calov., Spener, al., and the Commentators on the vulgate, in holding firmly that ἀγαπῶμεν is indicative, not imperative (i. e. hortative). This I do not merely on account of the expressed ἡμεῖς, though that would be a strong point in the absence of stronger, but on account of the context, which appears to me to be broken by the imperative. He that feareth is not perfect in love. Our love (abstract, not specified whether to God or our brother) is brought about by, conditioned by, depends upon, His love to us first: it is only a sense of that which can bring about our love: and if so, then from the very nature of things it is void of terror, and full of confidence, as springing out of a sense of His love to us. Nor only so: our being new begot-

r absol., ver. 7. s ch. ii. 9. iii. 15. t ch. i. 10 reff. u John i. 18. v John xiv. 21. Heb. vii. 5. (so λαμβ., 2 John 4 reff.) w John xi. 57. xv. 12. ch. iii. 23 al. J. only, exc. Acts xvii. 15. x constr., John vi. 69. xx. 31. Matt. ix. 28 al. Job xv. 31.

ABKLℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

r ἀγαπῶμεν, ὅτι αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς. 20 ἐάν τις εἴπῃ ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν θεόν, καὶ τὸν s ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ s μισῇ, t ψεύστης ἐστίν· ὁ γὰρ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν ἑώρακεν, τὸν u θεὸν ὃν οὐχ u ἑώρακεν οὐ δύναται ἀγαπᾶν. 21 καὶ ταύτην τὴν vw ἐντολὴν v ἔχομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, w ἵνα ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.

V. 1 Πᾶς ὁ x πιστεύων x ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς

rec aft *αγαπωμεν* ins *αυτον*, with KL rel Thl Œc Aug$_1$; *τον θεον* ℵ a c d 13 demid(and harl) syrr copt arm Leo$_1$ Bede: om AB am(with fuld) Aug$_1$ Pel. for *αυτος*, *ο θεος* A 13 vulg Pel: txt BKLℵ rel harl syrr coptt æth arm Thl Œc Aug$_1$ Bede.

20. om *ειπη* ℵ[1](ins ℵ-corr[1](appy)). rec (for *ου*) *πως*, with AKL rel vulg Syr copt æth arm Thl Œc Cypr Ambr Aug Cas-arel Bede: txt Bℵ a syr sah Lucif Zeno. om *οτι* ℵ. *μεισει* K ℵ-corr(-*σι*) m 13. 36(sic). 66.

21. for *απ' αυτου*, *απο του θεου* A am demid Bede: txt BKL rel fuld Lucif Aug. om *τον θεον αγαπα και* (*passing from τον to τον*) A[1]B[1](sic: see table at end of prolegg.): in both cases inserted by the original scribe or one of the same age, see Woide and Rulotta.

ten in love is not only the effect of *a sense of* His past love, but is the effect of that love itself: **We** (emphatic—one side of the antithesis) **love** (see above. The indic. is taken by Calvin, Beza, Aretius, Socinus, Schlichting, Seb.-Schmidt, Whitby, Bengel, Rickli, Neander, al. Most Commentators supply *αὐτόν* or *ἀλλήλους*, but unnecessarily. It is of all love that he is speaking; of love in its root and ideal), **because He** (God: see the parallel, ver. 10) **first loved us** (viz. in the sending of His Son). **20.**] The connexion is most close: and the error great of those who, as e.g. Erdmann, have made a new section begin here. This *ἀγάπη* is universal, necessarily manifested in *both* of the two great departments of its exercise. Love, living and working in the heart as a principle, will fix first upon objects at hand and seen: those objects being natural objects for it to fix on. How then can a man love God, the highest object of love, who is removed from his sight, and at the same time refuse to love his brother, bearing the mark of a child of God, before his eyes from day to day? Put in a brief form, the argument, as connected with the last verse, is this: His love has begotten *us* anew in love: in this *us* are included our brethren, objects of our daily sight: if therefore we do not love them, we do not love Him. **If any say** (aor. "have said;" i. e. at any time: the saying once, rather than the habit, is the hypothesis) **I love God, and hate** (pres. of habit) **his brother, he is a liar: for** (here again the argument is enthymematic, and we must supply from our common sense *ἐφελκυστικὸν γὰρ ὅρασις πρὸς ἀγάπην*, Œc.: "oculi sunt in amore duces," &c.) **he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen** (perf.: and continues to feel the influence of that sight. We do not say "I have seen him" of the dead, but of the living only), **cannot love God whom he hath not seen** (St. John does not say that there is no love without sight; nor that we love all we see better than any thing we do not see: his argument rests on a deeper and truer position: viz. on that assumed in the word *ἀδελφόν*, which carries with it the consideration that he of whom it is said is begotten of God. Both *ὁ ἀδελφός* and *ὁ θεός* are used within the limits of the Christian life, of which that is true, which is unfolded ch. v. 1, that this *ἀδελφός* as begotten of God is a necessary object of love to one that loves Him that begat him. *Here*, a lower step of the same argument is taken; but without this great truth, lying beneath the word *ἀδελφός*, it would carry no conviction with it). **21.**] And besides this argument from common sense, there is another most powerful one, which the Apostle here adds. "Quomodo diligis eum, cujus odisti præceptum?" as Aug. **And this commandment we have from Him** (God: not, Christ: see below), **that he who loveth God, love also his brother** (where have we this commandment? In the great summary of the law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, ... and thy neighbour as thyself," so often cited by our Lord; see Matt. xxii. 37—39). CHAP. V. 1.] And who is our brother? and why does this name carry with it such an obligation to love? These questions, in closest connexion with the last verse, the Apostle answers in this.

P θεου... ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

[y] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ [y] γεγέννηται, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννήσαντα ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν [y] γεγεννημένον [y] ἐξ αὐτοῦ. 2 [z] ἐν τούτῳ [z] γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τὰ [a] τέκνα τοῦ [a] θεοῦ, ὅταν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν καὶ τὰς [b] ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ [b] ποιῶμεν. 3 [c] αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ [d] ἀγάπη τοῦ [d] θεοῦ, [c] ἵνα τὰς [e] ἐντολὰς

y ch. iv. 7 reff. z ch. ii. 3, 5 reff. a ch. iii. 1, 2 reff. b John, here (Rev. xxii. 14 v. r.) only. Matt. v. 19 al. Deut. xix. 9. c ch. iii. 23 reff. d = ch. ii. 5 reff. e ch. ii. 3, 4 reff.

CHAP. V. 1. om 2nd και B 13 am(with demid tol) sah Hil_1 Aug Vig Fulg: ins AKL[P]ℵ rel vulg-ed syrr æth arm Cyr-jer Thdrt Thl Œc Hil_1 Bede. for 2nd τον, το ℵ(Tischdf: not Treg) m.

2. rec (for ποιωμεν) τηρωμεν, with KL[P]ℵ rel tol Œc: txt B a d g vulg syrr coptt æth arm Thl Lucif Aug_2 Bede.—A 100-1 pass from εντολας αυτου ver 2 to εντολας αυτου ver 3.

Every one that believeth (not as Grot. "qui credere se ostendit:" it is the faith itself which is spoken of) **that Jesus is the Christ hath been begotten of God** (to whom do these words apply? from what follows, in which the γεγέννηται is taken up by τὸν γεγεννημένον, to the brother whom we are to love as a necessary accompaniment of our loving God. But most Commentators, including Lücke, De Wette, Huther, Düsterd., assume that it is of *ourselves* that this is said: *our* birth of God depends on and is in closest union with our faith, ch. iii. 23, 24. Then the connexion between this and the following clause must be made by filling up an ellipsis, "and if born of God we love God." But this is far-fetched and, as has been above shewn implicitly, alien from the context, the object of which is to point out who those are whom we are bound to love if we love God. Then having made this predication of all the children of God, πᾶς ὁ πιστ. κ.τ.λ., he, as so frequently, takes it up again below, ver. 4, with a more general reference, and dwells on our faith as the principle which overcomes the world: see there): **and every one who loveth him that begot** (these words take up again the ἐάν τις εἴπῃ ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν θεόν, of ch. iv. 20), **loveth also him that is begotten of him** (viz. the brother of whom the former clause spoke: not, as Aug., Hil., Corn.-a-lap., al., Christ, the Son of God. As Calvin, "sub numero singulari omnes fideles designat. Est enim argumentum ex communi naturæ ordine sumptum").

2.] **And indeed so inseparable are** the two, that as before, ch. iv. 20, our love to our brethren was made a sign and necessary condition of our love to God, so conversely, our love to God, ascertained by our keeping His commandments, is itself the measure of our love to the children of God. Either of the two being found to be present, the presence of the other follows. **In this we know that we love the children of God** (τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ takes up again τὸν γεγεννημένον ἐξ αὐτοῦ of the preceding verse) **when** (the indefiniteness in ὅταν is to be taken not within the limits of each case, "*whensoever we*," but as belonging to the cases collectively, "in every case where") **we love God, and do His commandments** (this adjunct is made, as the following verse shews, in order to introduce an equivalent to ἀγαπῶμεν τ. θεόν by which its presence may be judged. It will be seen from what has been said, that all the devices which have been used to extract from this verse a sense different from that which it really conveys, are wholly unneeded, nay, out of place. Such are those of some of the ancient versions: "per hoc cognoscimus quod diligimus *Deum*, si diliximus Eum et fecimus mandatum ejus," æth: "per hoc cognoscimus *nos esse Dei filios* quum Deum dilexerimus," &c. arab: of Œc., who seems to be confused in his account, for after citing the words he says, καὶ δεῖγμα τῆς εἰς θεὸν ἀγάπης τὴν εἰς ἀδελφὸν ἀγάπην τίθεται: of Grotius, who says, "facilis fit connexio si trajectio fiat, qualem ego libenter facerem, si librum aliquem veterem haberem auctorem, ἐν τ. γινώσκ. ὅτι τ. θεὸν ἀγ., ὅταν ἀγ. τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ κ. τ. ἐντολὰς αὐτ. τηρ.:" that of anon. in Schulz, Konject. ub. d. N. T., who wanted to transpose ὅτι and ὅταν: that of Rosenmüller, who coolly says, "permutantur h. l. significationes particularum ὅτι et ὅταν, quod contextus necessario postulat").

3.] **For** (explaining the connexion of the two preceding clauses) **the love of God is this** (consists in this: αὕτη, as the demonstrative pronoun, in all such sentences, being the predicate), **that** (ἵνα introduces the apodosis to αὕτη as in ch. iv. 17, where see note) **we keep His commandments. And His commandments are not grievous** (the reason, why they are not grievous, is given in the next verse. Almost all the Commentators refer to Matt. xi. 30, ὁ ζυγός μου χρηστός, κ. τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν. Œc., however, al., repu-

f = here only. (Matt. xxiii. 4, 23. Acts xx. 29. xxv. 7. 2 Cor. x. 10 only. Prov. xxvii. 3.)
g neut., = John (iii. 6.) vi. 37, 39. xvii. 2.

αὐτοῦ ᵉ τηρῶμεν. καὶ αἱ ἐντολαὶ αὐτοῦ ᶠ βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν, ⁴ ὅτι ᵍ πᾶν τὸ ʸ γεγεννημένον ʸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ νικᾷ τὸν κόσμον. καὶ ʰ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη ἡ ⁱ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν. ⁵ τίς ἐστιν ὁ ⁱ νικῶν τὸν κόσμον, ᵏ εἰ μὴ ὁ ˣ πιστεύων ˣ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; ⁶ οὗτός

ABKLP ℵabcd fghjkl mo13

h constr., ch. ii. 25. i John (esp. Rev.) only, exc. Luke xi. 22. Rom. iii. 4 (from Ps. l. 4). xii. 21 bis. past, ch. ii. 13, 14. iv. 4. see John xvi. 33. k constr., ch. ii. 22.

4. αυτης(*sic*) ℵ[1].
5. aft τις ins δε K[P]ℵ a c 13. 36 demid tol syr copt arm Cyr Thl Did-int; γαρ Syr: pref και æth Leo: aft εστιν ins δε B: txt AL vulg-ed(with am) sah. [πιστευσας P.]

diate this reference, but apparently on account of the form of expression; observing that the Apostle has said not ἐλαφραὶ εἰσίν, but βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν; but the comment of Œc. is in confusion, and not easy to understand. The Schol. in the Oxf. Catena well remarks, εἴ τις προσελθὼν αὐταῖς μὴ ὃν δεῖ τρόπον λέγει αὐτὰς βαρείας, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀσθένειαν ᾐτιάσατο· φίλον γὰρ τοῖς ἄγαν ἀποβάλλουσιν ἰσχὺν βαρέα νομίζεσθαι καὶ τὰ πάνυ ἐλαφρὰ καὶ κοῦφα. This declaration, that His commandments are not grievous, has, as did ch. iii. 9, furnished some of the R.-Cath. Commentators with an opportunity of characterizing very severely the Protestant position that none can keep God's commandments. But here as there the reply is obvious and easy. The course of the Apostle's argument here, as introduced in the next verse by ὅτι, substantiates this βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν by shewing that all who are born of God are standing in and upon the victory which their faith has obtained over the world. In this victorious state, and in as far as they have advanced into it, in other words in proportion as the divine life is developed and dominant in them, do they find those commandments not grievous. If this state, in its ideality, were realized in them, there would be no difficulty for them in God's commandments: it is because, and in so far as sin is still reigning in their mortal bodies and their wills are unsubdued to God's will, that any βάρος remains in keeping those commandments), **4.**] **because** (reason, why His commandments are not grievous: not, as Œc., ἐπιτίθησι τοῖς ἤδη εἰρημένοις καὶ ἕτερον ἐπακτικὸν πρὸς τὴν μεταχείρισιν τῆς ἀγάπης, making καὶ αἱ ἐντ. αὐ. β. οὐκ εἰσ. merely parenthetical) **all that is born of God** (the neuter is here used as gathering together in one, under the category of "born of God," the ἡμεῖς implied in the last verses. So St. John uses the comprehensive categorical neuter in reff. Œc. seems to deny this personal meaning of πᾶν, and to understand it "every thing," applying it afterwards to ἡ πίστις ἡμ. as one such thing. Aretius and Paulus take it similarly. But besides the Apostle's usage cited above, the whole analogy here is against such an interpretation. It is *we*, not our faith, of which the term ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγεννῆσθαι is used) **conquereth** (νικᾷ, of habit: simply predicated of the category πᾶν τὸ κ.τ.λ.) **the world** (the kingdom of evil under its prince the devil, God's adversary; in the main as Calv., "quicquid adversum est Dei spiritui. Ita naturæ nostræ pravitas pars mundi est, omnes concupiscentiæ, omnes Satanæ actus, quicquid denique nos a Deo abstrahit." The argument then is this: The commandments of God are not grievous: for, although in keeping them there is ever a conflict, yet that conflict issues in universal victory: the whole mass of the born of God conquer the world: therefore none of us need contemplate failure, or faint under his struggle as a hard one), **and the victory which (hath) conquered the world is this, our faith** (the identification of the victory with the faith which gained it, is a concise and emphatic way of linking the two inseparably together, so that wherever there is faith there is victory. And this is further expressed by the aorist participle, by which, as Estius (notwithstanding that the vulgate has "quæ vincit"), "significatur victoria jam parta:" cf. ch. ii. 13, iv. 4. Socinus absurdly explains the aorist as speaking of those whose Christian course is done, against the plain ἐστίν, not only here but in ver. 5). **5.**] If it be asked, How does our faith overcome the world? this verse furnishes the answer; because it brings us into union with Jesus Christ the Son of God, making us as He is, and partakers of His victory, John xvi. 33. Through this belief we are born again as sons of God; we have Him in us, One greater than he who is in the world, ch. iv. 4. And this conclusion is put in the form of a triumphant question: What other person can do it? Who that believes this,

ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν [1]δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰησοῦς χριστός· [1 = Acts xiv. 23. see note. Winer, edn. 6, § 47. i.]

6. δια ℵ. aft αιματος ins και πνευματος Aℵ a 13. 36 tol syr coptt: bef κ. αιμ. [P] æth arm: om BKL rel vulg Syr Cyr_1 Thl Œc Tert Rebapt Aug_1.—for αιμ., πνευμ. 103-4 Cyr_1 Ambr Aug_1. rec (aft ιησ.) ins ὁ, with b f 13 Thl-$comm_1$ Œc-$comm_1$: om ABLℵ rel 40 Cyr_2 Thl Œc: χρ. ιησ. K[P] 36 sah Ambr.

can fail to do it? **Who is he that conquereth the world, except he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?** By comparing ver. 1 a, we find 1) that ὁ χριστός there answers to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ here; 2) that by the combination of the two verses, we get the proposition of ver. 4 a. Episcopius gives well the meaning: "Lustrate universum mundum et ostendite mihi vel unum, de quo vere affirmari possit, quod mundum vincat, qui Christianus et fide hac præditus non est."

6—21.] The third and last division of the Epistle. This portion falls naturally into two parts: vv. 6—13, and vv. 14—21: the former of which treats of the concluding part of the argument, and the latter forms the close of the Epistle.

6—13.] As in the former portions, our communion with God who is light (ch. i. 5 ff.) was treated, and our birth in righteousness from God who is righteous (ii. 29 ff.), by faith in Jesus the Son of God,—so now we have another most important element of the Christian life set before us: the testimony to it arising from that life itself: *the witness of the spiritual life to its own reality*. This witness rests not on apostolic testimony alone, but on the Holy Spirit, which the believer has in himself (ver. 10), and which is God's testimony respecting His Son (vv. 9, 10), and our assurance that we have eternal life (ver. 13). There is hardly a passage in the N. T. which has given rise to more variety of interpretation: certainly none which (on account of the apparent importance of the words interpolated after ver. 7) has been the field of so much critical controversy. Complete accounts of both the exegesis and the criticism will be found in the recent monographs on the Epistle: more especially in that of Düsterdieck. I shall indicate the more salient points of the divergent interpretations as I proceed.

6.] **This** (viz. the person spoken of in the last verse; Jesus. This, which is maintained by most Commentators, is denied by Knapp and Huther, who refer οὗτος to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ: "This Son of God is he &c.:" making the proposition assert the identity of the Son of God with the historical Jesus, not the converse. This Huther supports on two grounds: 1) that the fact that Jesus came by water and blood needed no proof even to Heretics: 2) that on the ordinary interpretation the following words, Ἰησ. (ὁ) χριστός, become altogether superfluous. But to these it is easily replied, 1) that although the fact might be confessed, that was not confessed to which the fact bore testimony, viz. that Jesus who came in the flesh was the Son of God: 2) that the appositional clause Ἰησ. (ὁ) χριστός is by no means superfluous, being only a solemn reassertion of our Lord's Person and Office as testified by these signs. The main objection to Huther's view is, that, as well stated by Düsterd., it makes the coming by water and blood, which, by the context, is evidently in the Apostle's argument a substantiating consideration, to be merely an exceptional one: "this Son of God is Jesus (the) Christ, *though* He came by water and blood." Therefore the other interpretation must stand fast. It is well defended also by Lücke) **is he that came by water and blood** (the words **δι' ὕδατος κ. αἵματος** have been universally and rightly taken with ἐλθών. Only Hofmann, in the Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 331, maintains the joining δι' ὕδ. κ. αἵμ. to ἐστιν, understanding ἐλθών, "He that has come," in the sense of ὁ ἐρχόμενος. But this latter idea is wholly without N. T. precedent, and condemns the whole. It indeed, without Hofmann's construction, is taken by several Commentators, Corn.-a-lap., Tirinus, Calov., Bengel ("Jesus est is quem propter promissiones venire oportuit, et qui venit revera"), Knapp, &c. But if this meaning is in ἐλθών, then it cannot be the mere exponent of δι' ὕδ. κ. αἵμ., but must take an emphatic place of its own, and δι' ὕδ. κ. αἵμ. must stand awkwardly alone, "and that by water and blood," or must, as Hofmann, belong to ἐστιν.

Taking then the generally received construction, we may observe that the article before the aor. part. ἐλθών, makes οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθών to be the identification of οὗτος with ὁ ἐλθών, i. e. with one who as an historical fact, ἦλθεν, precluding such renderings as "came" for ἐστὶν ὁ ἐλθών; also forbidding the making the aor. into a present, "this is He that cometh," as Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, J. Lange, Rickli,

m = Heb. ix. 25. (see ch. iv. 2.)

οὐκ ᵐἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλ' ᵐἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ᵐἐν

ABKLP ℵ a b r d f g h j k l m o 𝔡

μονω B. for αλλ', αλλα A, αλλα και b o. rec om 3rd εν, with Kℵ rel vulg Cyr$_2$ Thl Œc Aug: ins ABL[P] j k 13. 36(sic). 40 Cyr$_2$. [transp υδατι and αιματι

Sander, al., and perhaps Œc., as has been inferred from his understanding ὕδωρ and αἷμα of present means of grace and salvation: ὁ γὰρ ἐλθὼν Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστὸς δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννᾷ καὶ αἵματος. But he may have been misunderstood: the ἐλθών in this comment, and the circumstance that he afterwards dwells on the historical facts of the Baptism and the Crucifixion, seem to shew that he understood the participle aoristically. We may clearly do so, and still regard the water and blood as present in their effects and testimony. All Commentators, except Hofmann (see above), regard ἐλθών as referring, not to the Lord's birth in the flesh, but to His open manifestation of himself before the world. See above on ch. iv. 2.

The prep. διά, which passes into ἐν in the next sentence, is thereby explained to bear its very usual sense of through or by means of, as said of that which accompanies, as the medium through which, or the element in which. We have an example of ἐν passing into διά, 2 Cor. vi. 6, 7: and the very same phrases, δι' αἵματος and ἐν αἵματι, are used of our Lord in Heb. ix. 12, 25, which chapter is the best of all comments on this difficult expression.

δι' ὕδατος κ. αἵματος has been very variously understood. Two canons of interpretation have been laid down by Düsterd., and may safely be adopted: 1) "Water" and "blood" must point both to some purely historical facts in the life of our Lord on earth, and to some still present witnesses for Christ: and 2) they must not be interpreted symbolically, but understood of something so real and powerful, as that by them God's testimony is given to believers, and eternal life assured to them. These canons at once exclude such interpretations as that of Wetst., al., "probavit se non phantasma sed verum hominem esse qui ex spiritu (sive aëre, ver. 8) sanguine et aqua seu humore constaret, Joh. xix. 34:"—as the purely symbolical interpretation, of which there are two kinds:—1) that of Socinus and his school, in which ὕδωρ stands for the purity and innocence of the life and doctrine of Christ, Heb. x. 22, Eph. v. 26,—and αἷμα of the death of Christ as His testimony of Himself. So Schlichting and Grotius: 2) that given by Clement of Alex., Adumbrationes ad h. l. 1011 P (not in Migne), in which ὕδωρ represents regeneration and faith, and αἷμα, knowledge (cognitionem): by Beza,—in which ὕδωρ is "ablutio a peccati labe, cujus nunc tessera est Baptismus,"—αἷμα, "expiatio et persolutio pro peccatis:" by Calvin, in which he explains both ὕδωρ and αἷμα by "summatim ostendit quorsum præcipue tenderent ceremoniæ veteres: nempe ut homines ab inquinamentis purgati et soluti omnibus piaculis, Deum haberent propitium et illi consecrarentur." By the latter of our two canons is excluded also the idea of mere symbolic reference to the sacraments, as e. g. Beza (see above), Luther, Calvin, al.

Düsterdieck observes that it is remarkable that the best R.-Cath. expositor, Estius (whose commentary is unfortunately broken off at this verse), does not as some have done, interpret αἷμα of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but puts together ὕδωρ and αἷμα, as Calvin and Luther: "per sanguinem vivificat tum in baptismo aquæ, tum in aliis sacramentis, tum etiam extra sacramenta." So that, as Düsterdieck proceeds, the great leaders of the three schools of theology have had the tact to see that which their less skilful followers have missed seeing,—that αἷμα cannot by any means be understood of the Lord's Supper, as has been done by Hunnius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov., Sander, al.

The next point which comes before us is, to enquire whether at all, or how far, our passage is connected with John xix. 34? It occurs here, because many Commentators, e. g., Bede, Hunnius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Wolf, Bengel, &c., have seen in the incident there related a miraculous symbolizing of the two sacraments, and in this passage an allusion to that incident. To deny all such allusion, as is done by Düsterdieck, seems against probability. The Apostle could hardly both here and in that place lay such evident stress on the water and blood together, without having in his mind some link connecting this place and that. That in the Gospel it is αἷμα and ὕδωρ,—in this place ὕδωρ and αἷμα,—a difference of which Düsterd. makes much, is surely not worth mentioning. The idea that we have here nothing more than a reference to the fact of John xix. 34, is against our 2nd canon

τῷ αἵματι· καὶ τὸ ⁿ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ⁿ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ

ⁿ John xv. 26. Heb. x. 15. see Acts v. 32.

P m[1] (5. 83 Sz) :] for αιματι, πνευματι A 21. 41 Cyr: al vary.

above: but that John xix. 34 and this refer to the same fundamental truth, is I conceive hardly to be doubted.

It rests now then that we enquire into the meaning of each expression. On **αἷμα**, there cannot surely be much uncertainty. The blood of His Cross must, by all Scripture analogy, be that intended. The pouring out of this blood was the completion of the baptism which He had to be baptized with, Mark x. 38, 39, Luke xii. 50. And if this is so, to what can ὕδωρ be referred so simply, as to that baptism with water, which inaugurated the Lord's ministry? It might indeed be said that the baptism which He instituted for His followers, better satisfies the test of our 2nd canon, that viz. of being an abiding testimony in the Christian Church. But to this there lies the objection, that as αἷμα signifies something which happened to Christ Himself, so must ὕδωρ likewise, at least primarily, whatever permanent testimony such event may have left in the Christian Church. And thus some modern Commentators have taken it: as uniting the historical fact of the Lord's baptism with the ordinance of baptism, grounded on it, and abiding in the Christian Church. So Semler, Rosenm., Baumg.-Crus., Brückner, Neander, Huther. Düsterd. refuses to accept this view, denying that our Lord's Baptism was any proof or testimony of His Messiahship, and understanding ὕδωρ of the ordinance of baptism only. But surely we are not right in interpreting ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος, *He that ordained baptism:* nor, whatever Düsterd. may say, in giving the two, αἷμα and ὕδωρ, an entirely different reference. For his endeavour to escape from this by making αἷμα not Christ's death but His blood, applied to us, cannot be accepted, as giving a "non-natural" sense to ἐλθὼν δι' αἵματος likewise.

All this being considered, it seems impossible to avoid giving both to αἷμα and ὕδωρ the combined senses above indicated, and believing that such were before the Apostle's mind. They represent,—**ὕδωρ**, the baptism of water which the Lord Himself underwent and instituted for His followers, **αἷμα**, the baptism of blood, which He Himself underwent, and instituted for His followers. And it is equally impossible to sever, as Düsterd. does, from these words, the historical accompaniments and associations which arise on their mention. The Lord's baptism, of itself, was indeed rather a result than a proof of his Messiahship: but in it, taking St. John's account only, a testimony to His divine Sonship was given, by which the Baptist knew Him to be the Son of God: ἐγὼ ἑώρακα κ. μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, are his words, John i. 34; and when that blood was poured from His "riven side," he that saw it again uses the same formula, ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκε. It cannot be that the word μαρτυρία being thus referred to two definite points of our Lord's life, should not apply to these two, connected as they are with ὕδωρ and αἷμα here mentioned, and associated by St. John himself with the remarkable preterite μεμαρτύρηκεν, of an abiding μαρτυρία in both cases. But these past facts in the Lord's life are this abiding testimony to us, by virtue of the permanent application to us of their cleansing and atoning power. And thus both our canons are satisfied, which certainly is not the case in Düsterdieck's interpretation, though they were laid down by himself), **Jesus Christ** (see above on οὗτος. As now, with the art. omitted, the words are merely the name, "Jesus Christ:" if it were inserted, the adjunct ὁ χριστός would be an appositional predicate, and would necessarily send the thought back to the ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδ. κ. αἵμ. as a proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. It may be remarked, however, that in all the places where St. John uses this Name, it has a solemn meaning, and is by the emphasis thus thrown on the official designation of our Lord, nearly = Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστός. Cf. John i. 17, xvii. 3: 1 John i. 3, ii. 1, iii. 23, iv. 2, v. 20: 2 John 3, 7): **not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood** (**ἐν**, see above on **διά**. The sense of the two is there shewn to be closely allied, **ἐν** giving rather the "element in which," **διά**, the medium through which. The art. before each dative shews not merely, as Huther, that ὕδωρ and αἷμα have been before named, but that they are well-known and solemn ideas. It is inserted not as matter of course, but as giving solemnity.

But why has the Apostle added this sentence? Schöttgen thought that it is to give Christ the preference over Moses, who came only by water (1 Cor. x. 2), and Aaron, who came only by blood (of sacrifice), whereas Christ united both. But this is too far-fetched. Baumgarten-Crusius again regards the words as directed against those who despised the Cross of Christ (1 Cor. i. 23): but a more definite expla-

o see ch. iv. 6 reff.

ᵒ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ᵒ ἀλήθεια. ⁷ ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυ-

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

for 2nd το πνευμα, χριστος 84 vulg arm-usc $Ambr_1$-ms Aug_1. (*This reading is found in but one Greek copy which at this point is remarkably conformed to the vulg current in the xvith cent. The variation sprung from the confusion in Latin MSS of the contractions* SPS *and* XPS. *See Treg in Horne vol* IV. *p.* 215.)

7. aft οτι ins οι ℵ.

nation than this is required. And those can hardly be wrong, who find it in such words as those of the Baptist in John i. 25, ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι, μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε: cf. the emphatic repetitions below, ib. ver. 31, ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βαπτίζων, and ver. 33, ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι. The baptism of Jesus was not one of water only, but one of blood,—ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ—and something more than that, which follows in the next clause): **and the Spirit is that which witnesseth, because the Spirit is the truth** (that is, as explained by the next verse, the Spirit is an additional witness, besides those already mentioned, to the Messiahship of Jesus, and in that, to the eternal life which God has given us in Him. This at once removes the meaning "that," which some have given to ὅτι. It is not to the fact that the Spirit is the truth, that the Spirit gives witness: but the fact, that He is the truth, is that which makes Him so weighty a witness; which makes the giving of witness so especially His office.

Very various however have been the meanings here given to τὸ πνεῦμα. The scholium in Matthäi understands, the spirit of our Lord (τὸ πν. τῆς ψυχῆς) which He when dying commended into His Father's hands. Augusti, who explains ὕδωρ and αἷμα of the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, sees in πνεῦμα, in connexion with John xx. 22 ff., a third Sacrament of *absolution*. Ziegler and Stroth regard it as = ὁ πνευματικός, i. e. St. John himself. Œc. and Knapp regard it as = ὁ θεός—διὰ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι ὡς θεὸς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν· θεοῦ γὰρ τοῦτο μόνου λοιπόν, τὸ ἀνιστᾷν ἑαυτόν. τῇ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος φωνῇ σημαίνεται ὁ θεός: thus making the threefold witness to the υἱοθεσία of Jesus, τὸ βάπτισμα, ὁ σταυρός, ἡ ἀνάστασις. Then again Socinus, Schlichting, Grot., Whitby, al., interpret it of the Divine power by which Christ wrought His miracles: "id est," says Grot., "per μετωνυμίαν, admiranda ejus opera, a virtute divina manifeste procedentia." But this, as well as Bede's interpretation, that the Spirit which descended on the Lord at His baptism is meant, inasmuch as it testified to His being "verus Dei filius,"—fails, in giving no *present abiding* testimony such as the context requires. Others again understand by πνεῦμα the ministry of the word: so Aretius, J. Lange, Hunnius ("Spiritus per externam prædicationem verbi testificatur de Jesu Christo, atque simul intrinsecus in cordibus fidelium hanc Christi notitiam obsignat"), Luther, Piscator, Carpzov., Rosenmüller (the Gospel), Seb.-Schmidt ("verbum evangelii et cum eo ministerium ecclesiasticum"), &c. Most of these, as well as Bengel, whose whole interpretation is confused by his attempt to force the interpolated words in ver. 7 into the context, understand πνεῦμα here and in ver. 8 differently. But nothing can be plainer than that we must not alter the meaning, where the ὅτι binds together the sentences so closely.

The above interpretations (to which we may add that of Sander, that τὸ πν. = τὸ χάρισμα, the transformation of a man which takes place by the agency of the Holy Spirit) failing to give any satisfactory account of the text, we recur to the simple and obvious meaning, *the Holy Spirit*. This is taken by Schol. I., Estius, Corn.-a-lap., Tirinus, Calvin, Calov., Lücke, Rickli, De Wette, Huther, Neander, Düsterdieck, al. And it seems fully to satisfy all the requirements of the passage. The Holy Spirit is He, who testifies of Christ (John xv. 26), who glorifies Him, and shews of the things which belong to Him (John xvi. 14). It is by the possession of Him that we know that we have Christ (ch. iii. 24). And the following clause, "because the Spirit is the Truth," exactly agrees with this. He is the absolute Truth (John xiv. 17, xv. 26), leading into all the Truth (John xvi. 13 f.). And in this consists the all-importance and the infallibility of His witness. "Testimonium ejus haudquaquam rejici potest, quoniam Spiritus est veritas, quum sit Deus, ideoque nec falli potest, nec fallere." Estius).

7.] "Johannes hic causam reddit, cur locutus fuerit non de Spiritu tantum, cujus præcipua in hoc negotio est auctoritas, verum etiam de aqua et sanguine, quia in illis etiam non exigua est testimonii fides, et ternarius numerus in testibus est perfectissimus." Grot. **For** (from what has been just cited from Grot. it will be seen that "because" would be here, as so often,

ροῦντες, ⁸ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ

7, 8. rec aft μαρτυρουντες ins εν τω ουρανω ο πατηρ ο λογος και το αγιον πνευμα και ουτοι οι τρεις εν εισι και τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τη γη, with (34. 162) 173²-marg vulg(demid tol &c, not am fuld al_{60}), supposed to be alluded to or cited by Tert Cypr Phœbad(see below), clearly cited by Vig Fulg Cassiod Ansbert Ps-Jer(prologue to Cath epp), also(as given by Vict-vit) in a confession of faith drawn up at end of the 5th cent by Eugenius(or, as some, Vig), and further by many writers after the 9th cent: OMITTED in ALL GREEK MSS previous to the beginning of the 16th century; ALL the GREEK FATHERS (even when producing texts in support of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity: as e. g. by Clem Iren Hipp Dion Ath Did Bas Naz Nys Epiph Cæs Chr Procl Andr Damasc Œc Thl Euthym); ALL THE ANCIENT VERSIONS (including the Vulgate (as it came from Jerome, see below) and (though interpolated in the modern editions) the Syriac); AND MANY LATIN FATHERS (viz Novat Hil Lucif Ambr Faustin Leo Jer Aug Hesych Bede).

(The following is a statement of the most important details:—

I. Scholz numbers 192 cursive mss in the Acts and Catholic Epistles. Of these; *six* do not contain 1 John, viz. "55. 74. 85. 90. 157. 159;" *six* are defective at this point, viz. "53 (= Scrivener's n). 103. 120. (122?) 130. 177;" *seven* are identical with mss named on our margin, viz. "13," "24" = "l," "31" = "m," "61" = "111" = "o" (see Scriv.), "91" = "h," and "102" = "K;" *two*, viz. "110" and "152," are not mss at all but printed books; *one*, viz. Cantab. Kk 6. 4 (= *2068 of Nasmith's index), is cited twice, first as "9," and then as "112" (cf. "o"); and *three* more must be dismissed from the enumeration for separate reasons ("107" is a lectionary, and does not contain the pericopa, "44" represents not a ms but an ancient collection of various readings, and "83" is probably the same ms as "173"). We have thus left 165 (including (see prolegomena) "108" and "109"), all of which, together with Hʳ, and the *eighteen* given on the margin, 184 in all [*nineteen* are now given on the margin, making 185 in all. R. H.], have been examined and found to omit the disputed passage. This statement however is not really quite as accurate and complete as at first sight it might seem to be. *Nine* of the number named above (viz. "c. f. 8. 39. 47. 49. 50. 52. 98") may possibly be hereafter identified with others as yet denoted by a separate symbol, for it is not distinctly known where they are now preserved. When we say then that all known manuscripts, with the exception of two, omit the words in question; let it be understood that we mean, to begin with, 175 [176] mss to be found at the places indicated in the list prefixed to this volume; and in addition probably not less than 70 more seen and examined by trustworthy persons. (The nine named above; the ms entered as 182 a in our list; eighteen given by Scrivener, Introd. to N. T. Crit. pp. 199, 200; and about 50 lectionaries.) We have thus, at least 175 [176], possibly as many as 250 manuscripts, of all ages, to be set against 2 of the 16th century. Codex Ravianus at Berlin and two mss at Wolfenbüttel are sometimes brought forward to support the insertion. Cod. Rav. and one of the Wolf. mss were made from the printed text: the former "from the Complutensian Polyglott, imitating its very misprints" (Treg. on P. T.); part of the plan of the latter (written in the 17th century) is to give various readings from the Latin translations of Erasmus, Beza, &c. In the other Wolf. ms, and in that at Naples cited as "173," the addition is only found on the margin and in writing not earlier than the 16th century. Even "34" and "162" cannot be admitted as trustworthy witnesses. Written at the time when the contest was going on in favour of the current Latin text as opposed to the Greek, they differ from the received text and from one another. Both read πατηρ λογος και πνευμα αγιον (an expression which it is instructive to compare, as to the omission of the articles, with Erasmus' latin-derived text of Rev. xxii. 16—21. Erasmus himself, however (edd. 1527, 1535), *here* inserted the articles in his text, though in his quotation of "Cod. Brit." they do not occur). "34" has εν τω ουρανω and εν τη γη;

too strong a causal rendering for ὅτι, and that even at the risk of identifying it with γάρ, logical accuracy requires the slighter causal conjunction) **those who bear witness are three** (τρεῖς εἰσιν is copula and predicate. The three are considered as living and speaking witnesses; hence the masculine form. By being *three*, they fulfil the requirements of the Law as to full testimony: cf. Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15: Matt. xviii. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 1), **the Spirit, and the water, and the blood** (now, the Spirit is put first: and not without reason. The Spirit is, of the three, the only living and active witness, properly speaking: besides, the water and the blood are no witnesses without Him; whereas He is independent of them, testifying both in them and out of

τρεῖς [pq] εἰς τὸ [q] ἓν εἰσιν. [9] εἰ τὴν [r] μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώ- ABKLP ℵabcd fghjk lmo13

r Matt. xix. 5. xxi. 42. Luke iii. 5. Rom ii. 26. Gen. xv. 6 q so John xi. 52. xvii. 23. r John iii. 11, 32, 33.

"162," απο του ουρανου and επι της γης. "162" omits the received ουτοι and inserts εις το bef ἕν εισι.

All the lectionaries which contain the passage omit the disputed words. (They are sometimes reckoned as about 50 in number, but are possibly much fewer.)

II. The Vulgate is cited in support of the disputed passage. It is true that it is found in the mass of the later mss of that version; but it is wanting in the two earliest (written in the 6th century), in those revised by Alcuin and in about fifty others; whilst those that contain it differ both as to the words themselves and as to their position. Some have it as it stands in the authorized editions: others (as demid tol) insert it after verse 8. Some have it in the ordinary form; others (and these after verse 8) *Sicut et in cœlo tres sunt, pater, verbum, et spiritus; et tres unum sunt.* (For minor variations, see Tischendorf.)

III. The testimony of the Latin fathers, taken as a whole, has been relied upon by the advocates of the received text.

It is as follows:—

"*Cæterum de meo sumet,*" *inquit,* "*sicut ipse de Patris.*" *Ita connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes alterum ex altero: qui tres unum sunt, non unus; quomodo dictum est:* "*Ego et Pater unum sumus,*" *ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.* (Tertull. adv. Praxean c. 25, vol. ii. p. 188.) *Si baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remissam peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est; . . . quæro cujus Dei? Si Creatoris; non potuit quia in eum non credidit: si Christi; non hujus fieri potuit templum, qui negat Deum Christum: si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Filii aut Patris inimicus est?* (Cypr. ad Jubaianum 12, Migne Patr. ii. p. 1117.) *Dicit Dominus* "*Ego et Pater unum sumus;*" *et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est,* "*Et hi tres unum sunt.*" (Cypr. de unitate ecclesiæ, § 6, p. 503 f.) *Si ea quæ his significata sunt velimus inquirere non absurde occurrit ipsa Trinitas qui unus . . . est deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, de quibus verissime dici potuit* "*Tres sunt testes et tres unum sunt:*" *ut nomine spiritus significatum accipiamus Deum Patrem . . .; nomine autem sanguinis, Filium . . .; et nomine aquæ, Spiritum Sanctum.* (Augustin. contra Maximin. Arianum, lib. ii. c. 22. 5, vol. viii. p. 795.) *Sic alius a Filio Spiritus, sicut a Patre Filius. Sic tertia in Spiritu ut in Filio secunda persona: unus tamen Deus omnia, tres unum sunt.* (Phœbadius, contra Arianos 22, Migne, vol. xx. p. 30.) *Plures tamen hic ipsam interpretatione mystica intelligunt Trinitatem.* (Eucherius de Quæst. N. T. (Instruct. i. 2, Migne Patr. vol. l. p. 810 f.)) *Johannes Evangelista . . . ad Parthos* "*Tres sunt*" *inquit* "*qui testimonium perhibent in terra, aqua, sanguis et caro, et tres in nobis sunt; et tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in cœlo Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus, et ii tres unum sunt.*" (Vigilius of Thapsus against Varimadus, i. 5, p. 367. For this and further quotations, see Davidson's Bibl. Criticism and Tischendorf h. l.)

The words cited from St. Augustine form the commencement of an elaborate justification of the mystical meaning assigned by him to "the spirit," "the water," and "the blood." Throughout the whole, there is no allusion to the disputed words; though

them), and the three concur in one (contribute to one and the same result: viz. the truth that Jesus is the Christ and that we have life in Him. Corn.-a-lap.'s mistake, "in unum, ad unum, scil. Christum," cannot have come (as Düsterd.) from a misunderstanding of the vulgate, seeing that it has "hi tres unum sunt:" but is merely an exegesis, and in the main a right one. But the words simply signify in themselves, "are in accord." And this their one testimony is given by the purification in the water of baptism into His name, John iii. 5: by the continual cleansing from all sin which we enjoy in and by His atoning blood: by the inward witness of His Spirit, which He hath given us).

The question of the genuineness of the words read in the rec. at the end of ver. 7, has been discussed, as far as external grounds are concerned, in the digest; and it has been seen, that unless pure caprice is to be followed in the criticism of the sacred text, *there is not the shadow of a reason for supposing them genuine.* Even the supposed citations of them in early Latin Fathers have now, on closer examination, disappeared (see Digest)

πων ʳ λαμβάνομεν, ἡ ˢ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ ˢ μείζων ἐστίν, ὅτι ˢ John v 36.

a simple quotation of that one sentence would have had greater controversial value than the most perfect proof of the symbolical meaning of the other clause. So far is he from knowing the words, that he brings forward John viii. 18 and xv. 26 to shew that it is not improper to speak of the Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity as "witnesses." If he had had any thing plainer to urge, he would not have contented himself with "NON ABSURDE *occurrit ipsa Trinitas.*" The authority of so great a father would soon lead to the noting down of the substance of his interpretation, on the margin of the books belonging to the orthodox. From the margin to the text is but one step. At the end of the 5th century, Vigilius, perhaps (see Davidson), quotes the interpretation as part of the text. There is no real citation before this date. The passages brought forward from Tertullian and Cyprian contain only the words "*Et hi tres unum sunt,*" or the like: this being the Latin form of the corresponding clause in either verse, there is nothing in the words themselves to shew from which they came. In the two first passages it would be hard to prove that there is any thing more than a simple statement of the Catholic doctrine. In the third, Cyprian, treating of the unity of the Church, urges that very analogy between earthly and heavenly things, the acknowledgment of which seems to have led first to the use of "*hi tres unum sunt*" as a convenient formula in speaking of the Holy Trinity; next, to Augustine's mystical interpretation; and then, to the received gloss. With the teaching of his "master" Tertullian in his mind, Cyprian would not hesitate to speak as he does of the unchallenged verse; had his copies contained the words we reject, we might naturally expect that he would quote the whole passage as fitting in precisely with the course of his argument.

IV. The Greek words were first inserted in the Complutensian edition of 1514. When Erasmus enquired whether the editors really had mss so different from any he had seen, the answer given by one of them was, "Sciendum est Græcorum codices esse corruptos; nostros vero (i. e. Latinos) ipsam veritatem continere." Erasmus unfortunately pledged himself to insert the words if they existed in any one Greek ms. A Codex Britannicus was at length found which contained them. Erasmus, in his 3rd edition (1522), fulfilled his promise. In his annotations, however (ed. 1535, p. 770), after giving the words precisely as they stand in Cod. Montf., he writes thus, "Ex hoc igitur Codice Britannico reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse: ne cui sit ansa calumniandi. Tametsi suspicor codicem illum ad nostros esse correctum." A. W. G.)

8. om οι τρεις εις το εν εισιν 34. 162. (so also the vulgate in the Complutensian edition.)

9. for των ανθρωπων, του θεου ℵ¹. om 1st οτι K arm.

Something remains to be said on internal grounds, on which we have full right to enter, now that the other is secured. And on these grounds it must appear, on any fair and unprejudiced consideration, that the words are 1) alien from the context: 2) in themselves incoherent, and betraying another hand than the Apostle's. For 1) the context, as above explained, is employed in setting forth the reality of the substance of the faith which overcomes the world, even of our eternal life in Jesus the Son of God. And this is shewn by a threefold testimony, subsisting in the revelation of the Lord Himself, and subsisting in us His people. And this testimony is the water of baptism, the blood of atonement, the Spirit of truth, concurrent in their witness to the one fact that He is the Son of God, and that we have eternal life in Him. Now *between two steps* of this argument,—not as a mere analogy referred to at its conclusion,—insert the words "For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one," and who can fail to see, unless prejudice have blinded his eyes, that the context is disturbed by the introduction of an irrelevant matter? Consequently, Bengel, one of the most strenuous upholders of the words, is obliged tamely to take refuge in the transposition of vv. 7 and 8 (which was perhaps the original form of its insertion in the vulgate; see Digest I. II. and the quotation by Vigilius), so as to bring into treatment the matter in hand, before the illustration of it is introduced. But even suppose this could be done; what kind of illustration is it? What is it to which our attention is directed? Apparently the mere fact of the triplicity of testimony: for there is not the remotest analogy between the terms in the one case and those in the other; the very order of them, differing as it does in the two cases, shews this. Is this triplicity a fact worthy of such a comparison? And then, what is the testimony in heaven? Is it borne to men? Certainly not: for God hath no man seen,

t (double ὅτι), ch. iii. 20.
u John i. 7, 8, 15. ii. 25 and passim. John only.

αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ, [t] ὅτι [u] μεμαρτύρηκεν [u] περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [10] ὁ [v] πιστεύων [v] εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

v John ii. 11, and usually. this ep., these three times only.

rec (for 2nd οτι) ἥν, with KL[P] rel arm Thl Œc: txt ABℵ 13 vulg coptt Cyr, Aug Bede.

as He is there: His only-begotten Son hath declared Him to us on earth, where all testimony affecting us must be borne. Is it a testimony to angels? Possibly: but quid ad rem? And then, again, what but an unworthy play on words can it be called, to adduce the ἕν εἰσιν on the one side, the essential unity of the ever blessed Godhead, and on the other the εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν, the concurrence in testifying to one fact,—as correspondent to one another? Does not this betray itself as the fancy of a patristic gloss, in the days when such analogies and comparisons were the sport of every theological writer? And 2) the very words betray themselves. ὁ πατήρ and ὁ λόγος are never combined by St. John, but always ὁ πατήρ and ὁ υἱός. The very apology of Bengel, "*Verbi* appellatio egregie convenit cum testimonio," may serve to shew how utterly weak he must have felt the cause to be.

The best conclusion to the whole subject is found in the remark of Bengel himself on another occasion (cited by Lücke here), of the practice reprobated, of which he himself furnishes here so striking an instance: "male strenuos ii se præbent in bellis Domini, qui ita animum inducunt, 'Dogmati elenchoque meo opportunus est hic textus: ergo me ipse cogam ad eum protinus pro vero habendum: eumque ipsum, et omnia quæ pro eo corradi possunt, obnixe defendam.' Atqui veritas non eget fulcris falsis, sed se sola multo melius nititur." A sketch of the principal particulars of the dispute and of the books relating to it is given in Horne's Introduction, vol. iv. pp. 355—388.

9.] An argument *a minori ad majus*, grounded on the practice of mankind, by which it is shewn that God's testimony must be by *all* means believed by us. **If we** (mankind in general: all reasonable men) **receive** (as we *do*: εἰ with an indic.: cf. John vii. 23, x. 35, xiii. 14. On the expression μαρτ. λαμβάνειν, see reff. It is, to receive with approval, to *accept*) **the testimony of men** (τῶν ἀνθρ., generic; τὴν μαρτ. in any given case. No special testimony need be thought of, as touching this present case: the proposition is general), **the testimony of God is greater** (supply in the argument, "and therefore much more ought we to receive that." The testimony of God here spoken of is not any particular testimony, as the prophecies concerning Christ (Bede), or the testimony of the Baptist and other eye-witnesses to Him (Wetstein, Storr), or the Prophets, the Baptist, Martyrs, and Apostles (Bengel, Episcopius, al.): it is general, as is the testimony of men with which it is compared. The particular testimony pointed at by the general proposition is introduced in the following words): **for** (see above at the beginning of ver. 7. Here, there is an ellipsis: "and this maxim applies in the case before us, because"), **the testimony of God is this, that He hath borne testimony concerning His Son** (i. e. the testimony of God to which the argument applies is this, the fact that He hath borne testimony to His Son: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, ὅτι . . . , as in ver. 11. The correction to the easier ἥν, as in ver. 10, gives a wrong reference for αὕτη, making it refer back to that mentioned in vv. 6—8, and throws back also a wrong shade of meaning over ver. 9, making "the testimony of God" there particular instead of general. The absolute sense of μεμαρτύρηκεν is found in the Gospel, i. 32, xiii 21, xix. 35: see also vv. 6, 7 above).

10—12.] The perfect μεμαρτύρηκεν, ver. 9, shewed that the testimony spoken of is not merely an historical one, such for instance as Matt. iii. 17, which God ἐμαρτύρησεν, but one abiding and present. And these verses explain to us what that testimony is. **He that believeth in the Son of God hath the testimony** (just spoken of; τοῦ θεοῦ, as the gloss adds: see var. readd.) **in him** (i. e. in himself. The two readings do not differ in sense. The object of the divine testimony being, to produce faith in Christ, the Apostle takes him in whom it has wrought this its effect, one who habitually believes in the Son of God, and says of such an one that he possesses the testimony in himself. What it is, he does not plainly say till below, ver. 11. But easily enough here we can synthetically put together and conjecture of what testimony it is that he is speaking: the Spirit by whom we are born again to eternal Life, the water of baptism by which the new birth is brought to pass in us by the power of the Holy Ghost (John iii. 5, Tit. iii. 5), the Blood of Jesus by which we have reconciliation with God, and purification from our sins (ch. i. 7, ii. 2), and

θεοῦ [w] ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν [w] ἐν αὐτῷ· ὁ μὴ [x] πιστεύων [x] τῷ θεῷ [y] ψεύστην [y] πεποίηκεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ [v] πεπίστευκεν [v] εἰς τὴν [z] μαρτυρίαν ἣν [us] μεμαρτύρηκεν ὁ θεὸς [u] περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. [11] καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, ὅτι [a] ζωὴν αἰώνιον [a] ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεός, καὶ αὕτη ἡ [b] ζωὴ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. [12] ὁ [c] ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν [d] ἔχει τὴν [d] ζωήν· ὁ μὴ

w see John v. 36.
x of the Father, John v. 24. Gal. iii. 6 (from Gen. xv. 6) al.
y ch. i. 10 (reff.)
z John v. 32. Rev. i. 2 only
a John x. 28. xvii. 2.
b John i. 4. v. 26.
c = ch. ii. 23 bis. 2 John 9. Rev. ii. 25. iii. 11.
d John v. 26 bis, 40. vi. 53. x. 10. xx. 31.

10. aft *μαρτυριαν* ins *του θεου* A b² d 13(appy) vulg copt æth Bede: om BKL[P]ℵ rel syrr sah arm Cyr₂ Thl Œc Aug. rec *εαυτω*, with ℵ rel spec Cyr₂ Œc: txt ABKL[P] d f g j k l 36 Thl. for *θεω*, *υιω* A b² c d k vulg syr-mg; *υιω του θεου* 56 sah arm; *υιω αυτου* æth; *Jesu Christo* spec: om am: txt BKL[P]ℵ rel syrr copt Cyr₂ Thl Œc Aug Vig. (13 def.) *ουκ επιστευκεν* and *εμαρτυρηκεν*(sic) ℵ: *ουκ επιστευσεν* A d 3. (13.) 43. 65.

11. *ο θεος* bef *ημιν* B h m 38 vulg syr sah. *εστιν* bef *η ζωη* A.

eternal life (John vi. 53 ff.),—these three all contribute to and make up our faith in Christ, and so compose that testimony, which the Apostle designates in ver. 11 by the shorter term which comprehends them all. This is rightly maintained by Düsterd. as the exegesis: identifying the *μαρτυρία* here with that in ver. 11, as against numerous expositors who make the one differ from the other. It is plain that all evasive senses of *ἔχει ἐν αὐτῷ*, such as "recipit in se" of Socinus, Grot., Rosenmüller, are inadmissible): **he that believeth not God** (St. John, as so frequently, proceeds to put his proposition in the strongest light by bringing out the opposite to it. The reading *τῷ θεῷ* is internally as well as externally substantiated. The participle with the dative is wholly different from the same above with *εἰς τὸν υἱόν*. That is the resting trust of faith: this the mere first step of giving credit to a witness. Huther well fills in *τῷ θεῷ* by *τῷ μεμαρτυρηκότι*. And thus it is tacitly assumed that one who does not believe in the Son of God, gives no credit to God Himself) **hath made Him a liar** (perf. because the state of discredit implies a definite rejection still continuing. On the expression, see ch. i. 10), **because he hath not believed in** (here, not only, hath not credited, though that was the more shameful rejection of God's word: but now the *full* rejection—the refusal to *believe in*, cast himself on God's testimony) **the testimony which God hath testified concerning His Son.** 11.] Wherein this testimony consists. **And the testimony** (just spoken of) **is this, that** (consists in this, namely, that . . .) **God gave** (not, "hath given." This is of especial importance here, where not the endurance of a state, but the fact of the gift having been once made, is brought out. The present assurance of our possessing this gift follows in the next clause, and in ver. 12) **to us** (not "*decrevit*," "*promisit*," as Socinus, Schlichting, Episcopius, &c.,—nor as Bede, "dedit . . . sed adhuc in terra peregrinantibus in spe, quam daturus est in cœlis ad se pervenientibus in re") **eternal life, and** (*ὅτι* is not to be supplied, nor does this clause depend on *αὕτη ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.*, but it is appositional and co-ordinate with it) **this life is in His Son** (is, as Düsterd. quotes from Joachim Lange, in Him, *οὐσιωδῶς* (John i. 4, xi. 25, xiv. 6), *σωματικῶς* (Col. ii. 9), *ἐνεργητικῶς* (2 Tim. i. 10). Here again, as ever in this Epistle, we have to guard against the evasive and rationalistic interpretations of Socinus, Grotius, Schlichting, al., such as "vitæ æternæ a Deo consequendæ rationem totam inveniri in ipso Jesu" of Socinus: "*in* pro *per*," and "*est* pro *contingit*," of Grot.: "illa vita æterna ipsa est quam Jesus revelavit," of the same). 12.] *Conclusion of the whole argument* from ver. 6: dependent on the last clause of ver. 11, and carrying it on a step farther, even to the absolute identity as matter of possession for the believer, of the Son of God, and eternal life. **He that hath the Son, hath the life: he that hath not the Son of God, the life hath he not.** First notice the diction and arrangement, on which Bengel has well remarked, "Habet versus duo cola: in priore non additur *Dei*, nam fideles norunt Filium: in altero additur, ut demum sciantinfid eles, quanti sit non habere. Priore hemistichio cum emphasi pronunciandum est *habet:* in altero, *vitam*." This latter furnishes a simple and beautiful example of the laws of emphasis in arrangement: *ἔχει τὴν ζωήν—τὴν ζωὴν οὐκ ἔχει*. Next, the *ἔχειν τὸν υἱόν* must not be explained away with Grotius by "verba illa retinere quæ Pater Filio mandavit," nor *ἔχειν τὴν ζωήν*, with the same, by "jus certum habere ad

c ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν d ζωὴν οὐκ d ἔχει. 13 ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι d ζωὴν d ἔχετε αἰώνιον, τοῖς ve πιστεύουσιν ve εἰς τὸ e ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. 14 Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ f παῤῥησία ἣν f ἔχομεν f πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐάν τι g αἰτώμεθα h κατὰ τὸ h θέλημα αὐτοῦ, i ἀκούει ἡμῶν.

ABKLP ℵa b cd f g h j k l m o 13

c John i. 12. ii. 23. iii. 18 only. see ch. iii. 23. f ch. iii. 21 (reff.). g ch. iii. 22. John xiv. 13. xv. 7 al. Ps. xxvi. 4. h Gal. i. 4. 1 Pet. iv. 19. see Rom. viii. 27. Eph. i. 5, 11. i = John ix. 31. xi. 41.

13. rec aft υμιν ins τοις πιστευουσιν εις το ονομα του υιου του θεου, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: om ABℵ 13(prob) vulg syrr coptt æth arm Cassiod Bede. αιωνιον bef εχετε KL[P]ℵ rel Thl Œc: txt AB c m 36 vulg Cassiod Bede. rec (for τοις πιστευουσιν) και ινα πιστευητε, with KL[P] rel arm Thl Œc: οι πιστευοντες Aℵ[3] 13 Cassiod Bede: txt Bℵ[1]. (vss uncertain.)

14. εχωμεν A. for οτι εαν τι, ο τι αν A: οτι ο εαν 13 vulg Syr æth: οτι εαν m.

vitam æternam." The *having the Son* is the possession of Christ by faith testified by the Spirit, the water, and the blood: and the *having the life* is the actually possessing it, not indeed in its most glorious development, but in all its reality and vitality. Thirdly, it must be remarked that the question as to whether eternal salvation is altogether confined to those who in the fullest sense have the Son (to the exclusion, e. g., of those who have never heard of Him), does not belong here, but must be entertained on other grounds. See note on 1 Pet. iii. 19. Düsterd. has remarked that the use of ὁ μὴ ἔχων, not ὁ οὐκ ἔχων (cf. οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι 1 Pet. ii. 10), shews that the Apostle is contemplating, at all events primarily, rather a possible contingency than an actual fact: and thus is, primarily again, confining his saying to those to whom the divine testimony has come. To them, according as they receive or do not receive it, according as they are οἱ ἔχοντες or οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, it is a savour of life unto life, or of death unto death. 13.] This verse seems, as John xx. 30 f., like an anticipatory close of the Epistle: and its terms appear to correspond to those used in ch. i. 4. This view, which is maintained by Düsterd., is far more probable than that it should refer only to what has occurred since ver. 6, as ch. ii. 26 to ver. 18 ff. there (so De Wette): or only to vv. 11, 12, as Huther. Still less likely is it that the concluding portion of the Epistle *begins* with this verse, as Bengel, Baumg.-Crus., Lücke, Sander, and Tischendorf in his editions. **These things wrote I to you that ye may know that ye have eternal life, (to you) that believe in the name of the Son of God** (as to the reading, I believe the text, which is found in Bℵ[1] only, to be the "fons lectionum." The unusual position of the dative seeming hard, it was altered to the nominative as in A al., or transposed with its accompanying words, to follow ὑμῖν. Then the final clause, not having been struck out, was adapted to the preceding ἵνα εἰδῆτε, or to John xx. 31, from whence came the reading (see Tischdf.) πιστεύσητε. The two readings come, in the sense, to much the same. If the rec. be followed, then the πιστεύητε must be interpreted "continue to believe"). 14—21.] CLOSE OF THE EPISTLE. The link which binds this passage to ver. 13 is the παῤῥησία, taken up again from the εἰδῆτε ὅτι of that verse. This παῤῥησία is the very energizing of our spiritual life: and its most notable and ordinary exercise is in communion with God in prayer, for ourselves or for our brethren, vv. 14—17. Then vv. 18—20 continue the explanation of the "sin unto death," and the "sin not unto death," by setting forth the state of believers as contrasted with that of the world, and the truth of our eternal life as consisting in this. Then with a pregnant caution, ver. 21, the Apostle closes his Epistle.

14, 15.] *The believer's confidence as shewn in prayer.* **And the confidence which we have towards Him** (which follows as a matter of immediate inference from the fact of our spiritual life: see ch. iii. 19—21) **is this, that if we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us** (this confidence may be shewn in various ways, including prayer as one, ch. iii. 22. And that one, of prayer, is alone chosen to be insisted on here. As regards the construction, there is no ellipsis between ἡ παρ. and ὅτι; "our confidence is this, (the confidence) that . . . ," as some, e. g. Lücke, have thought. ἡ παῤῥησία is itself subjective, the feeling of confidence. **αὐτόν** and **τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ** must by all analogy be referred to the Father, not to the Son, by whom we have access to the Father. See especially ch. iii. 21, 22. The truth that God hears (ἀκούει, as in reff.) all our prayers, has been explained on ch. iii. 22. The condition here

15 καὶ [k] ἐὰν οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν ὃ ἂν [g] αἰτώμεθα, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ [lm] αἰτήματα ἃ [gmn] ᾐτήκαμεν [n] παρ' αὐτοῦ. 16 ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ [o] ἁμαρτάνοντα [o] ἁμαρτίαν μὴ [p] πρὸς θάνατον, [g] αἰτήσει, καὶ [qr] δώσει αὐτῷ [r] ζωήν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ [p] πρὸς θάνατον. ἔστιν

k w. ind., 1 Thess. iii. 8. so ἐὰν σὺ ἦσθα, Job xxii. 3. see Winer, edn. 6, § 41. 2.
l Luke xxiii. 24. Phil. iv. 6 only.
m 1 Kings i. 17. 3 Kings iii. 5. Dan. vi. 7 Theod.
n John iv. 9. Acts iii. 2. ix. 2. James i. 5. Exod. iii. 22.
o here only. Exod. xxxii. 30.
p = John xi. 4. Luke xiv. 32. xix. 42. 2 Pet. i. 3.
q see James v. 15, 20.
r = ver. 11.

15. for εαν, αν B: om vulg Did-int. Aℵ[1] 19. 96 pass (*by homœotel*) from ημων at end of last ver to ο αν αιτ. in this: for οιδαμεν, ιδωμεν ℵ[3] copt. for αν, εαν L[P]ℵ a c d f g h k l 3. 36. 43. 66 Thl. (not B.) for εχομεν, εαν εχωμεν ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving εαν). for παρ', απ Bℵ 13.

16. for ιδη, ειδῃ 13 vulg lat-ff. αιτησεις and δωσεις ℵ[1](but corrd). ins μη bef αμαρτανουσιν and αμαρτιαν bef μη πρ. θαν. A.

attached, that the request be **κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ**, is in fact no limitation within the reality of the Christian life, i.e. in St. John's way of speaking according to the true ideal. For God's will is that to which our glorious Head himself submitted himself, and which rules the whole course of the Christian life for our good and His glory: and he who in prayer or otherwise tends against God's will is thereby, and in so far, transgressing the bounds of his life in God: see James iv. 3. By the continual feeling of submission to His will, joined with continual increase in knowledge of that will, our prayers will be both chastened, and directed aright. If we knew His will thoroughly, and submitted to it heartily, it would be impossible for us to ask any thing, for the spirit or for the body, which He should not hear and perform. And it is this ideal state, as always, which the Apostle has in view. In this view he goes still farther in the next verse).

15.] **And if we know that He heareth us whatsoever we ask** (= our every petition: the condition, *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ*, is omitted this time as being supposed to be fulfilled), **we know that we have the petitions** (*τὰ αἰτήματα*, 'res petitas,' as Huther from Lorinus) **which we have asked from Him** (notice the pres. ἔχομεν with the perf. ᾐτήκαμεν. The perf. reaches through all our past prayers to this moment. All these we ἔχομεν: not one of them is lost: He has heard, He has answered them all: we know that we have them in the truest sense, in possession. If the perf. were pres., αἰτούμεθα, the assertion ἔχομεν would be merely of habit, on each occasion: as it is, it is of the present possession of all past requests. The παρ' αὐτοῦ belongs, by the arrangement of the words, to ᾐτήκαμεν, not to ἔχομεν, as Huther).

16, 17.] Join together the confidence concerning prayer just expressed, and the all-essential Christian principle of brotherly love, and we have following, as matter of course, the duty, and the practice, of intercession for an erring brother. And of this, with a certain not strictly defined limitation, these verses treat. **If any man see** (on any occasion, aor. "*shall have seen*") **his brother** (as throughout the Epistle, to be taken in the stricter sense: not "*proximus quicunque*," as Calov., but his Christian brother, one born of God as he is himself) **sinning** (Düsterd. remarks, that the present part. is not merely predicative, as would be the infin. ἁμαρτάνειν, but more graphic, as describing the 'brother' actually in the act and under the bondage of the sin in question) **a sin not unto death** (see below), **he shall ask** (the future conveys not merely a permission, "licebit," but a command, taking for granted the thing enjoined as that which is to happen), **and shall give him life** (viz. the *asker* shall give: not, as Beza, Piscator, Socinus, Grot., Benson, Bengel, Lücke, Sander, al., *God* shall give, though of course this is so in reality: but the words mean, he, interceding for his brother, shall be the means of bestowing life on him: "rogans vivificabit," as the æthiopic version. The vulg. evades it by "*dabitur ei vita*." This bestowal of life by intercessory prayer, is not to be minutely enquired into, whether it is to be accompanied with "correptio fraterna,"—whether it consists in the giving to the sinner a repentant heart (Grot., al.), but taken as put by the Apostle, in all its simplicity and breadth. *Life*, viz., the restoration of that divine life from which by any act of sin he was in peril and indeed in process of falling, but his sin was not an actual fall) **for them that sin not unto death** (the clause takes up and emphatically repeats the hypothesis before made,

s so John xvi. 26. xvii 9 bis. Luke iv. 38. Isa. xlv. 11.
t John, vii. 18. ch. i. 9 only. Luke xiii. 27 al. Job xxxvi. 10.

ἁμαρτία [p] πρὸς θάνατον· οὐ [s] περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα [s] ἐρωτήσῃ· 17 πᾶσα [t] ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν, καὶ ἔστιν

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

ins τις bef ερωτηση d 36. 48 Orig Tert$_2$; aft ερ. add τις vulg(not fuld lux tol) Syr Clem: ερωτησης ℵ[3].

viz., that the sin of the brother is not unto death. It does so in the plural, because the αὐτῷ before being indefinite, all such cases are now categorically collected: q. d. "shall give this life, I repeat, to those who sin not unto death"). **There is a sin unto death: concerning it I do not say that he should make request** (leaving for the present the great question, I will touch the minor points in this verse. First, it necessarily by the conditions of the context involves what is equivalent to a prohibition. This has been denied by many Commentators, "Ora si velis, sed sub dubio impetrandi," says Corn.-a-lap. And it is equally denied, without the same implied meaning being given, by Socin., Schlichting, Grot., Carpzov., Neander, Lücke, De Wette, Huther: some of these, as Neander, thinking it implied, that prayer may be made, though the obtaining of it will be difficult,—others, as De Wette, that it will be in vain, others as Huther, that St. John simply says such a case was not within his view in making the above command. And most of even those who have recognized the prohibition, strive to soften it, saying, as e. g. Lyra, that though "non est orandum pro damnatis," yet we may pray for such a sinner, "ut minus peccaret et per consequens minus damnaretur in inferno:" or as Bengel, "Deus non vult ut pii frustra orent, Deut. iii. 26. Si ergo qui peccatum ad mortem commisit ad vitam reducitur, id ex mero provenit reservato divino." Calvin indeed holds fast the prohibition in all its strictness, but only in extreme cases: adding, "Sed quia rarissime hoc accidit, et Deus, immensas gratiæ suæ divitias commendans, nos suo exemplo misericordes esse jubet: non temere in quemquam ferendum est mortis æternæ judicium, potius nos caritas ad bene sperandum flectat. Quod si desperata quorundam impietas non secus nobis apparet, ac si Dominus eam digito monstraret, non est quod certemus cum justo Dei judicio, vel clementiores eo esse appetamus."
Certainly this seems, reserving the question as to the nature of the sin, the right view of the οὐ λέγω. By an express command in the other case, and then as express an exclusion of this case from that command, nothing short of an implied prohibition can be conveyed.

The second point here relates to the difference between αἰτεῖν and ἐρωτᾷν. The first is *petere*, the second *rogare:* as in Cicero, Planc. x. 25, "Neque enim ego sic rogabam ut petere viderer, quia familiaris esset meus." Cf. Trench, N. T. Synonyms, pp. 140—143, edn. 1865. αἰτεῖν is more of the petition of the inferior: "in victum quasi et reum convenit," as Bengel: ἐρωτᾷν is more general, of the request of the equal, or of one who has a right. Our Lord never uses αἰτεῖν or αἰτεῖσθαι of His own requests to God, but always ἐρωτᾷν, John xiv. 16, xvi. 26, xvii. 9, 15, 20. It is true, Martha says, ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεόν, δώσει σοι ὁ θεός, John xi. 22, but it was in ignorance, though in simplicity of faith, see Bengel in loc.: Trench, p. 142: and my note, Vol. I. And this difference is of importance here. The αἰτεῖν for a sin not unto death is a humble and trusting petition in the direction of God's will, and prompted by brotherly love: the other, the ἐρωτᾷν for a sin unto death, would be, it is implied, an act savouring of presumption—a prescribing to God, in a matter which lies out of the bounds of our brotherly yearning (for notice, the hypothesis that a man sees a brother sin a sin unto death is not adduced in words, because such a sinner would not truly be a brother, but thereby demonstrated never to have deserved that name: see ch. ii. 19), how He shall inflict and withhold His righteous judgments.

And these latter considerations bring us close to the question as to the nature of the sin unto death. It would be impossible to enumerate or even classify the opinions which have been given on the subject. Düsterdieck has devoted many pages to such a classification and discussion. I can do no more than point out the canons of interpretation, and some of the principal divergences. But before doing so, ver. 17 must come under consideration). **17.] All unrighteousness is sin** (in the words πᾶσα ἀδικία we have a reminiscence of ch. i. 9, ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας, and also, but not so directly, of ch. iii. 4, which is virtually the converse proposition to this. Here the Apostle seems to say, in explanation of what he has just written,

ἁμαρτία οὐ [p] πρὸς θάνατον. [18] οἴδαμεν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ [u] γε- u ch. iv. 7 reff.

17. om ου 13. 67[1] vulg syr sah æth-rom arm Tert(teste Wtst). (Simly d in ver 16 has την for 1st μη.)

"Sin is a large word, comprehending all unrighteousness whatever: whether of God's children, or of aliens from Him." The thoughts which have been brought into these words,—that ἀδικία is a mild word, meant to express that every slight trip of the good Christian falls under the category of sin, and so there may be a sin not unto death,—or, on the other hand, that it is a strong word, as Grot., "ἀδικίαν vocat non quamvis ignorantiam aut obreptionem subitam, sed quicquid peccatur aut cum deliberatione aut dato ad deliberationem spatio,"—or thirdly, as Beza, that "peccata omnia hactenus paria sunt, ut vel minima minimi peccati cogitatio mortem æternam millies mereatur . . ." and "omnia per se lethalia esse peccata," —are equally far from the meaning of the words, whose import is, as above, to account for there being a sin not unto death as well as a sin unto death); **and there is a sin not** (in this case not μή, because no hypothetical case is put, nor one dependent on judgment, but an objective fact) **unto death** (not having death for its issue: within the limit of that ἀδικία, from all of which God cleanseth all those who confess their sins, ch. i. 9).

Our *first* canon of interpretation of the ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον and οὐ πρὸς θάνατον is this: that *the θάνατος and the ζωή of the passage must correspond.* The former cannot be bodily death, while the latter is eternal and spiritual life. This clears away at once all those Commentators who understand the sin unto death to be one for which bodily death is the punishment, either by human law generally, as Morus and G. Lange, or by the Mosaic law, as Schöttgen,—or by sickness inflicted by God, as our Whitby and Benson; or of which there will be no end till the death of the sinner, which Bede thinks possible ("Potest etiam peccatum ad mortem, p. usque ad mortem, accipi." But he rejects this himself), and Lyra adopts. This last is evidently absurd, for how is a man to know whether this will be so or not?

Our *second* canon will be, that this sin unto death being thus a sin leading to eternal death, being no further explained to the readers here, must be presumed as *meant to be understood by what the Evangelist has elsewhere laid down* concerning the possession of life and death. Now we have from him a definition immediately preceding this, in ver. 12, ὁ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει τὴν ζωήν· ὁ μὴ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ζωὴν οὐκ ἔχει. And we may safely say that the words πρὸς θάνατον here are to be understood as meaning, "involving the loss of *this life* which men have only by union with the Son of God." And this meaning they must have, not by implication only, which would be the case if any obstinate and determined sin were meant, which would be a *sign* of the fact of severance from the life which is in Christ (see ch. iii. 14, 15, where the inference is of this kind), but directly and essentially, i. e. in respect of that very sin which is pointed at by them. Now against this canon are all those interpretations, far too numerous to mention, which make *any* atrocious and obstinate sin to be that intended. It is obvious that our limits are thus confined to *abnegation of Christ,* not as inferred by its fruits otherwise shewn, but as the act of sin itself. And so, with various shades of difference as to the putting forth in detail, most of the best Commentators, both ancient and modern: e. g. Aretius, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Corn.-a-lap., Tirinus, Baumg.-Crus., Lücke, Huther, Düsterd.

Our *third* canon will help us to decide, within the above limits, what especial sin is intended. And it is, that by the very analogy of the context, it must be *not a state of sin, but an appreciable* ACT *of sin,* seeing that that which is opposed to it *is the same kind,* as being not unto death, is described by ἐάν τις ἴδῃ ἁμαρτάνοντα. So that all interpretations which make it to be a *state* of apostasy,—all such as, e. g. Bengel's "peccatum ad mortem est peccatum non obvium, neque subitum, sed talis status animæ in quo fides et amor et spes, in summa, vita nova, exstincta est,"—do not reach the matter of detail which is before the Apostle's mind.

In enquiring what this is, we must be guided by the analogy of what St. John says elsewhere. *Our* state being that of life in Jesus Christ, there are those who have gone out from us, not being of us, ch. ii. 19, who are called ἀντίχριστοι, who not only "have not" Christ, but are Christ's enemies, denying the Father and the Son (ii. 22), whom we are not even to receive into our houses nor to greet (2 John 10, 11). These seem to be the persons pointed at here, and this the sin: viz. the denial that Jesus is the Christ the

v = John xvii. 11, 12, 15. 1 Tim. v. 22. Jude 21. Rev. iii. 10. Prov. xvi. 17. w ch. ii. 13 reff.

γεννημένος [u] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· ἀλλ' ὁ [u] γεννηθεὶς [u] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, [v] τηρεῖ αὐτόν, καὶ [w] ὁ πονηρὸς οὐχ

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

18. αλλα B(sic: see table at end of prolegg) Orig. rec εαυτον, with KL[P]ℵ rel Orig: txt A(ε written over the line by origl scribe) B vulg Jer.

incarnate Son of God. This alone of all sins bears upon it the stamp of severance from Him who is the Life itself. As the confession of Christ, with the mouth and in the heart, is salvation unto life (Rom. x. 9), so denial of Christ with the mouth and in the heart, is sin unto death. This alone of all the proposed solutions seems to satisfy all the canons above laid down. For in it, the life cast away and the death incurred strictly correspond: it strictly corresponds to what St. John has elsewhere said concerning life and death, and derives its explanation from those other passages, especially from the foregoing ver. 12: and it is an appreciable act of sin, one against which the readers have been before repeatedly cautioned (ch. ii. 18 ff., iv. 1 ff., vv. 5, 11, 12). And further, it is in exact accordance with other passages of Scripture which seem to point at a sin similarly distinguished above others; viz. Matt. xii. 31 ff., and, so far as the circumstances there dealt with allow common ground, with the more ethical passages, Heb. vi. 4 ff., x. 25 ff. In the former case, the Scribes and Pharisees were resisting the Holy Ghost (Acts vii. 51) who was manifesting God in the flesh in the Person and work of Christ. For them the Lord Himself does not pray (Luke xxiii. 34): they knew what they did: they went out from God's people and were not of them: receiving and repudiating the testimony of the Holy Ghost to the Messiahship of Jesus.

18—20.] *Three solemn maxims* of the Epistle regarding sin, and the children of God and the world, and our eternal life in Christ, *are repeated* as a *close* of the teaching of the Apostle. Ver. 18 seems to be not without reference to what has just been said concerning sin. In actual life, even our brethren, even we ourselves, born of God, shall sin, not unto death, and require brotherly intercession: but in the depth and truth of the Christian life, sin is altogether absent. It is the world, not knowing God, which lies under the power of the wicked one: God's new-begotten children he cannot touch: they are in and they know the True One, and in Him have eternal life. These maxims are introduced with a thrice-repeated *οἴδαμεν*, the expression of full persuasion and free confidence. They form a triumphant repetition of and anticipation of the attainment of the purpose expressed in ver. 13, *ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον*.

18.] **We know that every one who is born of God, sinneth not** (see on ch. iii. 9, from which place our words are almost repeated. As explained there and in our summary of these verses there is no real inconsistency with what has been just said. And that there is none the second member of the verse shews): **but he that hath been born of God** (**γεννηθείς**, aor. this time. The perf. part. expresses more the enduring abidance of his heavenly birth, and fits better the habitual *οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει*: the aor. part., calling attention to the historical fact of his having been born of God, fits better the fact that the wicked one toucheth him not, that divine birth having severed his connexion with the prince of this world and of evil. So Düsterd. and Huther. See also the construction according to the true reading below. Sander, in apparent ignorance of the force of the tenses, has curiously taken them exactly vice versa: and Bengel has failed to hit the difference when he says, "Præteritum grandius quiddam sonat quam Aoristus: non modo qui magnum in regeneratione gradum assecutus, sed quilibet qui regenitus est, servat se." The distinction is ingenious, but is not contained in the tenses) **it keepeth him** ("*it*," viz. the divine birth, pointed at in the aor. part. *γεννηθείς*. So the vulg., but omitting the pendent nom., "sed generatio Dei conservat eum." It is this, and not the fact of his own watchfulness, which preserves him from the touch of the wicked one: as in ch. iii 9, where the same is imported by *ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, κ. οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται*. The rationalistic Commentators insist on *τηρεῖ ἑαυτόν*, as shewing, as Socinus, "aliquid præstare eum atque efficere, qui per Christum regeneratus fuerit:" and the orthodox Commentators have but a lame apology to offer. Düsterd. compares *ἁγνίζει ἑαυτόν* ch. iii. 3. But the reference there is wholly different—viz. to a gradual and earnest striving after an ideal model; whereas here the *τηρεῖσθαι* must be, by the very nature of the case, so far complete, that the wicked one cannot approach: and whose self-guarding can ensure this even for a day? Cf. John xvii. 15, *ἵνα*

[x] ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ. [19] οἴδαμεν ὅτι [y] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ [y] ἐσμέν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος [z] ἐν [w] τῷ πονηρῷ [z] κεῖται. [20] οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ [a] ἥκει, καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν [b] διάνοιαν [c] ἵνα

x = Job i. 12. Wisd. xviii. 20.
y ch. ii. 16 reff.
z constr., here only. 2 Macc. iii 11.
a = John viii. 42. Heb. x. 7 (from Ps. xxxix. 7).
b = Eph iv. 18. 1 Pet. i. 13 al. Prov. ix. 10.
c w. pres. ind., 1 Cor. iv. 6. Gal. iv. 17. but see notes on these places. Tit. ii. 4. (John xvii. 3. 1 Thess. iv. 13 v. r.)

20. for *οιδαμεν δε*, *και οιδ.* A a d 13. 36 vulg spec syrr sah arm Did Ps-Ath Cyr: *οιδαμεν* (alone) L[P] j æth Cyr Did-int: txt BKℵ rel copt Thl Œc. for *δεδ.*, *εδωκ.* A a c 13 Did Cyr Ps-Ath.

τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, which is decisive. There is a possible construction of the clause which I do not remember to have seen suggested, but which should hardly be left out of account. *ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ* might be taken as meaning the Son of God: "He that was begotten of God keepeth him." But this would hardly suit the analogy of the Epistle: see e.g. ver. 1 and note), **and the wicked one** (Satan: see reff. and notes) **doth not touch him** (Düsterd. approves of Calvin's paraphrase, which is self-condemnatory—"continet se in Dei timore, nec se *ita abripi patitur*, ut *exstincto pietatis sensu* diabolo et carni *totum se permittat*"—as the meaning of *ὁ πον. οὐχ ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ*. Of course the words must not be understood as saying that he is not tried with *temptation* by the evil one: but imply that as the Prince of this world had nothing in our blessed Lord, even so on His faithful ones who live by His life, the Tempter has no point d'appui, by virtue of that their *γέννησις* by which they are as He is. "Malignus appropinquat," says Bengel, "ut musca lychnum, sed non nocet, ne tangit quidem").

19.] *Application* of that which is said ver. 18, to the Apostle and his readers: and that, in entire separation from *ὁ πονηρός*, the ruling spirit of this present world. **We know** (see summary above) **that we** (not emphatic: no *ἡμεῖς* as set over against *ὁ κόσμος*. It is not the object now to bring out a contrast, but to re-assert solemnly these great axioms of the Christian life) **are of God** (i.e. born of God: identifying us with those spoken of ver. 18), **and the whole world lieth in the wicked one** (this second member of the sentence does not depend on the preceding *ὅτι*, but like those of vv. 18, 20, is an independent proposition. *τῷ πονηρῷ*, by the analogy of St. John's diction, is masculine, not neuter, as Lyra ("in maligno, i. e. in malo igne concupiscentiæ"), Socinus, Schlichting, Episcopius ("in peccandi consuetudine tenentur"), Grotius (but with an allusion to *ὁ πονηρός*), al., and E. V. ("lieth in wickedness"). This neuter sense can hardly stand after comparing ch. ii. 13, 14, iii. 8, 10, 14, iv. 4: John xvii. 14 f., and above all after the preceding verse here. For *κεῖσθαι ἐν* in this sense, there is, as in reff., no other example. That in Polybius, vi. 14. 6, *ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ κεῖται*, "lies in the power or determination of the Senate," is an approximation, but not quite the same sense. *θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται*, so common in Homer, is another. The idea *in the power of*, and the *local* idea, seem to be combined. *ὁ πονηρός* is as it were the inclusive abiding-place and representative of all his, as, in the expressions *ἐν κυρίῳ*, *ἐν χριστῷ*, *ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, *ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ*, ver. 20, the Lord is of His. And while we are *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, implying a birth and a proceeding forth and a change of state, the *κόσμος*, all the rest of mankind, *κεῖται ἐν τ. π.*, remains where it was, in, and in the power of, *ὁ πονηρός*. Some Commentators have been anxious to avoid inconsistency with such passages as ch. ii. 2, iv. 14, and would therefore give *κόσμος* a different meaning here. But there is no inconsistency whatever. Had not Christ become a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, were He not the Saviour of the whole world, none could ever come out of the world and believe on Him; but as it is, they who do believe on Him, come out and are separated from the world: so that our proposition here remains strictly true: the *κόσμος* is the negation of faith in Him, and as such lies in the wicked one, His adversary).

20.] Yet another **οἴδαμεν**: and that in general, as summing up all, the certainty to us of the Son of God having come, and having given us the knowledge of God, and of our being in Him: and the formal inclusion, in this one fact, of knowledge of the true God here, and life everlasting hereafter. **Moreover** (**δέ** closes off and sums up all: cf. 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Heb. xiii. 20, 22, al. fr. This not being seen, it has been altered to *καί*, as there appeared to be no contrast with the preceding) **we know that the Son of God is come** (the incarnation, and work, and abiding presence of the Son of God, is to us a living fact. HE IS HERE—all is full of Him—*ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν καὶ φωνεῖ*

d 1 Thess. i. 9. e so Luke i. 32. Acts ix. 20, 22. f John xvii. 3. see note.

γινώσκομεν τὸν [d] ἀληθινόν, καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ [d] ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ. [e] οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ [f] ἀλη-

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

rec γινωσκωμεν, with B^2K rel Thl: txt AB^1L[P]ℵ c g^1 Cyr. for τον, το ℵ[1]. aft αληθινον ins θεον A a d 13. 40-3. 65-6^2 vulg copt (æth) arm-usc Ath_4 Cyr_2 Did Bas Aug Pel. for εσμεν, ωμεν 34 vulg spec arm-usc Hil. ιησ. χρ. bef τω υιω αυτου 162 am(with harl) Leo: om ιησ. χρ. A vulg: txt BKL[P]ℵ rel demid (and tol) vss Ath_{saepe} Cyr Did Thl Œc Hil Faustin Aug Jer.—ℵ[1] has χῡ by mistake

σε), **and hath given** (the subject to δέδωκεν is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, not, as Bengel, "Deus" understood. It is the Son of God who is to us the bestower of this knowledge, see ver. 13: it is He who is here at the end of the Epistle made prominent, as it is He who is to us eternal life, and he who hath Him hath the Father) **to us (an) understanding** (διάνοια, the divinely empowered inner sense by which we judge of things divine: see Beck, Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre, p. 58. It is not the wisdom or judgment *itself*, but the faculty capable of attaining to it. Compare John i. 12, 18, xvii. 2 f., 6 f., 25 f.; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 18) **that we know** (with the indic. as in the other places where it occurs, or seems to occur, in the N. T., ἵνα must bear a sort of pregnant sense, of a purpose accomplished or at least secured. See note on ἵνα with the future indicative Gal. ii. 4, and cf. Rev. iii. 9, vi. 4, xiii. 12, xiv. 13, and for the present indicative, reff.: and see the whole discussed and examples given from later Greek writers, in Winer, edn. 6, § 41, *b*. 1. *b*, *c*) **the true One** (i. e. God: cf. John xvii. 3, ἵνα γινώσκωσίν (-ουσιν al.) σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν. The adjective ἀληθινόν is not subjective, = ἀληθῆ, but objective, in its usual sense of genuine, in distinction from every 'deus fictitius.' So Calvin: "verum Deum intelligit non veracem, sed cum qui revera Deus est eum ab idolis omnibus discernat. Ita verus fictitio opponitur." And thus the way is prepared for the warning against all false gods, ver. 21): **and we are** (again, as in vv. 18, 19, this second member is an independent proposition, not dependent on the ὅτι nor on the ἵνα as in the vulgate, "et simus . . .") **in** (see above on κεῖται ἐν, ver. 19) **the true One** (viz. God, as above), **in His Son Jesus Christ** (i. e. by virtue of our being in His Son Jesus Christ: this second ἐν is not in apposition with, but as αὐτοῦ shews, is epexegetic of the former). **This** (viz. God, the Father: the ὁ ἀληθινός, who has been twice spoken of: see below) **is the true God, and eternal life.** There has been great controversy, carried on principally from doctrinal interests, respecting the reference of this οὗτος: whether it is to be understood as above, or of ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς χριστός, just mentioned. The Fathers who were engaged against Arian error, and most of the orthodox expositors since, regarding the passage as a precious testimony for the Godhead of the Son, have maintained this latter view, rather doctrinally than exegetically. To this list belong Bede, Lyra, a-Lapide, Tirinus, Barthol.-Petrus (the continuator of Estius), Mayer, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Aretius, Piscator, Erasm.-Schmidt, Seb.-Schmidt, Spener, Whitby, Calov., Wolf, Joach. Lange, Bengel, Sander, Stier: and even Episcopius takes this view, not being able, says Düsterd., to bear the caprice and tortuousness of the Socinian exegesis. The opposite doctrinal interest has led many of those who deny this application: e. g. Schlichting (who combats the other view simply by abusing the Trinitarians), Socinus, Grotius, Benson, Samuel Clarke, Semler, which last takes οὗτος in as far as it belongs to ἀληθ. θεός as referring to the Father, in as far as to ζωὴ αἰώνιος, to the Son. To these have succeeded another set of expositors with whom not doctrinal but exegetical considerations have been paramount: e. g. Wetstein, Lücke, De Wette, Rickli, Baumg.-Crusius, Neander, Huther, Hofmann (Schriftb. i. 128), Düsterdieck, Erdmann.

The grounds on which the application to Christ is rested are mainly the following: 1) that οὗτος most naturally refers to the last-mentioned substantive: 2) that ζωὴ αἰώνιος, as a predicate, more naturally belongs to the Son than to the Father: 3) that the sentence, if understood of God the Father, would be aimless and tautological. But to these it has been well and decisively answered by Lücke and Düsterd., 1) that οὗτος more than once in St. John belongs not to the nearest substantive, but to the principal one in the foregoing sentence, e. g. in ch. ii. 22 and in 2 John 7: and that the subject of the whole here has been the Father, who is the ὁ ἀληθινός of the last verse, and the Son is referred back to Him as ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, thereby keeping *Him*, as the primary subject, before the mind. 2) that as little can ζωὴ αἰώνιος

θινὸς [f] θεὸς καὶ [f] ζωὴ [f] αἰώνιος. 21 [g] Τεκνία, [h] φυλάξατε [i] ἑαυτοὺς [h] ἀπὸ τῶν [k] εἰδώλων.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Α.

g ch. ii. 1 reff. h = Luke xii. 15. 2 Thess. iii. 3. Ps. xvii. 23. i 2nd pers., Matt. iii. 9. Acts xx. 28. Phil. ii. 3. 2 John 8. Jude 20, 21 al. k 1 Thess. i. 9 al. fr. Exod. xx. 4. cf. 1 Cor. viii. 10 al.

for χῶ. rec ins η bef ζωη, with a n 36. 40 arm Ath$_2$ Thl: η ζωη η L[P] rel: ζωη η K a b^2 Ath$_3$ Cyr Antch: txt ABℵ b^1 d j o 13 Cyr$_1$ Did$_3$ Ath$_4$ Euthal.

21. εαυτα BLℵ^1 c m: txt AK[P]ℵ^3 rel Thl Œc, αυτους a. rec at end ins αμην, with KL[P] rel: om ABℵ d 13 am(with demid tol) syrr coptt arm æth.

Subscription. elz om, with a b c d g k l m o 13: απο αφεσου f: τελος της α ιωαννου επιστολης ητις εγραφη απο εφεσου j: Steph ιω. επιστ. καθολικη πρωτη εγραφη εν στιχοις σογ' (with K?): ιω. ευαγγελιστου επ. α' [137(Sz)]: του αγιου και πανευφημου αποστολου ιω. και θεολογου επιστολη καθολικη α' L: txt ABℵ[, and, prefg επιστ., P].

be an actual predicate of Christ as of the Father. He is indeed ἡ ζωή ch. i. 2, but not ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Such an expression used predicatively, leads us to look for some expression of our Lord's, or for some meaning which does not appear on the surface to guide us. And such an expression leading to such a meaning we have in John xvii. 3, αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, ἵνα γινώσκωσίν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν χριστόν. He is eternal life in Himself, as being the fount and origin of it: He is it to us, seeing that to know Him is to possess it. I own I cannot see, after this saying of our Lord with σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, how any one can imagine that the same Apostle can have had in these words any other reference than that which is given in those: 3) this charge is altogether inaccurate. As referred to the Father, there is in it no tautology and no aimlessness. It serves to identify the ὁ ἀληθινός mentioned before, in a solemn manner, and leads on to the concluding warning against false gods. As in another place the Apostle intensifies the non-possession of the Son by including in it the alienation from the Father also, so here at the close of all, the ἀληθινὸς θεός, the fount of ζωὴ αἰώνιος, is put before us as the ultimate aim and end, to be approached ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, but Himself the One Father both of Him and of us who live through Him. 21.] *Parting warning against idols.* Little children (see reff. He parts from them with his warmest and most affectionate word of address), **keep yourselves from idols** (the εἴδωλον is properly a figure of an imaginary deity, —while an ὁμοίωμα is that of some real person or thing made into an object of worship. So in an old Etymologicum ineditum in Biel sub voce (Düsterdieck),— τὸ μὲν εἴδωλον οὐδεμίαν ὑπόστασιν ἔχει, τὸ δὲ ὁμοίωμα τινῶν ἐστιν ἴνδαλμα καὶ ἀπείκασμα. So Rom. i. 23, 1 Cor. x. 19, xii. 2, and especially ref. 1 Thess., where, as here, θεὸς ζῶν καὶ ἀληθινός is opposed to εἴδωλα. And there seems no justification for the departing from the plain literal sense in this place. All around the Christian Church was heathenism: the born of God and the κείμενοι ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ were the only two classes: those who went out of one, went into the other: God's children are thus then finally warned of the consequence of letting go the only true God, in whom they can only abide by abiding in His Son Jesus Christ, in these solemn terms,—to leave on their minds a wholesome terror of any the least deviation from the truth of God, seeing into what relapse it would plunge them. This is a more satisfactory view than that taken by Düsterdieck, that having so long and so much warned them against error in Christian doctrine, he could not part without also warning them against that of which they were indeed in less danger, relapse into heathenism:—and far better than that of Hammond, al., that the εἴδωλα were the fictions of Gnostic error).

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Β.

1 Ὁ [a] πρεσβύτερος [b] ἐκλεκτῇ [c] κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, οὓς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ [d] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ [e] ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 2 διὰ τὴν [f] ἀλήθειαν τὴν [g] μένουσαν [fg] ἐν ἡμῖν, [h] καὶ [i] μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ἔσται

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

vv. 1 to 5 m mutilated.

a 3 John 1. see 1 Pet. v. 1. Philem. 9.
b ver. 13. Matt. xx. 16. Luke xviii. 7. Tit. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 1. Ps. cv. 23.
c ver. 5 only. (Isa. xxiv. 2) αἱ γυναῖκες κυρίαι καλοῦνται ἀπὸ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἐτῶν, Epictet. Enchirid. c. 40.
d 1 John iii. 18 reff.
e John viii. 32. see 1 Tim. ii. 4. iv. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 25. iii. 7. Tit. i. 1. Heb. x. 26. 1 John ii. 21.
f 1 John i. 8. ii. 4.
g see 1 John ii. 14 (reff.), 24.
h change of constr., see Luke xvii. 31. 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13. Winer, edn. 6, § 63. ii. 1.
i so 1 John iv. 17.

TITLE. Steph *επιστολη ιωαννου δευτερα*, with [P(β)] k 36(β′): elz *ιω. του αποστολου επιστ. καθολ. δευτ.*: *του αγιου αποστ. ιω. του θεολογου επιστ. δευτ.* L: *ιω. καθ. επ. δευ.* h: *ιω. επ. καθ. δευτ.* m(Treg expr. "sic fuit anno 1853"): *ιω. επ. καθ. β′* K l: *θειος ιω. ταδε δευ. τοις προτεροισιν* f: in A the title is torn away: *ιω. επ. β′* 13: *ιω. επ. δευ.* o: txt Bℵ.

VERSE 1. for *και ουκ εγω*, *ουκ εγω δε* A 73 syr-pk Thl: *και ουκ εγω δε* L.
2. for *μενουσαν*, *ενοικουσαν* A, *ουσαν* d 13 copt. [for *ημιν*, *υμιν* P c j 100-4.]

1—3.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. **The elder** (the Apostle, known by this name: see prolegg., "On the writer of the Epistle") **to the** (not, **an**: see prolegg. "To whom the Epistle was written") **elect lady** (see prolegg. ibid.), **and to her children whom** (οὕς, masc., probably embraces the whole, mother and children of both sexes: see 3 John 1. Ver. 4 is no reason why we should regard the masc. relative as applying to sons only: when proceeding to single out some for praise, as there, he naturally speaks in the masculine) **I love in truth** (not merely, in reality, as Œc., ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἐπιπλάστως ἀγαπᾶν, στόματι: but in truth, such truth being the result, as stated below, of *the truth* of the Gospel abiding in him: "amor non modo verus amor, sed veritate evangelica nititur." Bengel. See 1 John iii. 18, and note on iii. 19), **and not I alone, but also all who know the truth** (there is no need to limit this πάντες to all dwelling in or near the abode of the Writer, as Grot., Carpzov., De Wette, al., or all who were personally acquainted with those addressed, as Lücke: it is a general expression: the communion of love is as wide as the communion of faith), **on account of the truth** (objective: God's truth revealed in His Son, see 1 John ii. 4), **which abideth in us, and shall be with us** (the Apostle continues the construction as if he had previously written ἣ μένει) **for ever** (cf. John xiv. 16, 17. These words are a reminiscence of our Lord's words there, παρ᾽ ὑμῖν μένει, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν. The future is not the expression of a wish, as some, e.g. Lücke, have supposed; but of confidence, as that also which follows, which takes its tinge and form from this): **there shall be with us** (by the ἡμῶν the Apostle includes *himself* in the greeting, as he had before done in the introductory clauses. ἔσται, again, not a wish: see above: we must of necessity connect this second ἔσται with the first. But the very fact of a greeting being conveyed, must somewhat modify the absolute future sense, and introduce something of the votive character.

εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· [3] ἔσται [l] μεθ' ἡμῶν [kl] χάρις, [km] ἔλεος, [klm] εἰρήνη, παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ παρὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρός, [d] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ.

[4] [n] Ἐχάρην [n] λίαν ὅτι εὕρηκα [o] ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου [p] περιπατοῦντας [p] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καθὼς [q] ἐντολὴν [q] ἐλάβομεν

k 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2 only. l Rom. i. 7. 1 Cor. i. 3. 2 Cor. i. 2. Gal. i. 3. Eph. i. 2. Phil. i. 2. Col. i. 2. 1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. i. 2. Tit. i. 4. Philem. 3. 1 Pet i. 2. 2 Pet. i. 2. Rev. i. 4. m Jude 2 only. n Luke xxiii. 8. 3 John 3 only. o Rev. v. 9. xi. 9. see 1 John iv. 13. p 3 John 3, 4 only. see 1 John i. 6, 7. Eccl. xi. 9. q John x. 18. Acts xvii. 15. Col. iv. 10 only.

3. om ἐσται μεθ' ημων A.—elz υμων, with K rel vulg syr copt: txt BL[P]ℵ g[1] k l 13 am syr-pk sah Thl-comm Œc-comm. for 1st παρα, απο ℵ[1] c 42. 57. 126. om 2nd παρα ℵ[1] f am. rec ins κυριου bef ιησ. χρ., with KL[P]ℵ rel tol syr copt arm Thl Œc: om AB (d) vulg syr-pk (sah) æth. for του πατρος, αυτου f: αυτου του πατρος ℵ[1].

4. for ελαβομεν, ελαβον ℵ 13. 28.

It is as Bengel, "votum cum affirmatione" —a wish expressed by a confident assertion of its fulfilment) **grace, mercy, peace** (see reff. Trench says well, N. T. Synonyms, pp. 164, 5, edn. 1865, "χάρις has reference to the *sins* of men, ἔλεος to their *misery*. God's χάρις, His free grace and gift, is extended to men as they are guilty: His ἔλεος is extended to them as they are miserable." And thus χάρις always comes first, because guilt must be done away, before misery can be assuaged: see further in Trench, and in Düsterdieck, h. l. εἰρήνη is the whole sum and substance of the possession and enjoyment of God's grace and mercy; cf. Luke ii. 14; Rom. v. 1 (x. 15); John xiv. 27, xvi. 33) **from God the Father and from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father** (from the Father as their original fountain, who of His great love hath decreed and secured them for us: from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father, this solemn title being used for the more complete setting forth of the union of Jesus with the Father in the essence of the Godhead), **in truth and love** (not to be understood of the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, as Lyra,—nor to be joined with τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. πατρός, "filio verissimo et dilectissimo," as Barthol.-Petrus (continuator of Estius) and Whitby, nor to be filled up by "ut perseveretis," as Corn.-a-lap.,—nor to be taken as adding two more to χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη, making ἐν = *cum*, as Tirinus and Schlichting;—nor as Grot., al.—is it "per cognitionem veri et dilectionem mutuam: nam per hæc Dei beneficia provocamus, conservamus, augemus:" but the real sense is an approximation to this last;—truth and love are the conditional element in which the grace, mercy, and peace are to be received and enjoyed. So Bengel, Lücke, De Wette, Huther, Düsterdieck).

4—11.] *Truth and love:* These were the two ground-tones of the Epistle. And now the Apostle proceeds to describe his joy at finding the children of the ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία walking in truth (ver. 4), and to enforce the commandment to love one another (5, 6): and this in presence of the fact that many deceivers are in the world who would rob us of our Christian reward, and of our share in God (7—9). These are not to be treated as brethren, nor greeted, lest we partake of their evil deeds (10, 11). 4.] **I rejoiced greatly** (at some definite time indicated by the aor., *perhaps:* and so it is taken by Huther and Düsterdieck; but it may also be the epistolary aor., as ἔγραψα so often: and this is made more probable by the perf. εὕρηκα which follows. See however 3 John 3), **that I have found** (there is not a word nor a hint of the assumption of Sander, that this finding was the result of proof and trial. The most obvious interpretation is, that at some place where the Apostle was, he *came upon* these who are presently mentioned: as in Acts xviii. 2, (ὁ Παῦλος) . . . ἦλθεν εἰς Κόρινθον· καὶ εὑρών τινα Ἰουδαῖον ὀν. Ἀκύλαν, κ.τ.λ.) **of thy children** (no τινάς is needed as a supply: it is contained in the participle which follows) **walking in truth** (i. e. not only in honesty and uprightness, but in that truth which is derived from and is part of the truth of God and Christ: see above on ver. 1. Again, there is no hint whatever given that the rest, or that others, of her children were not walking in truth. The Apostle apparently, as above, in some place where he was, lit upon these children of the κυρία, and sends her their good report. Respecting the rest, he makes no mention nor insinuation) **according as we received commandment from the Father** (viz. to walk in the truth: not, as Lücke, to love one another, making this clause a further description of the manner in which they were walking in truth. And τοῦ πατρός must not be taken with Œc., πατέρα νῦν τὸν χριστὸν καλεῖ, ἐπεὶ καὶ πατήρ ἐστι τῶν διὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας αὐτῷ

ABKLP ℵ a b c f g h j k l m o 13

παρὰ [r] τοῦ [r] πατρός. [5] καὶ νῦν [s] ἐρωτῶ σε, [t] κυρία, οὐχ ὡς [u] ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι [u] καινήν, ἀλλὰ ἣν [u] εἴχομεν [u] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, [s] ἵνα [v] ἀγαπῶμεν [v] ἀλλήλους. [6] καὶ [w] αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, [w] ἵνα [x] περιπατῶμεν [x] κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. [w] αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστιν, καθὼς [y] ἠκούσατε [y] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς [w] ἵνα [z] ἐν αὐτῇ [z] περιπατῆτε· [7] ὅτι πολλοὶ [a] πλάνοι [b] ἐξῆλθον [b] εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ [c] ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν χρισ-

r 1 John i. 3 reff.
s constr., Luke vii. 36. John iv. 47. xvii. 15.
t ver. 1.
u 1 John ii. 7 (reff.).
v 1 John iii. 11 reff.
w constr., 1 John iii. 23 reff.
x = Mark vii. 5. Rom. viii. 4. xiv. 15. 1 Cor. iii. 3.
y 1 John iii. 11.
z 1 John i. 6, 7 reff.
a here bis. Matt. xxvii. 63. 2 Cor. vi. 8. 1 Tim. iv. 1 only. Job xix. 4. Jer. xxiii. 32 only.
b 1 John iv. 1 reff.
c constr., 1 John iv. 2.

for παρα, απο A 73. om του B.

5. Steph (for γραφων) γραφω, with c? d[1] 65-6 syrr: txt ABKL[P]ℵ rel 40 vulg sah Thl Œc.—καινην bef γρ. σοι Aℵ d m 13. 36. 65 vulg copt. ins εντολην bef ην ℵ (syr-w-ast sah). ειχαμεν Aℵ: εχομεν a b[1] c h j k l[2] m(Treg) o: ειχωμεν 13.

6. aft αυτου ins και καθως (but marked for erasure) ℵ[1]. rec εστιν bef η εντολη, with L[P]ℵ rel vulg-ed coptt arm Thl Œc Lucif: txt ABK m 13 am syr. (in ℵ λη of εντολη is not written, but αυτου is added.) ins ινα bef καθως AKℵ m 13. 36 vulg coptt arm (of these all but A m omit it below). περιπατειτε L o 13 Thl: περιπατησητε ℵ. [P def.]

7. rec (for εξηλθον) εισηλθ., with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: txt ABℵ d 36 vulg syrr sah

παρὰ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὸς δοθέντων υἱῶν, which is unlikely and unprecedented,—but as applying to the Father, as in ver. 6).

5.] **And now** (so καὶ νῦν, coupling to what has gone before, 1 John ii. 28. It has also a force of breaking off, and passing to that which is the main subject, or most in the Writer's thoughts, which here is, that this walking in truth is a walking after God's commandments in love) **I entreat thee** (see on ἐρωτάω and αἰτέω, 1 John v. 15, 16. Here ἐρωτῶ carries, as Schlichting, "blandior quædam admonendi ratio:" with the assumed fact of a right thus to entreat) **lady, not as writing to thee a new commandment, but** (as writing to thee . . : the construction is not strictly logical) **that which we had from the beginning** (see on this, 1 John ii. 7), **that** (ἵνα here is not epexegetic of ἐντολή, as so often in St. John, but is to be taken in its proper sense, as the aim of ἐρωτῶ, and dependent on it) **we love one another** (the expression of the commandment in the first person is a mark of gentleness and delicacy: a sign that he who wrote it kept the commandment himself.)

6.] **And** ("eine eigenthumliche Kreisbewegung der Gedanken, wie Johannes sie liebt." Düsterd.) **this is the love** (ἡ ἀγάπη here is subject, not predicate: **the love** (intended by this command) **is this**, i. e. may be thus described), **that** (the explicative ἵνα of St. John) **we walk according to His commandments. The commandment** (the one commandment in which God's other commandments are summed up) **is this, even as ye heard from the beginning that ye should walk in it** (the apodosis to αὕτη ἐστίν begins with καθώς: = "is this, even that which ye heard from the beginning, that ye should walk in it," viz. in ἀγάπη. **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**, as above, ver. 5, and 1 John ii. 7).

7.] The condition of Love is Truth, see ver. 3. And the necessity of fresh exhortation to walk in love, in that love whose condition is truth, lies in the fact that there are many deceivers gone forth, denying the Truth: of whom we are to beware, and not, by extending to them a spurious sympathy, to become partakers with them. **Because** (see above. ὅτι cannot be referred to βλέπετε ἑαυτούς, ver. 8, for its apodosis, as is done by Grot., Carpzov., J. Lange, as this would involve a length of protasis, broken by a parenthetical clause, οὗτός ἐστιν κ.τ.λ., quite alien from St. John's style. Nor can we well understand ὅτι with Bengel, "ratio cur jubeat retinere audita a principio:" because the foregoing is not a command "retinere audita a principio;" this latter particular being only introduced by the way, not as a principal feature) **many deceivers** (makers to wander, see reff.) **went forth** (here probably, on account of the aor., "from us," as in 1 John ii. 19. In 1 John iv. 1, it is perf., ἐξεληλύθασιν, where I have preferred the sense, "are gone forth from him who sent them," viz. the evil one. Huther prefers this latter sense here also) **into the world** (namely) **they who confess not** (instead of οὐχ ὁμολογοῦντες, the Apostle writes **οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες**, thereby not merely characterizing the πλάνοι as not confessing &c., but absolutely identifying all who repudiate the confession which follows, as belonging to the class of πλάνοι. The subjective μή is the necessary consequence

τὸν [d] ἐρχόμενον [e] ἐν σαρκί. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ [a] πλάνος καὶ ὁ [f] ἀντίχριστος. 8 [gh] βλέπετε [hi] ἑαυτούς, ἵνα μὴ [k] ἀπολέσητε ἃ [l] εἰργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ [mn] μισθὸν [no] πλήρη [p] ἀπολάβητε. 9 πᾶς ὁ [q] προάγων καὶ μὴ [r] μένων [r] ἐν τῇ [s] διδαχῇ

d pres., = John iii. 31. xi. 27. 1 Cor. xv. 35.
e 1 John iv. 2 reff.
f 1 John ii. 18 bis, 22. iv. 3 only.
g = 1 Cor. x. 12. xvi. 10 al.‡
h Mark xiii. 9.
i 2nd pers., 1 John v. 21 reff.
k = Matt. x. 42. Mark ix. 41 al. Isa. xlix. 20.
l = John vi. 27.
m John iv. 36. Matt. x. 42. Luke vi. 23 al.
n Ruth ii. 12.
o = Mark iv. 28.
p = Luke xvi. 25. xviii. 30. xxiii. 41. Col. iii. 24. Num. xxxiv. 14.
q = Mark xi. 9. Luke xviii. 39. (see note.)
r = John viii. 31. see 1 John iii. 24 reff.
s = John vii. 16, 17. xviii. 19. Rev. ii. 14, 15, 24.

arm Ps-Chr Iren-int Bede.— *-θαν* A. om 2nd ὁ ℵ k 3.

8. *αυτους* KL, *eos* Iren-int Lucif. rec *απολεσωμεν* and *απολαβωμεν*, with KL[P] rel: txt AB(ℵ) d f j 13. 36. 40 vulg syrr coptt æth arm Ps-Chr Isid Thl-comm Œc-comm Iren-int Lucif. (13 [not B, as Bch: see table] has *απολεσηται*: *απολησθε* ℵ[1].)—for *ειργασαμεθα*, *ειργασασθε* Aℵ d f j 13. 36 vulg syrr copt æth arm Ps-Chr &c: txt BKL[P] rel 40(so Zacagni) syr-mg sah. (*ηργ.* B[1].) *πληρης* L.

9. rec (for *προαγων*) *παραβαινων*, with KL[P] rel syrr Thl Œc, *ambulans extra* copt: txt ABℵ, *præcedit* am(with fuld harl al) sah, *recedit* vulg(with demid al) Did-int

of such an arrangement, involving an hypothesis within the limits of the relative οἵ,—the repudiation of the confession: see 1 John iv. 3, note) **Jesus Christ coming in (the) flesh** (ἐρχόμενον, altogether timeless, and representing the great truth of the Incarnation itself, as distinguished from its historical manifestation (ἐλθών, 1 John v. 6), and from the abiding effect of that historical manifestation (ἐληλυθότα, 1 John iv. 2): and all three, as confessions of the Person Ἰησοῦς χριστός, distinguished from the accus. with infin. construction: see note on 1 John iv. 2. He who denies the ἔρχεσθαι ἐν σαρκί, denies the *possibility* of the Incarnation: he who denies the ἐλθεῖν or ἐληλυθέναι, denies its *actuality*. Other interpretations, such as that of Œc., εἰπὼν δέ, ... ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐλθόντα, ἐμφαίνοντός ἐστιν ὡς τοὺς ἀθετοῦντας λέγει τὴν δευτέραν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν, . . . that of Erasm., Schlicht., Bengel,—"*qui veniebat*," and of Baumg.-Crus., "*who was to come*," are beside the mark). **This** (viz., "he that fulfils the above character." No supply, such as ὃς οὖν μὴ ταῦτα ὁμολογεῖ, Œc., is needed. See the same construction, 1 John ii. 22) **is the deceiver and the antichrist** (see notes on 1 John ii. 18, 22, as to the personal relation of these πολλοί to the one great Antichrist of prophecy. The οὗτος, pointing to a class, makes each one of these, in his place, a representative and "præcursor Antichristi"). 8.] The warning is suddenly introduced without any coupling particle, and becomes thereby so much the more solemn and forcible. **Look to yourselves** (the construction with the reflective pronoun is not usual, see reff. ἑαυτούς here probably implies not as Bengel, "me absente," but "yourselves," as contrasted with the deceivers, that ye too become not as they), **that ye lose not the things which we wrought** (i.e. that ye, Christian converts, lose not that your Christian state of truth and love which we, Apostles and Teachers, wrought in you. This not being understood, the verbs have been altered in the various texts to the first or to the second person to conform to one another. The Apostles were God's ἐργάται, Matt. ix. 37, 38; Luke x. 2, 7; 2 Tim. ii. 15: the ψευδαπόστολοι were ἐργάται δόλιοι, 2 Cor. xi. 13, κακοὶ ἐργάται, Phil. iii. 2: the true ἔργον was to cause men to believe on Christ, John vi. 29: and this ἔργον the false teachers put in peril of loss), **but receive reward in full** (what μισθός? The connexion of εἰργασάμεθα with μισθόν must not be broken. The idea is a complex one. Ye, our converts, are our μισθός in the day of the Lord: and this has suggested the use of the well-known word, even where it manifestly applies not to the teachers but to the taught, whose μισθός is the eternal life, which shall receive on that day its glorious completion: which is ἔχειν τὸν υἱόν, κ. τὸν πατέρα: see 1 John iii. 2. If this reading be right, the use which Roman-Catholic expositors, as Bart.-Petrus, Mayer, al., have tried to make of this verse to establish the merit of human works ("opera bona per Spiritum Dei facta mercedem apud Deum mereri," B.-Petrus), falls at once to the ground. Nor indeed does it fare much better if either of the other readings be taken. If the whole be in the first person, then the apostolic μισθός, the souls which are to be their hire, must be understood: if in the second, no human merit, but the reward laid up for faithfulness, and for every thing done in His name, must be understood, which is reckoned of grace, and not of debt). 9.] Explanation of this *loss*, that it is the non-possession of God, which

t 1 John ii. 23. u = John xviii. 29. Acts xxv. 18. 2 Pet. ii. 11. Jer. xlvi. (xxxix.) 16. v = John vi. 21. xix. 27. see also John i. 12. v. 43. w Matt. xxvi. 49. xxviii. 9. Luke i. 28. Acts xv. 23. xxiii. 26. James i. 1. Isa. xlviii. 22. Esdr. viii. 9. xliv. 9 (11) Ald. Compl. Wisd. vi. 23 (25). iv. 18 only.

τοῦ χριστοῦ θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει· ὁ [r] μένων [r] ἐν τῇ [s] διδαχῇ, οὗτος καὶ τὸν [t] πατέρα καὶ τὸν [t] υἱὸν [t] ἔχει. 10 εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ταύτην τὴν [s] διδαχὴν οὐ [u] φέρει, μὴ [v] λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν [v] εἰς οἰκίαν, καὶ [w] χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε· 11 ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ [w] χαίρειν [x] κοινωνεῖ τοῖς [y] ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς [y] πονηροῖς.

ABKLP ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

x = & constr., Rom. xv. 27. 1 Tim. v. 22. (Heb. ii. 14 reff.) Isa. y John iii. 19. vii. 7. 1 John iii. 12. Col. i. 21. 2 Tim.

Lucif. aft μενων και μη is repeated, but marked for erasure by ℵ[1]. rec aft 2nd διδαχη ins του χριστου, with KL[P] rel copt æth Thl Œc; αυτου syr-pk syr-w-ast Lucif$_2$: om ABℵ 13 vulg sah arm Did-int Fulg. transp πατερα and υιον A (m) 13 am(with demid fuld harl tol) Fulg (m om 2nd τον): txt BKL[P]ℵ rel syrr coptt æth arm Thl Œc Did-int Lucif$_2$.

10. aft την, ε̄ was written by ℵ[1] and erased [την is repeated by B[1](Tischdf)].

11. rec γαρ bef λεγων, with KL[P] rel Iren Thl Œc Lucif: txt ABℵ m 13. om αυτω K k l Œc.

is incurred by all who abide not in Christ's teaching. **Every one that goeth before (you)** (such I believe to be the meaning of the somewhat difficult προάγων: every one who would set up for a teacher, ἔμπροσθεν τῶν προβάτων πορευόμενος, as John x. 4, and they following. The expositors who take this reading interpret it, "goeth forward too fast," "maketh false and unsound advance," regarding it, either as ironical (so Huther), or as serious (so Düsterdieck)), **and not abiding in the doctrine of Christ** (i.e. in Christ's doctrine,—that truth which Christ Himself taught. This is far more likely than that the gen. should be objective, as Bengel ("in doctrina, quæ Jesum docet esse filium Dei"), Lücke, Sander, al.: and thus we have the personal gen. after διδαχή wherever it occurs in the N. T.: cf. Matt. vii. 28 ||, Mark iv. 2, John xviii. 19, Acts ii. 42, al. fr.), **hath not God** (see 1 John ii. 23, v. 12, notes): **he that abideth in the doctrine, that man hath both the Father and the Son** (see as above. The order in the text is the theological one, the Father being mentioned first, then the Son. That in A &c. (see digest) is the logical and contextual one, seeing that the test is, abiding in the doctrine of Christ. Thus he has Christ, and through Him, the Father). **10, 11.**] The exercise of the love of the brethren is conditioned and limited by the truth: and is not to be extended to those who are enemies and impugners of the truth. Those who harbour or encourage such, make common cause with them, and their evil deeds. **If any cometh to you, and bringeth not** (the indic. after εἰ shews that the case supposed actually existed: that such persons were sure to come to them: cf. John xi. 12, 2 Cor. ii. 5, 1 John iv. 11. It is not = ἐάν with subj., which always carries a purely hypothetical force, corresponding to an interrogation, whereas the other corresponds to an assertion: e.g. in 1 John ii. 15, ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, which may be resolved, "Does any among you love the world? If he do," &c. On the other hand, εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς may be resolved, "Some will come to you," &c., "If any does," &c.) **this doctrine** (the expression ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει points out the person as a teacher, not a mere traveller seeking hospitality. And the οὐ, not μή, distinctly reverses the φέρει: he not only comes without this doctrine, but by so doing brings the contrary doctrine. The absence of testimony for the truth is, in one who brings any testimony at all, equivalent to testifying for error), **receive him not into (your) house, and do not bid him good speed: for he that biddeth him good speed, partaketh in his evil deeds** (these words must be understood with their right reference: "non de iis qui alieni semper fuerunt ab ecclesia, 1 Cor. v. 10, sed de iis qui volunt fratres haberi et doctrinam evertunt," as Grot. These were not to be received with the φιλοξενία with which all Christian brethren were to be entertained. Such reception of them would in fact be only opening an inlet for their influence. But this is not the point on which the Apostle mainly dwells. It is the κοινωνία which the host in such a case would incur with them and their antichristian designs, by encouraging them. And this is further impressed by the caution against saying χαίρειν to them: which is to be understood not with Clem.-Alex., of the solemn salutation after prayer, "quoniam in oratione quæ fit in domo, post-

12 [z] Πολλὰ [z] ἔχων ὑμῖν [z] γράφειν οὐκ [a] ἐβουλήθην διὰ [b] χάρτου καὶ [c] μέλανος· ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω [d] γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ [e] στόμα πρὸς [e] στόμα λαλῆσαι, ἵνα ἡ [f] χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ [f] πεπληρωμένη. 13 ἀσπάζεταί σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς [g] ἐκλεκτῆς.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Β.

z 3 John 13. constr., John viii. 26. xvi. 12.
a 1 aor. pass., Matt. i. 19. James i. 18. iv. 4 only. Exod. x. 27.
b here only. Jer. xliii. (xxxvi.) 2 A, 6 AN, 23 only (-τίον, ib. ver. 4, &c.).
c = 2 Cor. iii. 3. 3 John 13 only ‡. (Matt. v. 36. Rev. vi. 5, 12 only. Zech. vi. 2.)
d Acts vii. 31. x. 10, 13. 1 Cor. ii. 3. xvi. 10. see John vi. 25.
e 3 John 14. = Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 4 only (4 Kings xxi. 16 Ald., εἰς AB). στ. κατὰ στ., Num. xii. 8. ἔπος πρὸς ἔπος, Plato, Sophist. p. 217.
f 1 John i. 4 reff.
g ver. 1 reff.

12. for εχων, εχω A¹ℵ¹ o æth: but in A, ν is written over the line by an ancient, perhaps the original, scribe. γραψαι A g 73. (εβουληθην, so ABKL[P]ℵ a b g h l m o 36. 40 Thl.) for αλλα ελπιζω, ελπ. γαρ A d 13. 36(sic) vulg copt æth arm: txt BKL[P]ℵ rel syrr sah Thl Œc.—αλλ' L[P] a h j m. rec (for γενεσθαι) ελθειν, with KL[P] rel tol syr-pk sah æth arm: txt ABℵ d 13 vulg syr Thl. στοματι ℵ¹. rec ημων, with KL[P]ℵ rel syrr (sah) arm Thl Œc: txt AB c 13 vulg copt æth. πεπληρωμενη bef η Bℵ vulg(exc am) Thl.—ℵ¹ has ην, ℵ³ ῇ(sic), having erased ν.

13. rec at end ins αμην, with KL rel fuld syrr Thl Œc, *vale* some-mss-of-vulg; η χαρις μεθ' υμων or μετα σου 68-9. 103 syr-pk syr-w-ast æth-rom arm: om AB[P]ℵ d 13 vulg coptt Bede.

Subscription. elz om, with rel: τελος στχ λ' h: ιωαννου επιστολη β' L: txt ABℵ. [P doubtful.]

quam ab orando surgitur salutatio gaudii est et pacis indicium," Adumbrat. in 2 Joan. juxt. fin., p. 1011 P. (not in Migne): nor with Corn.-a-lap., of all intercourse whatever, "omne colloquium, omne consortium, omne commercium cum hæreticis:" but it is a further intensification of the exclusion from the house, and forms a climax, καὶ μή = μηδέ: do not even, by wishing him χαίρειν, good speed, and if spoken by a Christian, *God* speed, identify yourselves with his course and fortunes. If you do, you pronounce approval of his evil deeds, and so far share his guilt, advancing their success by your wishes for it.

This command has been by some laid to the fiery and zealous spirit of St. John, and it has been said that a true Christian spirit of love teaches us otherwise. But as rightly understood, we see that this is not so. Nor are we at liberty to set aside direct ethical injunctions of the Lord's Apostles in this manner. Varieties of individual character may play on the surface of their writings: but in these solemn commands which come up from the depths, we must recognize the power of that One Spirit of Truth which moved them all as one. It would have been infinitely better for the Church now, if this command had been observed in all ages by her faithful sons).

12, 13.] Conclusion. **Having many things to write to you, I would not (communicate them) by means of paper and ink** ("ὁ χάρτης," says Lücke, "the Egyptian papyrus, probably the so-called Augustan or Claudian,—τὸ μέλαν, the ink, commonly made of soot and water thickened with gum,—ὁ κάλαμος (3 John 13), the writing-reed, probably split, μεσοσχιδής or μεσότομος,—were the N. T. writing materials"), **but I hope to come to you** (reff., and note on Rev. i. 9) **and to speak mouth to mouth** (so πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον 1 Cor. xiii. 12. στόμα πρὸς στόμα in Xen. Mem. ii. 6. 32 is not said of conversation), **that your joy may be filled full** (see 1 John i. 4, viz. by hearing from the mouth of the Apostle himself those messages of life and truth which he forbore writing now; not, as Schlichting and Benson, by his bodily presence: still less as Bart.-Petrus, "Apostolos non omnia voluisse scripto committere quæ ad salutem pertinentia vellent nota esse fidelibus, sed multa sermone solo tradidisse" (see also Corn.-a-lapide h. l.), than which it is hardly possible to imagine a sillier comment: for *the first Epistle was written* with this very same view, i. 4). **There greet thee the children of thine elect sister** (these words are variously interpreted according as the κυρία is understood of a lady, or of a church. The nonmention of the κυρία herself here seems, it must be confessed, rather to favour the latter hypothesis). See on the whole, the prolegomena.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Γ.

1 Ὁ [a] πρεσβύτερος Γαΐῳ τῷ [b] ἀγαπητῷ, ὃν ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ [c] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

2 Ἀγαπητέ, περὶ πάντων [d] εὔχομαί σε [e] εὐοδοῦσθαι καὶ [f] ὑγιαίνειν, καθὼς [e] εὐοδοῦταί σου ἡ ψυχή. 3 [g] ἐχάρην

a 2 John 1 reff. b 1 John ii. 7 reff. Ps. xliv. tit. c 1 John iii. 18 reff. d Acts xxvi. 29. xxvii. 29. Rom. ix. 3. 2 Cor. xiii. 7, 9. James v. 6 only. Num. xi. 2. e here bis. Rom. i. 10. 1 Cor. xvi. 2 only. Gen. xxxix. 3, 23 al. (-δος, Num. xiv. 41. -δως. Prov. xxx. 29.) f Luke v. 31. vii. 10. xv. 27 only (exc. 1 Tim. i. 10 al[7]. in pastoral epp. met.). Gen. xxix. 6. g Luke xxiii. 8. 2 John 4 only.

C εχαρην ... ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

TITLE. Steph επιστολη ιωαννου τριτη: elz ιω. του αποστολου επιστ. καθολικη τριτη: αλλα παλιν τριτα ταυτα περικλυτος ιωαννης f: ιω. τρ. επ. h: επ. τρ. ιω. καθ. k: ιω. επ. καθ. γ′ l: ιω. καθ. τρ. m: επ. ιω. καθ. γ′ o: ιω. επ. γ′ C: επ. τρ. του αγιου αποστ. ιω. L: A's title is lost: txt Bℵ. [P doubtful.]

1.] ADDRESS. **The elder** (see prolegg. to the two Epistles) **to Caius the beloved** (on Caius, see prolegg. The epithet **τῷ ἀγαπητῷ** seems to be used this first time in a general sense: cf. ἐγώ below), **whom I** (for my own part: Caius was generally beloved, and the Apostle declares that he personally joins in the affection for him) **love in (the) truth** (see 2 John 1, note. Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἀγαπᾷ ὁ κατὰ κύριον ἀγαπῶν ἐνδιαθέτῳ ἀγάπῃ, Œc.). **2—4.**] *Wish that Caius may prosper, as his soul prospers: and ground of this latter assertion.* **Beloved** (the repetition of ἀγαπητέ is due perhaps more to the fact that the direct address begins here, than to any specific motive, such as the supposed ill-health of Caius, as Düsterd. from Lücke (but not in his 3rd edn.)), **I pray that concerning all things thou mayest prosper** (**περὶ πάντων** is taken by many, e. g. Beza (E. V.), Wahl, Lücke (1st edn.), al., and recently by Düsterd., as signifying "above all things:" for which they allege Hom. Il. α. 287, ἀλλ' ὅδ' ἀνὴρ ἐθέλει περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων. But it has been urged on the other side 1) that Homeric usage is no real index to N. T. usage: 2) that the meaning in Homer is not that sought here: 3) that it would be unnatural for the Apostle to pray for Caius's bodily health and prosperity "above all things." And hence the other modern Commentators, Lücke (edn. 2), De Wette, Huther, Sander, have taken the above meaning: which cannot be impugned, as Düsterd., by saying that περί is never found joined with εὐοδοῦσθαι, or that ἐν πᾶσιν would be more natural than περὶ πάντων. **περί** with a gen. is too usual signifying reference, to be set aside or judged of by the consideration of the verb which precedes: St. John himself uses it with verbs of very various classes. **εὐοδοῦσθαι** is pass. of εὐοδόω, of which the neut. form is εὐοδέω, from εὐοδία, to have a καλὴ ὁδός: -όω, to make, or give a καλὴ ὁδός. So Hesych., εὐοδώσει, κατευθυνεῖ· εὐωδώθη, ἡτοιμάσθη. So that the pass. εὐοδοῦσθαι comes to much the same as the intrans. εὐοδεῖν. Its use is common, and regular, in the LXX. See notes on reff., and Lücke's and Düsterd.'s account of the usages, here) **and be in health** (i.e. bodily health. *περὶ πάντων*, in all probability, does not belong to ὑγιαίνειν, but only to

γὰρ [g] λίαν ἐρχομένων [h] ἀδελφῶν καὶ [i] μαρτυρούντων σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, [j] καθὼς σὺ [k] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ [k] περιπατεῖς. 4 [l] μειζοτέραν [mn] τούτων οὐκ ἔχω χαράν, [n] ἵνα [o] ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα [k] ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ [k] περιπατοῦντα.

vv. 5—10 m mutilated.

5 [b] Ἀγαπητέ, [p] πιστὸν [q] ποιεῖς ὃ ἐὰν ἐργάσῃ εἰς τοὺς [i] ἀδελφοὺς [r] καὶ [r] τοῦτο [s] ξένους, 6 οἳ [i] ἐμαρτύρησάν σου τῇ

h = Acts ix. 30. al. fr.
i = Rom. iii. 21 ‡. constr., here bis, ver. 12. John iii. 26. v. 33. xviii. 37. Luke iv. 22.
j = Acts xv. 14 only.
k here bis. 2 John 4 only. see 1 John i. 6, 7.

l here only †. m plur. indef., see 1 Cor. vi. 11. n constr., John xv. 13. o constr., Luke iv. 23. Acts vii. 12. p = 1 John i. 9. q so οὐχ Ἑλληνικὸν τοῦτο ποιεῖς, Liban. ad Max. r Rom. xiii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8. Eph. ii. 8. Phil. i. 28. s = Matt. xxv. 35, &c. xxvii. 7. Acts xvii. 21. Eph. ii. 19. Heb. xi. 13 only. Ruth ii. 10. (-νίζειν, Heb. xiii. 2. -νοδοχεῖν, 1 Tim. v. 10.)

VERSE 3. om γαρ ℵ d 13. 65. 100 vulg sah æth arm. B omits the -των of μαρτυρουντων. om σου A.

4. χαραν bef ουκ εχω C 68 æth, χ. ταυτης ουκ εχω m (syr coptt).—εχων B[1](ita cod). —χαριν B 7. 35 vulg(not tol) copt. rec om τη, with C-corr KL[P]ℵ rel Thl Œc: ins AB(ita cod) C[1].

5. εργαζη A. (*quidquid operaris* vulg Jer.) rec (for τουτο) εις τους, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: τους, omg εις, d: txt ABCℵ vss.

6. for οι, ὃ K.

ευοδοῦσθαι: the latter verb is a particular, taken out of the former, which is general), **even as thy soul prospereth** (viz. ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείᾳ, Œc.: as is shewn by what follows. There is a passage in Philo, Quis rer. div. hæres, § 58, vol. i. p. 514, in which the well-being of body and soul are similarly compared: ὅταν εὐοδῇ μοι τὰ ἐκτὸς πρὸς εὐπορίαν καὶ εὐδοξίαν· εὐοδῇ τὰ σώματος πρὸς ὑγείαν τε καὶ ἰσχύν, εὐοδῇ δὲ καὶ τὰ ψυχῆς πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν ἀρετῶν). **For I rejoiced greatly when the brethren came and testified to thy truth** (the participles ἐρχ. and μαρτ. are in reality timeless, and convey merely the reason of the ἐχάρην: but such a connexion is given in English by the temporal adverb, which has in this case rather a ratiocinative than a purely temporal force. In **σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ**, the subst. is necessarily subjective—thy share of that Truth in which thou walkest, see below), **even as** (almost = **how that**, see below) **thou walkest in truth** (this clause is not an independent one, adding the testimony of the Apostle to that of the brethren,—"as (I know that) thou walkest &c.:" but is epexegetical of the former clause, and states the substance of the testimony of the brethren, as is shewn by what follows, **ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τ. κ.τ.λ.**).

4.] Explains ἐχάρην λίαν above. **I have no greater** (the form μειζότερος is condemned by some (Phryn. Lob. p. 136, Œc. h. l.) as barbarous. But these comparatives of comparatives and superlatives are found both in classical and in N. T. Greek: see Eph. iii. 8, and note) **joy than this** (lit. "than these things:" following the usage by which ταῦτα is so often put where one thing only is intended: cf. the formula, καὶ ταῦτα, "idque:" so Plato, Phæd. p. 62, D, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνόητος ἄνθρωπος τάχ' ἂν οἰηθείη ταῦτα, φευκτέον εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσπότου. See Kühner, Gr. ii. p. 48), **that** (explicative, as constantly in St. John after the demonstrative pronoun) **I hear of my children walking in the truth** (on the participial construction, see note on 2 John 7. The expression τέκνα here seems rather to favour the idea that the κυρία of the 2nd Epistle is a Church: but see prolegg. to 2 John).

5—8.] *Praise of the hospitality shewn by Caius; and reason of that praise.* **Beloved** (beginning again of new address: see above on ver. 2), **thou doest a faithful act** (ἄξιον πιστοῦ ἀνδρός, as Œc. and most interpreters. De W. and Bengel explain it "fidele facis: facis quiddam quod facile a te pollicebar mihi et fratribus." But the other is better. In πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, 1 Tim. i. 15 al., there is possibly the same allusion: not only a saying worthy of credit, but one belonging to those who are of the πίστις) **whatsoever thou workest** (the aor. betokens these deeds as summed up in one and characterized as πιστόν) **towards** (so the Lord in Matt. xxvi. 10 describes His anointing by Mary thus, καλὸν ἔργον εἰργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ) **the brethren, and that** (and those brethren), **strangers** (φιλοξενία is an especial mark of Christian ἀγάπη, Rom. xii. 13, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 8, Heb. xiii. 2, 1 Pet. iv. 9), **who** (the above-named ξένοι ἀδελφοί) **bore testimony to thy love in the presence of the church** (viz. where St. John was at

t = Acts iv. 10. xix. 9. 1 Cor. i. 29.
u = Acts x. 33. 1 Cor. vii. 37, 38. Phil. iv. 14. James ii. 8, 19. 2 Pet. i. 19. 2 Chron. vi. 8.

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

ἀγάπῃ [t] ἐνώπιον ἐκκλησίας, οὓς [u] καλῶς [u] ποιήσεις [v] προπέμψας [w] ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ. 7 [x] ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ [x] ὀνόματος [y] ἐξῆλθον μηδὲν [z] λαμβάνοντες [a] ἀπὸ τῶν [b] ἐθνικῶν. 8 ἡμεῖς οὖν [c] ὀφείλομεν [d] ὑπολαμβάνειν τοὺς τοιούτους,

v Acts xv. 3. xx. 38. xxi. 5. Rom. xv. 24 al.† 1 Macc. xii. 4 al. Jos. Antt. xx. 2. 5. w Rom. xvi. 2. Eph. iv. 1. Phil. i. 27. Col. i. 10. 1 Thess. ii. 12 only†. Wisd. vii. 15. xvi. 1. Sir. xiv. 11 only. x Acts v. 41 (ellips.). ix. 16. xv. 26. xxi. 13. Rom. i. 5 only. y = Luke ix. 6. Acts xv. 40 al. z = Matt. xxi. 34. Exod. xxx. 16. a 1 John iii. 22 reff. b Matt. v. 47. vi. 7. xviii. 17 only†. (-κῶς, Gal. ii. 14.) c = 1 John ii. 6 reff. d = here (Acts i. 9. ii. 15. Luke vii. 43. x. 30) only. Ps. xxix. 1. οἱ εὔποροι τοὺς ἐνδεεῖς ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, Strabo, p. 653. Diod. Sic. xix. 67.

for *ους*, *ου* B[1]. *ποιησας προπεμψεις* C arm. (*benefaciens deduces* vulg-ed, but not am fuld &c.)

7. *γαρ* is repeated in ℵ. elz aft *ονοματος* ins *αυτου*, with b g m o vulg syr-pk syr-w-ast æth-ms arm: om ABCKL[P]ℵ rel am coptt arm. *εξηλθαν* Bℵ. om *των* C. rec (for *εθνικων*) *εθνων*, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc, *gentibus* am sah: txt ABCℵ 13. 40, *gentilibus* fuld tol copt.

8. rec *απολαμβ.*, with C-corr KL[P] rel: txt ABC[1]ℵ 13 vulg.

the time of writing. They were Evangelists, ver. 7: and thus would naturally give the church an account of their missionary journey, during which they were so hospitably treated by Caius): **whom thou wilt do well if thou forward on their way** (as Bengel says, the future is a "morata formula hortandi." The aor. part. presents no difficulty: it will then, and not till then, be a good act, when it is done. And this would only be expressed by the fut. with an aor. part.: *οὓς καλῶς ποιήσεις προπέμπων* would be liable to be rendered "whom thou wilt benefit by forwarding &c."—the present part. being, in such a conjunction, timeless, and merely ratiocinative. On *προπέμψ.*, see reff. and Tit. iii. 13) **worthily of God** (this qualification belongs to *προπέμψας*, not as Carpzov., who supplies a *καί* before *ἀξίως*, to *ποιήσεις*,—"well and worthily of God." The words mean, in a manner worthy of Him whose messengers they are and whose servant thou art). **For on behalf of the Name** (*of Christ*: see the second ref., and cf. Ignat. ad Eph. 3 and 7, pp. 648 f., and ad Philad. 10, p. 705, *δοξάσαι τὸ ὄνομα*. Bengel says, "subaudi, Dei, Lev. xxiv. 11. Conf. Jac. ii. 7." But neither of these places applies. O. T. usage is naturally no guide for us here; and St. James alludes to the name of *Christ*) **they went forth** (on their missionary journey: not, as Beza, Erasm.-Schmidt, Wolf, Carpzov., Bengel, "were driven forth:" see more below), **taking nothing** (receiving nothing by way of benefaction or hire: even as St. Paul in Achaia, 1 Cor. ix. 18, 2 Cor. xi. 7 ff., xii. 16 ff., 1 Thess. ii. 9 ff.: against Huther, who denies the applicability of the comparison, seeing that in St. Paul's case they were *Christian churches*: but so must these have been, before they would contribute to the support of their missionaries. Notice *μηδέν*; implying that it was their own deliberate purpose; refusing to take any thing: *οὐδέν* would have expressed only the *fact*, which might have arisen from the remissness of the *ἐθνικοί*, and might have been considered by themselves as a hardship. This is the force of *μηδέν*, and not as Dusterd., that *οὐδέν* would only have stated the fact, but by *μηδέν* the Apostle presents it for the consideration of his readers) **from the heathens** (reff. The expositors spoken of above under *ἐξῆλθον*, take these words as belonging to it, "expulsi sunt a paganis," and interpret *μηδὲν λαμβάνοντες*, "nihil secum asportantes," "omnibus rebus spoliati." Grot., who takes *ἐξῆλθον* of expulsion, understands it to have been "a Judæa, per Judæos incredulos, ob Christum:" and takes the rest as meaning "potuerant in ista calamitate adjuvari misericordia *τῶν ἔξω*, sed maluerunt omnia Christianis debere." But the whole interpretation is forced and unnatural, and the ordinary one obvious, and very suitable, considering the motive put forward in ver. 8, which clearly shews them to have been workers for God's truth. The pres. part. *λαμβάνοντες* indicates, not what they did *when* they *ἐξῆλθον*, but their habit after their setting out: and is as so often, indicative of norm, without any particular time being pointed out. So that we need not, with Huther and Düsterd., imagine that there is an allusion to a missionary *maxim*, to take nothing from the heathen, in accordance with which they acted). **We therefore** (*ἡμεῖς*, contrast to the *ἐθνικοί*: *οὖν*, because they *μηδὲν λαμβάνουσιν ἀπὸ τ. ἐθνικῶν*) **ought to support** (see Strabo in reff. Notice the allusion to *λαμβάνοντες* above. The word

ἵνα [e] συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τῇ [f] ἀληθείᾳ. [9] Ἔγραψά τι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἀλλ' ὁ [g] φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν Διοτρέφης οὐκ [h] ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. [10] διὰ τοῦτο, ἐὰν ἔλθω, [i] ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖ λόγοις πονηροῖς [j] φλυαρῶν ἡμᾶς, καὶ μὴ [k] ἀρκούμενος ἐπὶ τούτοις [l] οὔτε αὐτὸς [h] ἐπιδέχεται

e John, and w. dat., here only. Paul, Rom. xvi. 3 alll.† 2 Macc. viii. 7. xiv. 5 only. (-γεῖν, James ii. 22.) f so ver. 12. g here only†. (-τος, Polyb. frag. 115.) h here bis only†. 1 Macc. xii. 8 al. Polyb. vi. 24. 7. see notes. i Luke xxii. 61. John xiv. 26. 2 Tim. ii. 14. Tit. iii. 1. 2 Pet. i. 12. Jude 5 only†. Wisd. xviii. 22 only. (-μνησις, 2 Pet. i. 13.) j here only†. (not transit. elsw.) Xen. Anab. iii. 1. 26. (-ρος, 1 Tim. v. 13.) k elsw. w. dat., Luke iii. 14. 1 Tim. vi. 8. Heb. xiii. 5. 2 Macc. v. 15. (act., Matt. xxv. 9. John vi. 7. xiv. 8. 2 Cor. xii. 9 only.) l so John iv. 11. v. 37, 38.

γινομεθα C c: γενωμεθα K f[1] 36(sic) Thl. for αληθεια, εκκλησια Aℵ[1].
9. εγραψας B. rec om τι, with KL[P] rel æth Thl Œc: for τι, αν ℵ[3] d 13. 36. 40 syrr, *scripsissem forsitan* vulg: αν τι 29. 66[2]: txt ABCℵ[1] coptt.
10. for εαν αν A. ins εις bef ημας C. (*garriens in nos* vulg.)

does not seem to signify "receive hospitably," as some have explained it, nor does it imply, as Œc., Thl., appealing to ὑπέλαβόν με ὡσεὶ λέων ἕτοιμος εἰς θήραν, Ps. xvi. 12, anticipating, not waiting to be asked, in the exercise of good offices) **such persons, that we may become fellow-workers (with them) for the truth** (this, and not as vulg. "ut cooperatores simus veritatis" (so Luth., Grot., Bengel, al.), is the construction. Those with whom one is συνεργός, are put in the *gen.*, see Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, 1 Cor. iii. 9 al. The dat. is commodi: to promote the cause of the truth: so συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τ. θεοῦ, Col. iv. 11,—συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, 1 Thess. iii. 2).

9, 10.] *Notice of the hostility of Diotrephes.* **I wrote somewhat to the church** (the τι does not imply that the thing written was specially important, nor on the other hand does it depreciate; but merely designates indefinitely: cf. Acts xxiii. 17, ἔχει γὰρ ἀπαγγεῖλαί τι αὐτῷ, and Luke vii. 40, Σίμων, ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν: and Matt. xx. 20. The contents of the Epistle are not hinted at. The "scripsissem forsitan" of the vulgate (ἔγραψα ἄν, see var. readd.) has arisen from a foolish notion that the Apostle must not be represented as having written any thing which has been lost to us. The ἐκκλησία is apparently the church of which Caius was a member: not as Bengel, that out of which the missionaries of ver. 7 had gone forth): **howbeit** (ἀλλά after an affirmative sentence is stronger than the mere adversative *but*: see Kühner, Gr. ii. p. 436) **Diotrephes who loveth pre-eminence** (ὁ ὑφαρπάζων τὰ πρωτεῖα as the ancient Schol. He appears to have been not, as Bede, "hæresiarcha temporis illius quidam superbus et insolens, malens nova dicendo primatum sibi usurpare scientiæ quam antiquis sanctæ Ecclesiæ, quæ Johannes prædicabat, humiliter auscultare mandatis:" so much is not implied in the words, but only that he was an ambitious man who willed that not the Apostle but himself should rule the church) **over them** (the members of the church, implied in the word ἐκκλησία. The gen. after verbs of pre-eminence, as ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι Τρώων, Il. ζ. 460: καλλιστεύσει πασέων τῶν ἐν Σπάρτῃ γυναικῶν, Herod. vi. 161. See Kühner, ii. p. 197) **receiveth us not** (does not recognize our authority: here in an improper sense, but in the next verse probably literal: see there. Its more usual sense in Polybius, who uses it frequently, is to *admit of*, τοῦ καιροῦ οὐκ ἐπιδεχομένου καταμονήν, iii. 79. 12. The ἡμᾶς wants no explanation such as "monita nostra," "συστατικάς nostras," or the like: in rejecting the Apostle's person, he rejected all his influence). **On this account, if I should come** (see for ἐάν 1 John ii. 28), **I will bring to mind** (i. e. as Bede, "in omnium notitiam manifestius arguendo producam:" see reff. No αὐτόν is understood: it is not to *his* mind, but to the minds of all) **his works which he doeth** (what they were, is explained by the participle following), **prating against us** (this is the best rendering of φλυαρῶν, which conveys not only the λοιδορῶν, κακολογῶν of Œc., but also that the reproaches were mere tattle, worth nothing, irrelevant: so Eustathius on Il. χ. 361, in Raphel, h. l., τὸ ἐν οὐ δέοντι λόγους προϊέναι φλυεῖν λέγεται κ. φλυαρεῖν. Cf. 1 Tim. v. 13) **with wicked speeches: and not satisfied with** (ἀρκεῖσθαι is ordinarily (see reff.) with a dative: the ἐπί, as in χαίρειν ἐπί, and similar expressions, introduces the ground on which the ἀρκεῖσθαι superimponitur) **this** (more probably plur., as in ver. 4, where the whole matter in question is meant, than as agreeing with the λόγοι πονηροί, which had not been the only

τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς [l] καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους κωλύει καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας [m] ἐκβάλλει.

11 [n] Ἀγαπητέ, μὴ [o] μιμοῦ [pq] τὸ κακόν, ἀλλὰ [qr] τὸ ἀγαθόν. ὁ [s] ἀγαθοποιῶν [t] ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν· ὁ [u] κακοποιῶν οὐχ [v] ἑώρακεν τὸν θεόν. 12 Δημητρίῳ [w] μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων καὶ ὑπ᾿ αὐτῆς τῆς [x] ἀληθείας· [y] καὶ ἡμεῖς [y] δὲ

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h j k l m o 13

m = John ix. 34, 35. Prov. xxii. 10.
n ver. 1.
o 2 Thess. iii. 7, 9. Heb. xiii. 7 only †. Wisd. iv. 2 BN. xv. 9 only. (-μητής, Heb. vi. 12.)
p Rom. ii. 9. vii. 21. xii. 21 bis. xiii. 4 bis. xvi. 19. 1 Cor. xiii. 5 only.
q Rom. xii. 21. (2 Cor. iv. 10.) Deut. xxx. 15.
r Matt. xix. 17. Luke vi. 45. Rom. ii. 10. vii. 13 bis. 1 Pet. iii. 13. 2 Kings xiv. 17.
s Luke vi. 9 ∥ Mk., 33, 35. 1 Pet. ii. 15, 20. iii. 6, 17 only. Num. x. 32. (-ία, 1 Pet. iv. 19. -ός, 1 Pet. ii. 14.)
t 1 John ii. 16 reff.
u Mark iii. 4 ∥ L. 1 Pet. iii. 17 only. Lev. v. 4. (-ός, 1 Pet. iii. 16.)
v 1 John iii. 6.
w pass., Acts x. 22. xvi. 2. xxii. 12. dat., vv. 3, 6 reff.
x so ver. 8.
y 1 John i. 3 reff.

for *βουλομενους*, *επιδεχομενους* C vulg syr-pk syr-mg sah arm: txt ABKL[P]ℵ rel am syr-txt copt æth Thl Œc. om *εκ* ℵ b h [not B, Tischdf expr].

11. rec ins *δε* bef *κακοποιων*, with L a h m tol copt æth arm Thl Œc Did-int: ins *και* bef *ο κακ*. syr-pk: om ABCK[P]ℵ rel 40 vulg syr(Treg) sah.

12. ins *εκκλησιας και* bef *της αληθειας* C syr-pk syr-mg arm. (*α*, *λ*, *η* re-written by an ancient hand in A; there is no reason to suppose that the original scribe wrote *εκκλησιας*, see Woide.) *υπο* [C]ℵ.

things mentioned of him), **neither doth he himself receive the brethren** (here *ἐπιδέχομαι* seems best taken in its literal sense, as in Polyb. xxii. 1. 3, *ἅπαντας ἐπεδέχετο φιλανθρώπως* (if the reading can be depended upon), of entertaining hospitably, see 2 John 10. The **ἀδελφοί** are probably the same as in ver. 5, the travelling missionaries), **and** (so **καί** after **οὔτε** in reff., and Eur. Iph. Taur. 595 f., *εἶ γὰρ οὔτε δυσγενής, καὶ τὰς Μυκήνας οἶσθα*. *τε* is more frequently found, see Kühner, Gramm. ii. p. 441. The occurrence of the construction explains itself. It is found when the negative form of the first member of a series of connected clauses, is not possible or not convenient in the second or any following one. Here it might have been, but not so forcibly expressed, *οὔτε τοὺς βουλομένους ἐᾷ*) **hinders** (by forbidding: cf. 1 Thess. ii. 16) **those that would** (receive them), **and casts them** (those that would receive the brethren: not, as C. F. Fritzsche, Carpzov., al., the travelling brethren themselves) **out of the church** (manifestly, by excommunication, which owing to his influence among them he had the power to inflict. There is no difficulty, nor any occasion to take the word as pointing at that which Diotrephes was *attempting* to do or *threatening* to do, and so as spoken in irony (Huther): the present tense indicates his habit, as *ἐπιδέχεται* and *ποιεῖ* above. He was evidently one in high power, and able to forbid, and to punish, the reception of the travelling brethren. See prolegg.).

11.] Upon occasion of the hostility just mentioned, St. John *exhorts Caius to imitate not the evil but the good*,—probably as shewn in the praises of Demetrius which follow. **Beloved, imitate not evil** (**τὸ κακόν**, abstract), **but good** (abstract also). **He that doeth good, is from God** (is born of God, and has his mission and power from Him: as so often in the first Epistle): **he that doeth evil, hath not seen God** (so in ref., *πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτόν*, where see note. And yet this expression is called by Lücke and De Wette "unjohanneisch," and 1 John iv. 20, adduced to prove it, where the word *ἑώρακεν* is used in its literal physical sense). 12.] *The praise of Demetrius.* **Testimony hath been borne to Demetrius by all** (scil. who know him, and have brought report concerning him: "nemo qui non"), **and by the truth itself** (it is not very easy to explain this expression. If we understand it that the reality of facts themselves supports the testimony of the *πάντες*, we have abundance of authority for the expression in classical usage: Wetst. gives, from Demost. contra Neær. (qu. page?), *δεῖ δ᾿ ὑμᾶς ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἀκούσαντας τῆς τε κατηγορίας καὶ τῆς ἀπολογίας οὕτως ἤδη τὴν ψῆφον φέρειν*: de corona, p. 232, *τούτων τοιούτων ὄντων καὶ ἐπ᾿ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας οὕτω δεικνυμένων*. And from Æsch., contra Timarch., *καταμεμαρτυρημένος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας*. And thus Œc. (*ὑπ᾿ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀλ., τοῦ ἐνεργοῦς λόγου· εἰσὶ γάρ τινες οἷς μαρτυρεῖται μὲν ἀρετή, κατεψευσμένη δὲ ἐπὶ ἀπράκτῳ λόγῳ*), Corn.-a-lap., Bart.-Petr., Grot. ("rebus ipsis"), Joach.-Lange, Carpzov., G. Lange, al., and Beausobre, who (Düsterd.) explains it "sa conduite est un témoin réel

μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ [z] οἶδας ὅτι ἡ [z] μαρτυρία ἡμῶν [z] ἀληθής ἐστιν.

[13] Πολλὰ [a] εἶχον γράψαι σοι, ἀλλ' οὐ θέλω διὰ [b] μέλανος καὶ [c] καλάμου σοι γράφειν, [14] ἐλπίζω δὲ εὐθέως σε ἰδεῖν, καὶ [d] στόμα πρὸς [d] στόμα λαλήσομεν. [15] [e] εἰρήνη σοι.

z John v. 32. xxi. 24.
a 2 John 12.
b 2 Cor. iii. 3. 2 John 12 (reff.) only‡.
c = here only. Ps. xliv. 1. (Matt. xi. 7. Rev. xi. 1 al.)
d 2 John 12 reff.
e John xx. 19, 26. 1 Pet. v. 14. Judg. vi. 23.

rec (for οιδας) οιδατε, with KL rel syrr Thl Œc: οιδαμεν b[2] c h: om και οιδας a: txt ABC[P]ℵ d g 36 vulg D-lat coptt æth arm. αληθης εστιν bef η μαρτυρια ημων m æth: αληθ. ημ. εστ. η μαρτ. C 68.

13. rec (for γραψαι σοι) γραφειν, with KL[P] rel Œc: txt ABCℵ m 40 D-lat syrr coptt æth arm Thl, *tibi scribere* vulg. [αλλα B(Tischdf, expr)]. for ου θελω, ουκ εβουληθην A vulg. καλαμω (*itacism*) L. rec (for γραφειν) γραψαι, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: txt ABCℵ m.—γρα. bef σοι A 13 vulg D-lat syrr copt: om σοι arm.

14. rec ιδειν bef σε, with KL[P]ℵ rel copt Thl Œc: txt ABC m vulg D-lat (σε is omd in both edns of Mai. the reading of B is as here stated: see table at end of prolegg).

[for προς, προ B[1](Tischdf).] λαλησωμεν K Thl: λαλησαμεν ℵ[1], but ο is written over α (1 m?).

de sa vertu." But there are two reasons against this view: 1) that it does not correspond to the objective fact asserted in the μεμαρτύρηται, nor to the parallelizing of this testimony with that of the πάντες and that of the Apostle: and 2) that thus the Christian and divine sense of ἡ ἀλήθεια which St. John seems always to put forward, would be entirely sunk. Nor is the former of these met either by Schlichting, who says, "si ipsa veritas loqui posset, homini isti præberet testimonium virtutis et probitatis," or by Lücke, "if infallible Christian truth itself, cf. ver. 3, could be asked, it would bear favourable witness of him." Against both there is the μεμαρτύρηται, as matter of fact, not of hypothesis. Baumg.-Crus. would understand that Demetrius had done much for the truth, and his deeds were his witness: but this is hardly a witness of ἡ ἀλήθεια to him. Sander takes refuge in the extraordinary supposition, that the Holy Spirit had revealed to the Apostle the truth respecting Demetrius. Huther regards the testimony borne by the truth to be that furnished by the πάντες, whose evidence was decisive, not from their credit as men, but because they all spoke of and from the truth of Christ dwelling in them. This would reduce this new μαρτυρία to the former, and would in fact besides include the following in it likewise. The best interpretation is that of Düsterdieck (from whom much of this note is derived). The objective Truth of God, which is the divine rule of the walk of all believers, gives a good testimony to him who really walks in the truth. This witness lies in the accordance of his walk with the requirement of God's Truth. It was the mirror in which the walk of Demetrius was reflected: and his form, thus seen in the mirror of God's Truth, in which the perfect form of Christ is held up to us (1 John ii. 6, iii. 3, 16), appeared in the likeness of Christ; so that the mirror itself seemed to place in a clear light his Christian virtue and uprightness, and thus to bear witness to him): **yea, we too** (see ref. and note there. The contrast here is between his own personal testimony (for to that and not to any collective one does ἡμεῖς refer) and the two testimonies foregoing) **bear testimony, and thou knowest that our testimony is true** (see reff.).

13—15.] *Close of the Epistle.* **I had** (not, as Huther, for εἶχον ἄν: it is a pure imperfect, describing that which has not come to pass, but might have done so under certain conditions: cf. Acts xxv. 22: Rom. ix. 3, also alleged by Düsterd. is not quite a case in point. He gives the meaning here well: "I had indeed much to write: that I have not written it is owing to this, that I wish not, &c.") **many things to write to thee, howbeit I will not to write** (present, not only "to write them," which would be aorist, but to write at all, to write any more) **by means of ink and reed** (see on 2 John 12): **but** (on the other hand) **I hope immediately to see thee, and** (then) **we shall speak mouth to mouth** (see 2 John 12). **Peace be to thee** (beautifully paraphrased by Lyra, "Pax interna conscientiæ, pax fraterna amicitiæ, pax superna gloriæ." Remember our Lord's legacy, John xiv. 27, and His greeting after the Resurrection, εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, John xx. 19, 26). The

f John x. 3 only.

ἀσπάζονταί σε οἱ φίλοι. ἀσπάζου τοὺς φίλους f κατ' ὄνομα.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Γ.

15. for φιλοι, αδελφοι A d m 13 syr-mg æth. ασπασαι ℵ. at end ins αμην L 15. 26; vale tol.

SUBSCRIPTION. elz om, with rel: τελος h: επιστολη γ' του αγιου αποστολου ιωαννου L: ιωαννου επιστολη γ' C: txt ABℵ. [P doubtful.] Here, as elsewhere, B spells ιωανου with only one ν.

friends salute thee. Salute the friends by name ("non secus ac si nomina eorum præscripta essent." Bengel). The reason why St. John mentions φίλοι (see John xi. 11, xv. 15; Acts xxvii. 3), and not ἀδελφοί (1 Cor. xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 21; Eph. vi. 23), is probably to be found in the personal character of the Epistle, not addressed as from an Apostle to a church, but as from a friend to his friend, in which mutual friends on both sides would be the senders and receivers of salutation.

ΙΟΥΔΑ.

..c

[1] Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [a] δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῖς [b] ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ [b] ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ [c] τετηρημένοις [d] κλητοῖς· [2] [e] ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ [e] εἰρήνη καὶ [e] ἀγάπη [f] πληθυνθείη.

a Phil. i. 1. James i. 1. Eph. vi. 6.
b here only. see note.
c = John xvii. 11.
d = Rom. i. 6, 7. 1 Cor. i. 24.
e here only. see 2 John 3 reff.
f 1 Pet. i. 2. 2 Pet. i. 2. Dan. iii. 31 (98).

TITLE. elz *ιουδα του αποστολου επιστολη καθολικη* [with P?]: Steph *επ. τ. ιουδα καθ.*: *επ. του αγιου αποστ. ιουδα* L al Thl: *αλλος αδελφοθεος ταδ' ιουδας ευσεβεεσιν* f: *επ. ιουδα αδελφου ιακωβου* k: *ιουδα καθολικη επ.* h o: *ιου. επ. καθ.* l m: *ιουδα επιστολη* A(appy) CK 13. 36(sic): txt Bℵ.

VERSE 1. *χριστου* bef *ιησου* K[P] b c d k l o 40 demid tol: txt ABLℵ rel vss Orig Synop Lucif. rec (for *ηγαπημενοις*) *ηγιασμενοις*, with KL[P] rel Thl: txt ABℵ vulg syrr coptt arm Orig Ephr Synop Œc Thl-comm Lucif Aug Cassiod Bede. (13 def.) 2. om 1st *και* K.

1, 2.] *Address and greeting.* **Judas, a servant of Jesus Christ** (**δοῦλος**, probably not here in the wider sense, in which all Christians are servants of Christ—but in that special sense in which those were bound to His service who were employed in the preaching and disseminating of His word: see reff.: on the absence of any official designation, see prolegomena), **and brother of James** (see prolegomena), **to the called** (in the sense of St. Paul (reff.); effectually drawn by God the Father to the knowledge of the Gospel), **beloved in** (the phrase is one not elsewhere found, and difficult of interpretation. The meanings "*by*," = ὑπό, cf. 2 Thess. ii. 13, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου; "*on account of*," understanding ἠγαπημένοις "beloved *by the writer*," are hardly admissible. The only allowable sense of ἐν seems to be, "in the case of," "as regards," understanding of course that the love of the Father is spoken of) **God the Father** (St. Paul ordinarily in his greetings adds ἡμῶν to θεὸς πατήρ, cf. Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 1; Philem. 3. But he has θεὸς πατήρ absolutely in the following places; Gal. i. 1, 2; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; 2 Thess. i. 2; 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4; as also St. Peter, 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 17; St. John, 2 John 3. It became more frequently used, as might be expected, in the later days of the canon) **and kept for Jesus Christ** (reserved, to be His at the day of His coming: the dative is commodi. If the question be asked, kept by whom? the answer must be, by God the Father: though constructionally the words are not connected. Observe the perfect participles, giving the signification "from of old and still"): **mercy to you and peace and love be multiplied** (all three proceeding from God: God's mercy, God's peace, God's love: see ver. 21. In the somewhat similar passage, Eph. vi. 23, εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς κ. ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς κ. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, the love and faith are clearly, in themselves, the gift of God: mutual love or love towards God. But the other seems better here).

Ἰησοῦς [h] λαὸν [i] ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου [i] σώσας, [k] τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς [l] μὴ [l] πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. [6] ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ [m] τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν [n] ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ [o] ἀπολιπόντας τὸ [p] ἴδιον [q] οἰκητήριον, [r] εἰς [s] κρίσιν [t] μεγάλης [t] ἡμέρας

ABCKL ℵ a b c . f g h k l m o 13

h = Matt. i. 21. Luke ii. 32 al. fr. Deut. iv. 20. i John xii. 27. Heb. v. 7. 1 Macc. ii. 59. k 2 Cor. xiii. 2. Gen. (xxii. 15.) xxvii. 36. l 2 Thess. ii. 12. m = Rev. xvi. 15 reff. n Eph. i. 21. iii. 10. Col. i. 16. ii. 10 al. Gen. xli. 13 o = here (2 Tim. iv. 13, 20. Tit. i. 5. Heb. iv. 6, 9 x. 26) only. p = Gal. vi. 9 al. q 2 Cor. v. 2 only. (Jer xxxii. (xxv.) 30 Ald.) r John xii. 7. Acts xxv. 21. 1 Pet. i. 4. 2 Pet. ii. 4. s = Matt. x. 15. xi. 22. 2 Thess. i. 5 al. fr. Isa. i. 24. t = Rev. vi. 17 reff.

τας syr-pk. (C[1] is lost.) rec (for ιησους) ο κυριος, with (C[1] ?) KL rel syr Synop Œc Thl, κυριος ℵ : ο θεος C[2] 5. 8. 68 tol syr-pk arm Clem Lucif : txt AB(sic : see table) 13 vulg coptt æth Cyr Did-int Jer Cassian.

6. for τε, δε A f vulg syr copt Ath-4-mss Thl Jer Cassiod : txt BCKLℵ rel syr-pk sah æth arm Clem Orig Ath-ms Œc Lucif Vig. for αλλα, αλλ C a h k m Ath Thl.

tremely curious relation of the two passages to each other, that many common terms are used in different senses).

5—7.] *Examples of Divine vengeance.*

5.] *First example:* unbelieving Israel in the wilderness. Cf. Heb. iii. 16—iv. 5. **But** (solemn contrast to the conduct just mentioned) **I wish to remind you, knowing as ye do** (better here than "although ye know," on account of ἅπαξ. "Causa, cur admoneat duntaxat; quia jam sciant, semelque cognitum habeant." Bengel. The E. V. is doubly wrong: in rendering εἰδότας as an aor. part., "*though ye . . . knew,*" and in giving to ἅπαξ the signification of "*olim,*" "*once*") **once for all** (i.e. having once for all received the knowledge of) **all things** (all that refers to that of which I am speaking: the τοῦτο of the rec. was a good explanation: but πάντα is more forcible, and carries with it a latent admonition, to apply other examples for yourselves), **that Jesus** (critical principles seem to require this remarkable reading. It is not entirely precedented by 1 Cor. x. 4: for there St. Paul uses not the personal human name, but χριστός, in which there is no such difficulty. The only account to be given seems, that the Person designated by the two names being the same, they became sometimes convertibly used in popular exhortation. On the fact see Exod. xiv. 19; xxiii. 20, 23; xxxii. 2; Isa. lxiii. 9, where however note the remarkable rendering of the LXX), **having saved the people** (perhaps "*a people:*" λαός is not one of those words of which we can say that they are constantly found without the art. where yet their meaning is definite: cf. Acts xv. 14, Rom. x. 21, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Heb. viii. 10, 1 Pet. ii. 9 (10). But we are never safe in strictness on this point in these later Epistles; and especially when an objective case is thus thrown forward into emphasis, which emphasis often does the work of the definite article) **out of the land of Egypt, secondly** (not as E. V., "afterward:" still less with Grot., Wolf, "*ex contrario:*" but it indicates a second deed of the Lord, His first-mentioned having been the deliverance out of Egypt. By this τὸ δεύτερον the former aor. part. is marked as being not contemporary with but antecedent to the aor. verb following) **destroyed them that believed not** (viz. by forbidding their entrance into the land of promise (cf. Heb. iii. 18), and slaying them in the wilderness. This example is not mentioned in 2 Pet. ii., but instead of it, the judgment of the flood).

6.] *Second example:* the rebel angels. See 2 Pet. ii. 4. **And** (τε shews that the connexion with the foregoing is very close) **angels, those which kept not** (ἀγγέλους is probably indefinite, and then the art. τούς designates those angels who are meant. μή stands with the part., not οὐ, because μὴ τηρήσαντας conveys not only the fact (cf. οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, 1 Pet. ii. 10), but the reason for what follows: cf. Matt. xviii. 25, μὴ ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ πραθῆναι. See Acts xxi. 34: Luke xii. 47, ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοῦλος ὁ . . μὴ ἑτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσας . . . δαρήσεται πολλάς: and many more examples in Winer, edn. 6, § 55, where the whole matter is ably discussed) **their own dignity** (some interpret ἀρχή, as E. V., "*first estate,*" "original condition." So Erasm., Calv., and Beza, "originem:" Stier, "ihren ersten Grund:" some again, "*the government which was over them,*" viz. that of God: so Ollarius in a dissertation on this passage, cited in Wolf, h. l. But seeing that angels are often in the N. T. called ἀρχαί, as they also were among the Jews, and that such meaning answers best to the parallel clause which follows, there can be little doubt that the Vulg. "principatum" is right. The fact alluded to is probably that which is obscurely indicated in Gen. vi. 2. See prolegomena), **but left their own** (proper) **habitation** (viz. heaven), **He hath kept** (τετήρηκεν, in sharp contrast to τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας. The word is a pregnant one, ἔδησεν or περιέθηκεν, τοῦ

[u] δεσμοῖς [v] ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ [w] ζόφον [x] τετήρηκεν· 7 [x] ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμοῤῥα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, τὸν ὅμοιον [y] τρόπον τούτοις [z] ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ [a] ἀπελθοῦσαι [a] ὀπίσω σαρκὸς [b] ἑτέρας, [c] πρόκεινται [d] δεῖγμα [e] πυρὸς [e] αἰωνίου [f] δίκην [g] ὑπέχουσαι. 8 ὁμοίως [h] μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι [i] ἐνυπνια-

...και αι m. ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h k l o 13

u Luke viii. 29 al. fr. Ps. ii. 3
v Rom. i. 20 only +. Wisd. vii. 26 only. (-ότης, Wisd. ii. 23 F (not ABℵ).)
w Heb. xii. 18. 2 Pet. ii. 4, 17. ver. 13 only +. Symm., Ps. x. 2. xc. 6.
x = Luke xx. 37. 1 Thess. ii. 11.
y constr., Matt. xxiii. 37 al. fr. Isa. xiv. 24.
z here only. Gen. xxxviii. 24.
a Mark i. 20. John xii. 19. see Deut. iv. 3.
b = here only. (1 Cor. xiv. 21.) Exod. xxx. 9.
c 2 Cor. viii. 12. Heb. vi. 18. xii. 1, 2 only. Levit. xxiv. 7 al.
d here only +. (ὑπόδ., 2 Pet. ii. 6. παράδ., 3 Macc. ii. 5.)
e Matt. xviii. 8.
f Acts xxviii. 4. 2 Thess. i. 9 only. Ezek. xxv. 12.
g here only. 2 Macc. iv. 48. Ps. lxxxviii. 50. Lam. v. 7 only. τούτου δικην ὑπέχειν, Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 8. ὑπέχειν θανάτου κρίσιν, Polyb. xii. 8. 5. see also xvi. 27. 2 al. in index.
h James ii. 8 reff.
i Acts ii. 17 only, from Joel ii. 28. Gen. xxxvii. 6, 9, 10. Isa. xxix. 8. lvi. 10.

7. rec *τουτοις* bef *τροπον*, with KL rel arm Œc Thl: om *τουτοις* 40 vulg sah: txt ABCℵ 13 syrr copt Ephr. aft *προκειται* ins *δε* ℵ. *υπερεχουσαι* A: *απεχουσαι* 40: *ουκ εχουσιν* ℵ[1]: *υπεχουσιν* ℵ[3].

8. for *ομοιως*, *ομως* A.

τηρῆσαι) **against the judgment of the great day** (at the end of the world) **in eternal bonds under darkness** (cf. Hes., Theogon. 729, *ἔνθα θεοὶ Τιτῆνες ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠερόεντα | κεκρύφαται βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο | χώρῳ ἐν εὐρώεντι.* The **ὑπό** in both cases is to be accounted for by the darkness being considered as brooding over them, and they under it. There is apparently a difference which we cannot explain, between the description of the rebel angels here and in || 2 Pet., and that in the rest of the N. T., where the devil and his angels are said to be powers of the air, and to go about tempting men. But perhaps we are wrong in absolutely identifying the evil spirits mentioned here with those spoken of in 2 Pet.).

7.] *Third Example:* Sodom and Gomorrha. See 2 Pet. ii. 6. **How** (not "even as," E. V.; "wie auch," Luther; "*similiter*," Semler, al.; nor does it answer to *ὁμοίως* below, ver. 8; but is dependent on *ὑπομνῆσαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι* above, ver. 5, and parallel with *ὅτι* there: see reff.) **Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them, following fornication** (the *ἐκ*, as in ref. Gen., seems to mean, to its fulfilment, thoroughly, without reserve: hardly, as Stier, "beyond the bounds of nature," though this was so) **in like manner to these** (*τούτοις*, the angels above mentioned. The manner was similar, because the angels committed fornication with another race than themselves, thus also *ἀπελθόντες ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας*. So *τούτοις* is taken by Lud.-Cappell., Herder, Augusti, Schneckenburger, Lachmann, De Wette, Arnaud, Stier, Huther. But other references have been attempted. Beza, Est., Calov., Krebs, understand the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha to be intended: justifying the construction by such passages as Jos. Vita 69, *τίνα τρόπον ἐξαρπάσω τὴν Τιβεριάδα τῆς Γαλιλαίων ὀργῆς ἔτι αὐτούς*. But it is fatal to this, that thus we should have *αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις* as the main subject of the sentence, and Sodom and Gomorrha only mentioned by the way. Again, Bengel and Rosenmüller have referred **τούτοις** to the ungodly men who are being treated of. But this is still less likely, seeing that they come in ver. 8, evidently after a series of examples in which they have not been mentioned, with *ὁμοίως μέντοι* **καὶ οὗτοι**) **and going away after** (see reff. Here more stress is to be laid on the *ἀπ-*, than in those passages: it was a departure from the appointed course of nature and seeking after that which was unnatural) **other flesh** (than that appointed by God for the fulfilment of natural desire: as Œc., *σάρκα ἑτέραν τὴν ἄρρενα φύσιν λέγει. ὡς μὴ πρὸς συνουσίαν γενέσεως συντελοῦσαν*: the sin of Sodom was afterwards common in the most enlightened nations of antiquity, see Rom. i. 27. But in all probability Sodom and Gomorrha must be numbered among those whose sin went farther even than this: cf. Levit. xviii. 22—25. See 2 Pet. ii. 10), **are set forth as an example** (reff. Libanius says of Troy, *κεῖται παράδειγμα δυστυχίας*), **undergoing** (to this day, pres. part. alluding to the natural phænomena of the Dead sea: cf. Wisd. x. 7, *οἷς ἐπὶ μαρτύριον τῆς πονηρίας καπνιζομένη καθέστηκε χέρσος*: and Winer's Realw., "Todtes Meer") **the just punishment of eternal fire** (**δίκην ὑπέχειν**, see reff.: especially 2 Macc., and add *δίκην τίειν*, 2 Thess. i. 9. **πυρὸς αἰωνίου** is far better joined with *δίκην* than with *δεῖγμα* as Huther: and the sense is, undergoing the punishment, as may even now be seen, of eternal fire: of that fire which shall never be quenched).

8 ff.] *Designation of these evil men as*

k John xviii. 28. Tit. i. 15 (bis). Heb. xii. 5 only. Ezek. xviii. 6.
l Eph. i. 21. Col. i. 16. 2 Pet. ii. 10 only †.
m Mark vii. 9. Luke x. 16. John xii. 48.

ζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν [k] μιαίνουσιν, [l] κυριότητα δὲ [m] ἀθετοῦσιν, [n] δόξας δὲ [o] βλασφημοῦσιν. [9] ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ [p] ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ [q] διακρινόμενος [r] διελέγετο [s] περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος, οὐκ [t] ἐτόλμησεν [u] κρίσιν [v] ἐπενεγκεῖν [w] βλασφημίας, ἀλλὰ εἶπεν [x] Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος. [10] οὗτοι

ABCKL ℵ a b c d f g h k l o 13

1 Cor. i. 19. Gal. ii. 21 al. Isa. xlviii. 8. (-τησις, Heb. vii. 18.) n = 2 Pet. ii. 10 only. (see Philo in note.) o = 2 Pet. ii. 2, 10 al. fr. Isa. lii. 5. p 1 Thess. iv. 16 only †. see Dan. xii. 1 LXX. q = Acts xi. 2 (but w. πρός) only. (ver. 22.) Jer. xv. 10. r Acts xvii. 2. xix. 8. xx. 7 al. Exod. vi. 27. 2 Macc. xi. 20. s Acts xxiv. 25 only. t = Acts v. 13. Rom. v. 7. 1 Cor. vi. 1. 2 Cor. x. 12. Esth. vii. 5. u (see Polyb. under g.) = John vii. 24. viii. 16. 2 Pet. ii. 11. Deut. xix. 6. v = Rom. iii. 5 only. Gen. xxxvii. 21. = φέρειν, Acts xxv. 18. 2 Pet. ii. 11. w Rev. xiii. 1. xvii. 3. Ezek. xxxv. 12. (-μος, 2 Pet. ii. 11.) x gospp. (exc. John) passim. elsewhere, 2 Tim. iv. 2 only. Zech. iii. 2 (? see note).

κυριοτητας ℵ Orig-int. 9. for ο δε and οτε, ο τε or οτε and τοτε B. (αλλα, so AB.) [σοι is repeated by B[1]] for κυριος, ο θεος ℵ[1], ο κυριος ℵ[3].

following the same destructive courses. **In like manner nevertheless** (i. e. notwithstanding these warning examples) **these men in their dreams** (ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, by the construction of the sentence which proceeds with σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυρ. δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν,—must belong not to the first member alone, but to all. This necessity precludes the whole class of meanings represented by "de somniis, in quibus corpus polluitur:" explained by Calv., "est metaphorica loquutio, qua significat, ipsos esse tam hebetes, ut sine ulla verecundia ad omnem turpitudinem se prostituant." And those being got rid of, and *a fortiori* the interpretation given by Bretschneider, "falsis oraculis decepti, vel falsa oracula edentes" (see reff.),—we have but this left, that the word should represent that state of dreaming in the sleep of sin, out of which men are so often called on to awake to righteousness and the light of Christ: so (in Huther) Horneius: "tam insipientes sunt, ut quasi lethargo quodam sopiti non tantum impure vivant, sed etiam quæ non norunt tam audacter vituperent:" and Arnaud (ibid.), "cependant ceux-ci, comme des gens qui agissent sans savoir ce qu'ils font, comme s'ils rêvaient, pour ainsi dire, . . . ") **defile the flesh** (by unnatural lusts, as in ver. 7. σάρκα, generally: not, '*their* flesh,' but our common flesh), **and despise lordship and speak evil of glories** (of what sort? Calv., Beza, Grot., Leclerc, Wolf, Semler, al., understand those of kings and Cæsars: Œc. alt., Hammond, include ecclesiastical rulers and Apostles. But to neither of these meanings can vv. 9, 10 be fitted: and it becomes therefore necessary to understand the words of celestial lordships and dignities: probably in both cases those of the holy angels. So De Wette: similarly Huther, but understanding κυριότητα of God, and δόξας of the angels. It is against this last view, that κυριότης, in reff. Eph. Col., is used of angels. Philo de Monarchia i. 6, vol. ii. p. 218, says, δόξαν δὲ σὴν εἶναι νομίζω τάς σε δορυφορούσας δυνάμεις. The ancient interpretations were curious, as given in the Oxf. Catena: τὴν μίαν κυριότητα κ. δόξαν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος βλασφημοῦντες:— again, δόξας ἐκάλεσε τὰς δύο διαθήκας, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος φησίν, εἰ γὰρ ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξα: and so Severus also, and Œc. alt.): 9.] **But Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed concerning the body of Moses, dared not** (by the context, from reverence for Satan's former glory) **bring against him a judgment of evil speaking** (i. e. as E. V., a railing accusation: a sentence savouring of, belonging to, βλασφημία; not as Calov., "ultionem de blasphemia sumere:" the blasphemy is not one spoken *by*, but *against*, the devil), **but said, The Lord rebuke thee** (the source of the tradition to which St. Jude here refers as familiar to his readers, is not known with any certainty. Origen, περὶ ἀρχῶν, iii. 2. 1, vol. i. p. 138, says, "primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur: de quo in Adscensione Mosis, cujus libelli meminit in Epistola sua Apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis, ait . . . " Œc. h. l. says, λέγεται τὸν Μιχαὴλ τὸν ἀρχάγγελον τῇ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ταφῇ δεδιηκονηκέναι, τοῦ διαβόλου τοῦτο μὴ καταδεχομένου, ἀλλ' ἐπιφέροντος ἔγκλημα αὐτῷ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου φόνου, ὡς αὐτοῦ ὄντος τοῦ Μωϋσέως, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μὴ συγχωρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν τυχεῖν ἐντίμου ταφῆς. No such tradition is found in any apocryphal or rabbinical book now extant. In the targum of Jonathan in Deut. xxxiv. 6, it is stated that the grave of Moses was given into the special custody of Michael. See also several Rabbinical

δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν [y] βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ [z] φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ [a] ἄλογα [b] ζῶα [c] ἐπίστανται, [d] ἐν τούτοις [de] φθείρονται. 11 [f] οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ [g] ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάϊν [h] ἐπορεύθησαν,

y ver. 8. 2 Pet. ii. 12.
z here only †. Diod. Sic. xx. 55. (-κός, 2 Pet. ii. 12.)
a = 2 Pet. ii. 12 (Acts xxv. 27) only. (Exod. vi. 12. Num. vi. 12.) Wisd. xi. 15 only.
b Rev. iv. 6 ref.
c Acts xviii. 25. xix. 15. James iv. 14. Job xiii. 2.
d 2 Pet. ii. 12. Rev. xix. 2.
e as above (d). 1 Cor. iii. 17. xv. 33. 2 Cor. vii. 2. xi. 3. Eph. iv. 22 only. Gen. vi. 11.
f gospp. (exc. John) & Rev. passim. elsewhere, 1 Cor. ix. 16 only. Hos. vii. 13.
g = 2 Pet. ii. 15. 3 Kings xv. 34.
h constr., Acts ix. 31. xiv. 16 only. Prov. xxviii. 26.

legends having more or less reference to the point in Wetstein. Some, mentioned as early as Severus in the Catena, have given an allegorical interpretation, understanding by *τὸ σῶμα Μωϋσέως* the law, or Jewish polity, or even people: and, thus interpreting, fix the occasion very variously: at the giving of the law (*τινὲς* in Severus): at the siege under Hezekiah, or the rebuilding under Zerubbabel (Starck, in Wolf). All such explanations are of course out of the question: and the literal matter of fact alone to be held fast. It is, however, remarkable, that the same words, *ἐπιτιμήσαι (ἐν) σοι κύριος*, are spoken by the angel (*κύριος*, LXX) to the devil in Zech. iii. 1—3. This has led some, e. g. Bede, to imagine, that this was the occasion referred to, when Joshua and Satan stood as adversaries concerning the deliverance of Israel from captivity. Another and more curious explanation is given in the Catena: *ὅτε ἤγαγεν (ὁ Μιχαὴλ) Μωϋσῆν ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἔνθα μετεμορφώθη ὁ κύριος, τότε ἔλεγεν ὁ διάβολος τῷ Μιχαὴλ, ἐψεύσατο ὁ θεὸς εἰσαγαγὼν τὸν Μωϋσῆν, ἔνθα ὤμοσε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτόν.* The whole matter is thoroughly discussed, and every source of illustration exhausted, in Rampf, Der Brief Judæ u. s. w. pp. 201—253. His conclusion, in which I entirely agree, is that St. Jude took the incident from primitive tradition, which tradition slightly modified, is also given by the prophet Zechariah. That the incident is related as matter of fact, and not as an "argumentum ad hominem," is evident by the very form of it. That, being thus related as matter of fact, it *is* matter of fact, is a conclusion which will or will not be made, according as we are or are not persuaded of the authenticity of our Epistle as a part of canonical Scripture: and according as we esteem that canonical Scripture itself).

10.] *Contrast of the behaviour of these persons to that just related.* 2 Pet. ii. 12. **These on the other hand, whatever things they know not, speak evil of** (the reference in **ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν** is to the spiritual world. Those who understand *κυριότητα* and *δόξας* above of human authorities, are at a loss for an explanation here: so Arnaud, "il est assez difficile de préciser, quelles étaient ces choses qu'ignoraient ces impies"): **but whatever things naturally, as the irrational animals, they understand** (viz. the objects of sense: of which *σάρξ* ver. 8 has already been mentioned as one. **φυσικῶς**, as Œc., *φυσικῇ ὁρμῇ ἀδιακρίτως*: Wetst. cites Xen. Cyr. 7, *μάχῃ, ἣν ὁρῶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους φυσικῶς ἐπισταμένους*: but it appears from Sturz, Lex. Xen. *φύσις*, 1. f. that the place is Cyr. ii. 3. 5, and the word *φύσει*, not *φυσικῶς*. In Xen. Apol. Socr. iii. 9. 1, we have *ἡ ἀνδρεία πότερον εἴη διδακτὸν ἢ φυσικόν.* In 2 Pet. ii. 12, the comparison to irrational creatures is not confined to the sort of knowledge which they have, but is extended to the persons themselves and their conduct), **in these** (in the element and region of these) **they corrupt themselves** (or, are depraved). 11.] The description is interrupted by a *denunciation on them for having followed in the steps of former ungodly men.* **Woe unto them** (see reff.: from which it appears that Bengel is not exact, when he says "uno hoc loco unus hic apostolus *væ* intentat"): **for they went by the way** (the dat. is probably one of rule, cf. reff., rather than one following *ἐν* understood. The aorists *ἐπορεύθησαν*, &c. are probably proleptic, as looking back on their course; as those in John xvii.,—*ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, &c. In an English *version* we are almost compelled to render these by our perfect, "they have gone," &c.) **of Cain** (how? Œc. answers, *διὰ τῆς ἀδελφοκτονίας*, by perverse doctrine, or even according to his interpretation of *ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι* above, by abusing that process by which men might be born into the world: Grot., "Cain fratri vitam caducam ademit: illi fratribus adimunt æternam." But these explanations do not seem to fit the context, where as yet no indication has been given of their *seducing* power. Some (e. g. Lyra) have answered, from their persecuting the believers: but neither does this appear in the context: others, as De Wette and Arnaud, have regarded Cain simply as a representative of all bad men: Schneckenb., as that of all unbelievers, according to Jewish tradition ("respondit Cain . . . non est judicium nec judex, nec est aliud sæculum,"

καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ [k] μισθοῦ [l] ἐξεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ [m] ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο. [12] οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς [n] ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν [o] σπιλάδες, [p] συνευωχούμενοι [q] ἀφόβως,

i Rom. i. 27. Eph. iv. 14. James v. 20. 2 Pet. ii. 18. iii. 7 al. Jer. xxiii. 17.
k 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15. Micah iii. 11. (constr., see note.)
l = here only. Sir. xxxvii. 29. see note.
m Heb. xii. 3 reff.
n = here only †.
o here only †.
p 2 Pet. ii. 13 only †. Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 7. (εὐωχ., Judith i. 16.
q Luke i. 74. 1 Cor. xvi. 10. Phil. i. 14 only. Prov. i. 33. Wisd. xvii. 4 BN (-βος, AC. Prov. iii. 24 al.) only.

12. aft ουτοι εισιν ins γογγυσται μεμψιμοιροι κατα(κα (sic) ℵ[1]) τας ιδιας(om ιδιας ℵ[1]) επιθυμιας αυτων πορευομενοι (ver 16) C[2]ℵ[1] arm (sah æth). (C[1] is lost: ℵ[3] corrects κατα but disapproves the whole insertion.) rec om οι, with C[2](but see above) KN[1] rel vulg Œc Thl Lucif: ins A B(sic: see table at end of prolegg) Lℵ[3] 13. 36 syrr copt Pallad Did-int Aug. for αγαπαις, απαταις AC: ευωχιαις 6. 66[2]: txt BKLℵ rel vss Pallad Œc Thl Lucif Did-int Aug. for υμων, αυτων A vulg syr-pk arm Lucif Bede: txt BCKLℵ rel syr coptt æth Œc Thl Lucif Did-int. (αυτων, though written by A[1], is over an erasure.) aft συνευωχουμενοι ins υμιν C copt (sah) arm.

&c. Targ. Hieros. ad Gen. iv. 7: see also Philo, "quod deterius," &c., p. 155 ff., De agricultura, p. 169. De Wette). The most probable answer is that given by Stier and Huther, that the point of comparison is that selfish regard and envy which was at the root of Cain's sin), **and rushed after** (ἐκχυθῆναι, "effundi in," as Tacitus, Ann. i. 54, "Mæcenate effuso in amorem Bathylli:" so Polyb. xxxii. 11. 4, οἱ δ' εἰς ἑταίρας ἐξεκέχυντο: Clem. Al. Strom. ii. 20 (118), p. 491 P., εἰς ἡδονὴν ἐκχυθέντες) **the error of Balaam for reward** (such, and not as De Wette, "they were poured out (ruined) by the deception of the reward of Balaam." So also Horneius, "deceptione mercedis qua deceptus fuit Balaam, effusi sunt." For this latter disturbs the parallelism of the three clauses, in which we have τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Κάϊν, . . . τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ, . . . τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορέ, strictly correlative. De Wette's reasons for his view are (1) that the ordinary rendering severs the purpose, "for reward," from the error of Balaam: 2) that "for reward" does not suit ἐξεχύθησαν, which implies recklessness. But it may be answered to 1) that this by no means follows: for under the μισθοῦ may be well implied, "as Balaam did," or we may take μισθοῦ—ἐξεχύθησαν as one idea, "they ran-greedily-for reward," and τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Β., after the error of Baalam, i. e. as Balaam did in his πλάνη: and to 2) that although ἐκχυθῆναι implies recklessness, yet it may be reckless pursuit of some favourite end, as in "alienari in libidinem." As to the construction, πλάνῃ may be either the normal dative, as τῇ ὁδῷ above, or the dat. of direction, = εἰς τὴν πλάνην: and the gen. μισθοῦ is the usual one of price, as in 1 Cor. vii. 23, τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε), **and perished in the gainsaying** (ἀντιλογίᾳ, either the instrumental dative, "perished by gainsaying, as Korah," or the dative with ἐν implied, "perished in," i. e. as included in, "the gainsaying of Korah," i.e. when we read of Korah and his company perishing in their gainsaying, we read of these too, as perishing after the same example. This latter seems preferable, on account of the parallelism with the other two clauses) **of Korah** (the common point being, that they like Korah despised God's ordinances. **ἀντιλογίᾳ**, because Korah and his company ἀντέλεγον τῷ Μωϋσῇ. See reff., and cf. τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ἀντιλογίας, Num. xx. 13 (24), xxvii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 53, xxxiii. 8; Ps. lxxx. 7, cv. 32).

12, 13.] *Continuation of the description of these ungodly men.* 2 Pet. ii. 13, 17. **These are the rocks (which are) in your love-feasts** (σπιλάδες, αἱ ὕφαλοι πέτραι. Etymol. M. Cf. Od. ε. 405, ἀλλ' ἀκταὶ προβλῆτες ἔσαν, σπιλάδες τε πάγοι τε. See Wetst.'s note. They are the rocks on which the ἀγάπαι stand in danger of being wrecked. Cf. Œc., as quoted under ἀφόβως below. It is unnecessary and unjustifiable to attempt to give σπιλάδες any other meaning, as some have done on account of the σπίλοι in 2 Pet. ii. 13. Be: each passage must stand on its own ground. See Palm and Rost's Lex., who however give at the end, = ὁ σπίλος, citing for it this passage and Orph. lith. 614. Arnaud endeavours to unite both meanings, resting on the etymology as given by Eustathius (see Wetst.), αἱ παράλιαι πέτραι, παρὰ τὸ σπιλοῦσθαι τῇ ἄχνῃ: "les rochers continuellement battus par les flots de la mer et souillés par son écume:" but this is too far-fetched. See by all means the illustrations in Wetstein. As regards the construction, we might, as Stier, take οἱ with σπιλάδες: but the above may, supplying ὄντες, seem better, as ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας κ.τ.λ. ver. 6. **ἀγάπαις** has generally been taken to refer to the love-feasts: th[e] ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις γινόμεναι τράπεζαι, [...]

ἑαυτοὺς [r] ποιμαίνοντες· νεφέλαι [st] ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων [u] παραφερόμεναι, δένδρα [v] φθινοπωρινὰ [tw] ἄκαρπα [x] δὶς ἀποθανόντα [y] ἐκριζωθέντα, 13 [za] κύματα [ab] ἄγρια θαλάσσης

r Matt. ii. 6 al. Ezek. xxxiv. (2, 8) 10. s Matt. xii. 43 || L. 2 Pet. ii. 17 only. Ps. lxii. 1. t Jer. ii. 6.

u = Heb. xiii. 9 (Mark xiv. 36 || L.) only. 1 Kings xxi. 13 (Ezra x. 7) only. v here only †. Polyb. iv. 37. 2. w Matt. xiii. 22 || Mk. 1 Cor. xiv. 14. Eph. v. 11. Tit. iii. 14. 2 Pet. i. 8 only. Jer. ii. 6. Wisd. xv. 4 only. x Mark xiv. 30, 72. Luke xviii. 12. Phil. iv. 16. 1 Thess. ii. 18 only. 3 Kings xi. 9. y Matt. xiii. 29. xv. 13. Luke xvii. 6 only. Jer. i. 10. z Matt. viii. 24. xiv. 24 Mark iv. 37 ; Acts xxvii. 41 ; only. a Wisd. xiv. 1. b Matt. iii. 4 || Mk. only.

for *υπο ανεμων*, *παντι ανεμω* ℵ 25-6 Lucif. rec *περιφερομεναι*, with copt Œc, *circumferuntur* vulg₁ : *circumferendæ* Lucif : *φερομεναι* k : txt AB(-*νοι*, sic, see table) CKLℵ rel 40 syr(appy) sah æth (arm) Thl. *φθινοπωρικα* ℵ[1].
13. *αγρια* bef *κυματα* ℵ : om *αγρ.* sah.

καὶ Παῦλός φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους, ἃς καὶ ἀγάπας ἐκάλουν: see Winer, Realw. Erasmus would keep the ordinary meaning, "in dilectionibus vestris," or "inter charitates vestras." But the *συνευωχούμενοι* seems to fix the other. St. Peter has for *ἀγάπαις*, *ἀπάταις*, as at present read: see note there), **feasting with you** (*συνευωχούμενοι may* mean, feasting together: but the *ὑμῶν* preceding makes the other more probable) **fearlessly** (**ἀφόβως** is joined with *ἑαυτ. ποιμ.* by Erasm., Beza (and consequently E. V.), Tricæus, and Stier: but thus *συνευωχ.* would be left standing very badly alone. "Cum timore colenda sunt convivia sacra. Convivari per se nihil vitii habet. Ideo 'sine timore' huic verbo annecti debet," Bengel. Œc. mentions both arrangements: *ἀφόβως συνευωχούμενοι, τουτέστιν, μηδένα φόβον τοῖς συνευωχουμένοις προσδοκῶσιν, ἐξαίφνης ὥσπερ σπιλάδες ἐπάγοντες αὐτοῖς τὸν ὄλεθρον τῶν ψυχῶν. ἤ, πρὸς τὸ ποιμαίνοντες, τό, ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς συντάττοντες*), **pasturing their own selves** (using the *ἀγάπαι* not for their legitimate purpose, the realization of the unity of Christians by social union, but for *their own* purposes, the enjoyment of their lusts, and the furtherance of their schemes. See Ezek. xxxiv. 1 ff.; the parallelism of which has however been too far pressed here by Grot. ("se dum saginent, gregem negligunt"), Bengel ("non gregem"); which thought does not seem to be in the context, but merely that they feed and pasture *themselves* in the *ἀγάπαι*, having no regard to the Shepherd (or shepherds) set over them. Erasmus widens the sense too far—"suo ductu et arbitrio viventes"): **clouds without water** (see on *πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι* in 2 Pet. ii. 17. Water is *expected* from clouds), **carried out of course by winds** (here *our* text is the more concise: St. Peter having, as above, the *πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι* separate from the *ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι*. Cf Prov. xxv. 14, Heb. or E. V. **παραφερόμεναι**, borne by, or as above, borne out of their course, hither and thither), **autumn trees** (i.e. as trees are in the late autumn (*ἄκαρπα* explaining it, see below): as Bengel, "arbor tali specie qualis est autumno extremo, sine (foliis et ?) pomis:" not "*frugiperdæ*," as Grot.: and so Erasm., Beza (and consequently E. V.), al., and Stier, for which meaning there is no authority in usage: as neither for Schöttgen's, "quæ non nisi auctumno senescenti fructus ferunt immaturos et nulli usui futuros"), **without fruit** (as trees at the time above mentioned; but there is nothing in this word to indicate whether fruit has been on them or not), **twice dead** (it is not easy to explain these words in reference to trees. For that we must do so, and not, as Beza, Est., Bengel, Schneckenb., al., desert the similitude, and understand it of spiritual death twice inflicted, or of death here and in eternity (so Grot.: "neque hic bonum habebunt exitum, neque in sæculo altero"), must be evident by *ἐκριζωθέντα* following. Œc. says, *τὰ φθινοπωρινὰ δένδρα δὶς ἀποθνήσκοντα, ἔν τε τῇ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτῶν ἀποβολῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν φύλλων ἀποῤῥοῇ*: and then he explains the first particular as above: Beza, Rosenm. explain *δίς* by "plane," "prorsus," which meaning, though denied by Bretschneider, De Wette illustrates by "bis dat qui cito dat:" and Horace's "pro quo bis patior mori." But the most likely reference of the word is to the double death in a tree, which is not only as it seems to the eye in common with other trees, in the apparent death of winter, but really dead. dead to appearance, and dead in reality. Huther comes near this, but does not quite reach it, when he says, "not only without fruit, but dead and dried up:" but this would not be two deaths; whereas the other is), **rooted out** (the various descriptive clauses form a climax: not only without leaves and fruit, but dead: not only dead, but plucked up and thrown aside. "Tous ces mots sont des métaphores énergiques pour montrer le néant de ces impures, la légèreté de leur conduite, la stérilité de leur

c here only †. ἀ δὲ θάλ. κυρτὸν ἐπαφρίζῃ. Mosch. Idyll. v. 5.
d Luke xiv. 9. 2 Cor. iv. 2. Phil. iii. 19. Heb. xii. 2. Rev. iii. 18 only. Ps. cviii. 29. plur., see 1 Pet. iv. 3.
e Matt. ii. 2, &c. xxiv. 29 ‖, Mk. 1 Cor. xv. 41 (3ce). Rev. i. 16 al13. Gen. i. 16.

ABCKL ℵ a b c f g h k l o C

[o] ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν [d] αἰσχύνας, [e] ἀστέρες [f] πλανῆται οἷς ὁ [g] ζόφος τοῦ σκότους [h] εἰς [h] αἰῶνα [i] τετήρηται. 14 προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ [j] τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ λέγων Ἰδού, ἦλθεν κύριος [k] ἐν ἁγίαις [l] μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, 15 [m] ποιῆσαι [n] κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ [o] ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς [p] ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων [q] ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν [r] ὧν [s] ἠσέβησαν, καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν [t] σκληρῶν [r] ὧν ἐλάλησαν

P ...σαν—

f here only. = (see note) Hos. ix. 17 (only).
g ver. 6.
h (without art.) here (2 Pet. ii. 17 rec.) only. 2 Chron. ix. 8 B.
i = ver. 6 reff. constr., 2 Pet. ii. 17.
j dat., Luke xviii. 31. 3 Kings xxii. 18. see Matt. xiii. 14.
k = Luke xiv. 31. Acts vii. 14. (Matt. xxii. 37. Rom. v. 21 al.) 1 Macc. xi. 15.
l Heb. xii. 22 reff.
m = Luke xvii. 7, 8. Acts vii. 24. Micah v. 15. see Mark xv. 1.
n = John v. 27 only. Gen. xviii. 25. Ezek. xxviii. 26 Ald.
o = John iii. 20. viii. 46. xvi. 8 al. 1 Chron. xii. 17.
p ver. 4 reff.
q Rom. i. 18. xi. 26. 2 Tim. ii. 16. Tit. ii. 12. ver. 18 only. Jer. v. 6.
r attr., 1 John iii. 24 reff.
s 2 Pet. ii. 6 only. Dan. ix. 5 LXX & Theod-A. Zeph. iii. 11.
t = John vi. 60 (Matt. xxv. 24. Acts xxvi. 14. James iii. 4) only. Gen. xlii. 7, 30.

απαφριζοντα C 5. 13. 180. **πλανητες** B. om *ο* and *του* B. rec ins **τον** bef **αιωνα**, with K b g l o Ps-Chr: om ABCLℵ rel 40 Ephr Pallad Œc.

14. **επροφητευσεν** B[1]: **προεπροφητευσεν**(sic) ℵ(Tischdf: txt Treg). om **δε** A. ins **ο** bef **κυριος** ℵ 96. 142. rec **μυριασιν** bef **αγιαις**, with C syr copt æth: **μυριασιν αγιων αγγελων** ℵ 26 sah arm: alii aliter: txt ABKL rel vulg Chron Œc Thl Did-int.—om **αυτου** ℵ syr-pk.

15. rec **εξελεγξαι**, with c Œc: txt ABCKLℵ rel 40 Ephr Chron Phot Thl. for **παντας τους ασεβεις**, **πασαν ψυχην** ℵ. rec aft **τους ασεβεις** ins **αυτων**, with KL rel Œc Thl: om ABC(ℵ) b[1] d o 13. 36 vss Chron Did-int Ps-Cypr Vig. om **ασεβειας** C 36. 68 demid syr-pk arm Damasc: om **ασεβειας αυτων** ℵ tol sah. aft **σκληρων** ins **λογων** Cℵ 13. 36 syr-pk sah Ephr Damasc.

foi et l'absence de leurs bonnes mœurs." Arnaud): **13.]** **wild waves of the sea, foaming up their own shames** (cf. Isa. lvii. 20, in Heb. and E. V.: "The wicked are like the troubled sea, whose waters cast up mire and dirt," which beyond doubt has been in the Writer's mind. **αἰσχύνας**, plur., either, each his own *αἰσχύνη*, or all their own *αἰσχύνας*, disgraces, instances of disgraceful conduct), **wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever** (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 17, where nearly the same words occur. **ἀστέρες πλανῆται** would seem most probably to indicate *comets*, which (as in Oct. 1858) astonish the world for a time, and then pass away into darkness. The similitude would not find any propriety as applied to the *planets*, properly so called: for there can be no allusion to the astronomical fact of their being naturally opaque bodies, as Bengel imagines. Many Commentators have supposed that the similitude is to be understood of teachers, who would enlighten others, and yet are doomed to darkness themselves: so Œc., comparing the transformation into an angel of light, 2 Cor. xi. 14. But the context does not justify this. Rather should we say, these professing Christians, by their profession lights in the world, instead of letting that light shine on more and more into the perfect day, are drifting about in strange errors of doctrine and practice till it will be utterly extinguished in eternal darkness).

14, 15.] *Prophecy of Enoch respecting them*:—see below. **Yea, and** (**δὲ καί** are better taken together, applying to the whole sentence, than separated, joining *καί* with *τούτοις*, "of these as well as of others," for no other prophecies of Enoch are alluded to) **of these** (**προφητεύειν** is usually joined with **περί**: here and in ref. only (*γεγραμμένα*) with a dat. It is the dat. of reference, answering to **πρὸς αὐτούς**, Mark xii. 12: see Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 4) **prophesied Enoch seventh from Adam** ("ut vaticinii antiquitatem commendet," Calv. Possibly also the fact of seven being the sacred number may have been in view, as Bengel: "mysterii non expers, in quo immunitas a morte et numerus sanctus concurrunt." Cf. Wetstein's note, in which several similar designations are quoted: e. g. Philo, Vit. Mos. i. 2, vol. ii. p. 81, alleges Moses to have been the seventh generation from Abraham. R. Berbai, on Num. xxv. 12, says, "Erat autem Phineas septima progenies a Jacobo patre nostro," &c.), **saying, Behold, the Lord** ("Jam Henochi tempore nomen Jehovah notum erat," Bengel) **came** (the historic tense of prophecy) **among** (in, as surrounded by) **His holy myriads** (of angels: cf. Deut. xxxiii. 2: Zech. xiv. 5, Heb. xii. 23), **to execute judgment** (reff.) **upon all, and to convict all the impious concerning all their works of impiety**

κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ [p] ἀσεβεῖς. [16] οὗτοί εἰσι [u] γογγυσταὶ [v] μεμψίμοιροι, [w] κατὰ τὰς [w] ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν [w] πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ [x] ὑπέρογκα, [yz] θαυμάζοντες [z] πρόσωπα, [a] ὠφελείας [b] χάριν. [17] ὑμεῖς δέ, [c] ἀγαπητοί, [d] μνήσθητε τῶν [d] ῥημάτων τῶν [de] προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, [18] ὅτι ἔλεγον

u here only †. (-ζειν, 1 Cor. x. 10. -σμός, 1 Pet. iv. 9. Wisd. i. 10, 11.)
v here only †. (see note.)
w 2 Pet. iii. 3. see 1 Pet. iv. 3. 2 Pet. ii. 10. 2 Chron. xxviii. 2.
x 2 Pet. ii. 18 only. Exod. xviii. 22 al.
y constr. particip., 2 Cor. ix. 11. Col. ii. 2. Winer, edn. 6, § 63 i. 2. a.
z here only. Gen. xix. 21. Lev. xix 15.
a Rom. iii. 1 only. Job xxii. 3. Ps. xxix 9.
b 1 John iii. 12 reff.
c ver. 3. 2 Pet. iii. 1 al.
d 2 Pet. iii. 2.
e = Rom. ix. 29. Gal. i. 9 †. 2 Macc vi. 29 al

16. for 1st αυτων, εαυτ. CL[P] a c d f g l: txt ABKℵ rel Œc Thl. for 2nd αυτων, αυτω A.
17. τ. προειρ. ρημ. A Ephr Lucif.

which they impiously did, and concerning all the hard things which impious sinners spoke against Him. I have discussed in the prolegomena the question as to the source of this citation, and its relation to the present apocryphal book of Enoch. I will only here set down the passage as it at present stands in De Sacy's version: "Et venit cum myriadibus sanctorum, ut faciat judicium super eos et perdat impios et litiget cum omnibus carnalibus pro omnibus quæ fecerunt et operati sunt contra eum peccatores et impii."

16.] *Continuation of the description*, especially with reference to the concluding words of the prophecy. **These are murmurers** (γογγυσταί, *οἱ ὑπ' ὀδόντα καὶ ἀπαῤῥησιάστως τῷ δυσαρεστουμένῳ ἐπιμεμφόμενοι*, Œc. Murmurers against what, is not said: probably, against the appointments and ordinances of God. Bengel's distinction between the two words, "γογγ. adversus homines, μεμψ. contra Deum," does not appear justified) **dissatisfied with their lot** (see on *μεμψιμοιρία*, Theophrastus, Char. xvii. Wetst. and Elsner give examples: e.g. Philo, Vit. Mos. i. 33, vol. ii. p. 109, of the Israelites, *καὶ πάλιν ἤρξαντο μεμψιμοιρεῖν*: Lucian, Sacrif. 1, *τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος μεμψιμοιρούσης, ὅτι μὴ παρειλήφθη πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Οἰνέως*. *μεμψίμοιρος* is interpreted by Hesych., *μεμφόμενος τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἢ φιλεγκλήμων, ἢ φιλαίτιος*), **walking according to their lusts** (this is closely connected with the preceding: "quia sibi in pravis cupiditatibus indulgent, simul difficiles sunt ac morosi, ut illis nunquam satisfiat: hinc fit ut semper obmurmurent ac querantur." Calv.), **and their mouth speaking great swelling things** (see 2 Pet. ii. 18 note), **admiring** (the nom. part. belongs not to *εἰσίν* above, but to *αὐτῶν* immediately preceding, being joined to it by a loose construction: see reff.) **(men's) persons** (see reff.: holding mere outward appearances, dignities, of men in admiration. In ref. Gen., it is God who says to Abraham, *ἰδού, ἐθαύμασά σου τὸ πρόσωπον*, "Behold, I have regarded (E. V., accepted) thee." In the ref. Levit., the word imports as here, and is parallel with *οὐ λήψῃ πρόσωπον* in the preceding clause. The Commentators quote Lysias, Orat. 31, *οὔτε γὰρ τοὺς πονηροὺς ὑπερορᾷ, οὔτε τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς θαυμάζει, ἀλλ' ἴσον ἑαυτὸν παρέχει πᾶσιν*, said of *death*. In 4 Kings v. 1 Naaman is said to have been a man *τεθαυμασμένος προσώπῳ*, of high dignity) **for the sake of advantage** ("magniloquentiam taxat, quod se ipsos fastuose jactent: sed interea ostendit illiberali esse ingenio, quia serviliter se dimittant." Calv. Compare *μισθοῦ*, ver. 11).

17, 18.] *Exhortation to remember how the Apostles forewarned them of these men.* **But ye, beloved** (see again below, ver. 20), **remember the words which were before spoken** (not "prophesied:" see reff.) **by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ** (this can hardly be cited as evidence on one side or the other on the question whether St. Jude himself was an Apostle. He *might* use the expression, being himself an Apostle: he is certainly more likely to have used it, not being one. According to the critical text, St. Peter uses the same expression, without the *ἡμῶν*, 2 Pet. iii. 2: and whichever view is taken as to the genuineness or otherwise of 2 Peter, there could be no intention by such an expression to exclude either the real or the pretended St. Peter from the number of the Apostles), **that they told you** (whether by writing, or by word of mouth, does not appear: so that we cannot say, with Bengel, "ergo hi, ad quos Judas scribit, cæteros quoque Apostolos audierant." It is worthy of remark that he does not say *ἔλεγον ἡμῖν*, but *ὑμῖν*; hereby again not indeed making it certain that he included himself among the Apostles, but making it

f see Heb. i. 1 reff.
g 2 Pet. iii. 3 only. Isa. iii. 4 only. (-αιζειν, Matt. xxvii. 29 al. -παιγμός, Heb. xi. 36.)
h ver. 15 reff. constr., see note.

ὑμῖν ὅτι [f] ἐπ' ἐσχάτου [τοῦ] χρόνου ἔσονται [g] ἐμπαῖκται [w] κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν [w] ἐπιθυμίας [w] πορευόμενοι τῶν [h] ἀσεβειῶν. 19 οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ [i] ἀποδιορίζοντες, [k] ψυχικοὶ [l] πνεῦμα μὴ [l] ἔχοντες. 20 ὑμεῖς δέ, [m] ἀγαπητοί, [n] ἐποικοδομοῦντες [o] ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν [p] πίστει, [q] ἐν [q] πνεύματι ἁγίῳ

ABCKL P ℵ a t d f g k l l o ..

i here only † (διορ., Lev. xx. 24.) k 1 Cor. ii. 14. xv. 44 (bis), 46. James iii. 15 only †. l 1 Cor. vii. 40. Rom. viii. 9. m vv. 3, 17. n 1 Cor. iii. 10, &c. Eph. ii. 20. Col. ii. 7 only. Num. xxxii. 38 Ald. (οἰκ., AB) only. o = 1 John v. 21 reff. p = ver. 3 reff. q Rom. ix. 1. xiv. 17. xv. 16. 1 Cor. xii. 3, 9. 2 Cor. vi. 6. 1 Thess. i. 5. Rev. i. 10. iv. 2. Micah iii. 8.

18. ελεγεν ημιν K. om 2nd οτι L-txt ℵ Lucif. rec εν εσχατω χρονω, with KL rel vulg Œc: [εν εσχ. τω χρονω P:] επ εσχατων των χρονων g 68. 126-30 syr-pk: επ' εσχατου των χρονων 36: txt ABCℵ 13 Did Thl, but του is omd (*homœotel?*) in BC. for εσονται, ελευσονται AC[2]ℵ[3] 13. 36 vulg coptt æth Ephr Did Cyr: txt BC[1]KL[P]ℵ[1] rel syrr Ps-Hipp Ps-Chr Cyr Œc Thl Lucif.

19. for εαυτων επιθ., επιθυμιας αυτων ℵ[1] 42. (57?) 163, επιθ. εαυτων ℵ[3] f 73-8. 104. marks of disapproval have been placed by ℵ[3] over απο in αποδιοριζοντες, but erased. elz aft αποδιοριζοντες ins εαυτους, with C b d g o vulg(with am demid tol) Aug Fulg Bede: om ABKL[P]ℵ rel 40 fuld syrr(sic, Treg) coptt æth arm Ephr Did Œc Thl Lucif Cassiod.

20. ημεις C arm. rec τη αγιωτατη υμων πιστει bef εποικοδομουντες εαυτους, with KL[P] rel syr-pk arm Ephr Thl Œc: txt AB(C)ℵ d 13 vss Clem-frag-int Bede.—ημων C.

very uncertain, whether he intends to *exclude* himself) **that at the last of the time** (see notes on 2 Pet. iii. 3: Heb. i. 1: 1 Pet. i. 20: = at the end of the world, in the last age of the Church) **there shall be scoffers** (men who sport with what is holy and good: the λοιμοί of Ps. i. 1. The prophecy is contained in 2 Tim. iii. 1, 1 Tim. iv. 1, Acts xx. 29, and doubtless formed a constant subject of viva voce warning. 2 Pet. iii. 1, 2, can hardly be supposed to be referred to, for that place is, as this, a reminiscence of things before said by the Apostles, and nearly in the same words), **walking according to their own lusts of impieties** (ἀσεβειῶν, gen. after ἐπιθυμίας, indicating the direction, or perhaps the character, of those desires. Cf. the same words above, ver. 16). **19.**] *Last characteristics of these men.* **These are they that separate** (or "are separating," viz. from the Church, having no real sympathy with the spirit of the Gospel. The act. verb does not seem to require ἑαυτούς to be supplied: that draw lines of distinction, by walking after their own desires, not in the path of the Church's obedience, thus separating both themselves from you, and you from themselves), **sensual** (we have no English word for ψυχικός; and our biblical psychology is, by this defect, entirely at fault. The ψυχή is the centre of the personal being, the "I" of each individual. It is in each man bound to the spirit, man's higher part, and to the body, man's lower part; drawn upwards by the one, downwards by the other. He who gives himself up to the lower appetites, is σαρκικός: he who by communion of his πνεῦμα with God's Spirit is employed in the higher aims of his being, is πνευματικός. He who rests midway, thinking only of self and self's interests, whether animal or intellectual, is the ψυχικός, the selfish man, the man in whom the spirit is sunk and degraded into subordination to the subordinate ψυχή. In the lack of any adequate word, I have retained the "sensual" of the E. V., though the impression which it gives is a wrong one: "selfish" would be as bad, for the ψυχικός may be an amiable and generous man: "animal" would be worse: "intellectual," worse still. If the word were not so ill-looking in our language, "psychic" would be a great gain), **not having the spirit** (πνεῦμα, see above, not directly the Holy Spirit of God (the absence of the art. would be no objection to this: see reff. and Rom. viii. 14, 1 Cor. ii. 4, al. fr.), but the higher spiritual life of man's spirit in communion with the Holy Spirit. These men have not indeed ceased to have πνεῦμα, as a part of their own tripartite nature: but they have ceased to possess it in any worthy sense: it is degraded beneath and under the power of the ψυχή, the personal life, so as to have no real vitality of its own. See Delitzsch, Biblische Psychologie, v. Abschn. § 2, "das neue Geistesleben:" and Beck, Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre, p. 35 ff.).

20—23.] CONCLUDING EXHORTATION TO THE READERS: and a) vv. 20, 21, *as to their own spiritual life.* **But ye, beloved** (resumed from ver. 17), **building up yourselves** (ἑαυτούς, not = ἀλλήλους, but as

προσευχόμενοι, 21 ° ἑαυτοὺς ἐν [t] ἀγάπῃ [r] θεοῦ [s] τηρήσατε, [t] προσδεχόμενοι τὸ [u] ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [v] εἰς [w] ζωὴν [w] αἰώνιον. 22 καὶ [x] οὓς μὲν [y] ἐλέγχετε [z] διακρινομένους, 23 [x] οὓς δὲ σώζετε [a] ἐκ πυρὸς [b] ἁρπάζοντες,

r 1 John iv. 9 reff.
s 1 John v. 18 reff.
t = Mark xv. 43. Luke ii. 25, 38 al. 2 Macc. ix. 25 Ed-vat. (not AB).
u = 2 Tim. i. 18. Heb. iv. 16.
v = Acts xi. 18. Rom vi 22. x. 1.
w 1 John ii. 25 reff.
x = Matt xiii. 8. Rom xiv. 5 al.
y = John xvi. 8. 1 Tim. v. 20 al. Prov. ix. 8.
z = Matt. xxi. 21 || Mk Acts x 20 Rom. iv. 20. James i. 6‡.
a Zech. iii. 2. Amos iv. 11.
b = John x 28 29 Acts xxiii 10 2 Kings xxiii. 21.

21. τηρησαμεν B C[1](perhaps) syrr.

22. rec (for ελεγχετε) ελεειτε, with KL[P] rel: ελεατε BC[2]ℵ: txt AC[1] (13) 40 vulg copt æth arm Œc-comm Cassiod Bede. rec διακρινομενοι, with KL[P] rel copt(appy): txt ABCℵ 13 vulg syrr arm Clem Œc-comm lat-ff.

23. om 1st ους δε B. rec ins εν φοβω bef σωζετε, with KL[P] rel: om ABCℵ d 13. 40 vulg copt æth arm Œc-comm(appy) Cassiod Bede. rec ins του bef πυρος, with b d f g o: om ABCKL[P]ℵ rel 36(sic) 40 arm. ον of αρπαζοντες is written over a previous ε by ℵ[1].

in Phil. ii. 12) **upon (as a foundation) your most holy faith** (the *faith* here is the foundation: viz., the *fides quæ creditur*, the object of faith. Bullinger (in Huther), "Vestræ fidei superstruentes vos ipsos." Elsewhere in Scripture, Christ is this foundation, see 1 Cor. iii. 11; which in fact comes to the same, for He is the Author and Finisher of our Faith, the α and ω), **praying in the Holy Spirit** (as the means of thus building yourselves up. The expression προσεύχεσθαι ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ is not found elsewhere, but is in strict analogy with Scripture usage: cf. λαλεῖν ἐν πν. ἁγ., also Rom. viii. 26, Eph. vi. 18. Some, e.g. Luther, join ἐν πν. ἁγ. with what has gone before, and this is approved by De Wette: but surely προσευχόμενοι would not be left thus standing alone. De W. cites Œc. for this arrangement, but it is very doubtful whether he adopts it: ὑμεῖς δὲ τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει ἐποικοδομοῦντες, ἤτοι ἑαυτοὺς ἀνακτώμενοι ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, τουτέστι, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος διδασκαλίαν τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀθροίσεις ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμῶν ποιούμενοι: where it is evident that there should be a period at ἀνακτώμενοι, and that προσευχόμενοι has been omitted, or perhaps was never expressed, after ἁγίῳ; at any rate the latter sentence is an explanation of ἐν πν. ἁγ. προσευχόμενοι), **keep yourselves** (aor. of the one great life-long act to be accomplished by the ἐποικοδομεῖν and προσεύχεσθαι) **in the love of God** (within that region of peculiar love wherewith God regards all who are built up on the faith and sustained by prayer: θεοῦ being a subjective gen., "God's love," not objective, as Grot., Semler, Bengel, Vorstius, Arnaud, al. The expression is very like μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ, John xv. 9, where κἀγὼ ὑμᾶς ἠγάπησα preceding fixes the meaning to be Christ's love to them), **looking for** (present part. as in Tit. ii. 13, where see note. It is to be the habit of the life, as those other pres. participles, ἐποικ. and προσευχόμενοι) **the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ** (viz. that which He will shew at His coming, τὸν εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἡμέραν τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς βραβευόμενον ὑμῖν, Œc.: cf. Tit. ii. 13. Huther remarks that ἔλεος, more usually predicated of the Father, is in the addresses of the Pastoral Epistles, and of 2 John, attributed to the Father and Son jointly) **unto eternal life** (these words may be joined with ἔλεος,—that mercy, whose issue shall be eternal life; or with προσδεχόμενοι,—as the issue and aim of the expectation; or with τηρήσατε,—as the final terminus of that watchful guarding. Perhaps the right choice between the three will be to combine the two last: for προσδεχόμενοι is subordinate and conditional to τηρήσατε: "keep yourselves . . . in expectation of . . . unto"). The direct and studied reference to the Blessed Trinity will not escape the reader. b) vv. 22, 23.] *Exhortation as to their conduct with reference to the persons* previously stigmatized in the Epistle. **And some indeed convict when contending with you** (or, "when separating from you." These appear to be the only two meanings which suit the context. Œc. takes the latter, but apparently including in it the idea of hostile disputation: κἀκείνους δέ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδιίστανται ὑμῶν, τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνεσθαι . . . where the Latin renders, "illos vero si vobis resistant, nam id significat *disceptantes* . . ." The Vulg. renders it passive: "et hos quidem arguite judicatos," which can hardly stand as giving the pres. part. διακρινομένους, and representing rather διακρίνοντες. De Wette, following Bengel, understands it "doubting"—"convince," "persuade in the right direction," "those who doubt." But thus the sense of ἐλέγχετε is missed,

οὓς δὲ [c] ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς [d] ἐσπιλωμένον [e] χιτῶνα.

24 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ [f] φυλάξαι αὐτοὺς [g] ἀπταίστους

ABCKL Pℵ a b c d f g h k l o 13

c of man, Matt. xviii. 33. Rom. xii. 8. Job xix. 21. of God, Matt. v. 7 al. fr. pres. -ᾷν, Rom. ix. 15, 16, 18 v. r. only. Prov. xxi. 26 A (not F) BℵR.
d James iii. 6 only †. Wisd. xv. 4 only.
e = Matt. v. 40. John xix. 23. Acts ix. 39 al. Gen. xxxvii. 3, &c.
f absol., John xvii. 12. Acts xii. 4. 2 Pet. ii. 5. Ps. cxliv. 20.
g here only †. 3 Macc vi. 39. ἀπτ. ἵππος, Xen. de re eq. i. 6.

rec om *ους δε ελεατε εν φοβω*, with KL[P] rel: om *ους δε ελεατε* C syr: ins ABℵ k 13. 40 vulg copt (æth) arm.—*ελειτε* A: *ελεγχετε* k: txt Bℵ 13. 40.

24. elz (for *αυτους*) *υμας*, with BCLℵ rel vss Thl; *ημας* A 4[2]: txt K[P] a b c g h l o

which is never simply to convince, but always carries the punitive idea with it, to *convict*. Grot. gives another meaning, "reprehendite eos qui se cæteris præferunt." Huther goes with Œc. The sense of *contending*, for διακρίνομαι, is found both in classical writers and in the N. T., e. g. Acts xi. 2, and our Epistle, ver. 9 (which is no slight indication of the meaning here): cf. διακρίνεσθαι μάχῃ Herod. ix. 58, ὅπλοις κ. λόγοις Demosth. p. 163. 15 al. in Palm and Rost's Lex.

This is the first class: that of those who oppose themselves, who must be convicted and down-argued. According to the rec. οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι, the rendering will be, as E. V., "*of some have compassion, making a difference,*" viz. between them and the others); **but others save** (pres., attempt to save; not σώσατε, which would imply that you had the power, and must do it effectually), **snatching them from the fire** (the same passage in the prophets, Zech. iii. 1—3, which has already been before St. Jude's mind in ver. 9, again furnishes him with the material of this figure. There we read οὐκ ἰδοὺ τοῦτο ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός; cf. also ref. Amos. Notice too the repetition of διακρίνεσθαι in close connexion, which speaks not a little for the sense above given to it. The πῦρ is most probably not future eternal fire, as Œc. ἐκ τοῦ ἠπειλημένου αὐτοῖς πυρός: but the present hell into which their corrupt doctrines and practices have cast them, not however without reference to its ending in fire eternal. This is the second class; as Œc., εἰ δὲ πρὸς ἴασιν ἀφορῶσι: or rather perhaps, any over whom your influence extends, as younger members of the Church, &c., whom you can thus rescue by snatching them out of the fire of temptation and peril), **and others compassionate** (the form ἐλεάω for the usual ἐλεέω is also found in reff. Rom.; and ἐλλογᾶν, Rom. v. 13 (in A(ℵ)), Philem. 18. See Winer, edn. 6, § 15) **in fear** (on what account, is shewn by what follows. Œc. rightly, except that (see below) he identifies this class with the last,—προσλαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐλεεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ μετὰ φόβου, περισκεπτόμενοι μή πως ἡ πρόσληψις τούτων, ἀμελῶς ὑμῶν τὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς διακειμένων, λύμης ὑμῖν γένηται αἰτία. This is the third class: consisting of those whom not falling in the way of so as personally to convict, nor having influence over so as to rescue, the believers could only compassionate (and on occasion given, lovingly help) as led away hopelessly to their ruin: but in shewing such compassion, they were to maintain a wholesome fear of their deadly error, for fear they themselves should become defiled by it. It may suffice to repudiate at once Bengel's interpretation of ἐν φόβῳ, "clementer, metu duntaxat incusso." The following clause is epexegetical of ἐν φόβῳ), **hating** (not, "seeing that ye hate," as De W., nor "though ye hate," as Jachm.: the pres. part. simply falls under and expands the verbal clause ἐλεᾶτε-ἐν-φόβῳ, thus forming part of the command) **even the** (or, "*their*," cf. Œc. below) **garment which has received defilement from the flesh** (τῷ ἐλέῳ τῷ πρὸς αὐτοὺς συνεπέσθω τὸ μῖσος τὸ πρὸς τὰ μιαρὰ αὐτῶν ἔργα, μισούντων ὑμῶν καὶ βδελυσσομένων, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν ἐσπιλωμένον, ἤτοι μεμιασμένον αὐτῶν χιτῶνα, ὡς τῇ πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν σάρκα προσψαύσει, καὶ αὐτοῦ βδελυροῦ χρηματίζοντος. And so Bengel, understanding χιτῶνα of their garment, which you are to loathe, and to be afraid even to touch: "*tunica* est totius vitæ habitus exterior, qua ab aliis attingimur." This *may* be, but it is more probable that the χιτών is literal, and the saying a proverbial one—hating not merely fleshly pollution itself, but even the traces and outskirts of it; even that, be it what it may, which has its mark and stain upon it. On the sense, see Rev. iii. 4).

24, 25.] CONCLUDING DOXOLOGY, conceived in terms referring to their state of danger and necessity of divine upholding. **But** (the δέ, as in Rom. xvi. 25, closes off all other considerations and sums up all in this one. It is not at all given by the "now" of the E. V., which conveys a

καὶ [h] στῆσαι [ik] κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ [l] ἀμώμους ἐν [m] ἀγαλλιάσει [25] [n] μόνῳ [no] θεῷ [o] σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, [p] δόξα, [q] μεγαλωσύνη, [r] κράτος καὶ [s] ἐξουσία [t] πρὸ [t] παντὸς τοῦ [t] αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ [u] εἰς [u] πάντας τοὺς [u] αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

h = Matt. xxv. 33. Acts vi. 6.
i Eph. i. 4. Col. i. 22.
k as above (i) only. Josh. i. 5.
l as above (i). Eph v. 27. Phil. ii. 15. Heb. ix. 14. 1 Pet. i. 19. Rev. xiv. 5 only. Ps. xvii. 23. (-μητος, 2 Pet. iii. 19.)

ΙΟΥΔΑ.

m Luke i. 14, 44. Acts ii. 46. Heb. i. 9 (from Ps. xliv. 7) only. (-λιᾶν, Rev. xix. 7.) n John v. 44. (xvii. 3. Rom. xvi. 27.) 1 Tim. i. 17 only. o Luke i. 47. 1 Tim. i. 1. ii. 3. iv. 10. Tit. i. 3. ii. 10. iii. 4 only. Ps. xciv. 1. p — Luke ii. 14. xvii. 18. John ix. 24. Acts xii. 33. Rom. xvi. 27 al. Ps. xcv. 7. q Heb. i. 3. viii. 1 only. 2 Kings vii. 21, 23. Ps. lxxviii. 11 al. r 1 Pet. iv. 11 reff. s in doxoll. here only. t here only. see Prov. viii. 23. 1 Cor. ii. 7. u here only. see Luke i. 33 al.

Œc. aft *απταιστους και* ins *ασπιλους και* C k syrr (arm Thl). for *κατενωπ.*, *ενωπιον* C. for *αμωμους*, *αμεμπτους* A : om k.

25. rec aft *μονω* ins *σοφω*, with KL[P] rel Œc Thl : om ABCℵ m(Treg) 13. 40 vss Ephr Fulg Bede. rec om *δια ιησου χριστου του κυριου ημων*, with K[P] rel Œc : ins ABCLℵ k 13. 36. 40 vss Ephr Thl Fulg Bede. ins *ω* bef *δοξα* ℵ[1] am. rec aft *δοξα* ins *και*, with KL[P] rel 40 vulg-ed syr-pk copt Œc Thl Bede : om ABCℵ k 13 am(with demid fuld tol) syr arm Ephr Fulg. rec om *προ παντος του αιωνος*, with K[P] rel syr-pk Œc : ins ABCLℵ d 13 (36) 40 vulg syr copt æth arm Ephr Thl Fulg Cassiod Bede. om *παντας* K(Sz) ℵ 27. 36. 99 copt. aft *αιωνας* ins *των αιωνων* L 13 vulg(demid tol, but not am fuld) syr-mg (copt) Fulg Bede.

Subscription. om rel : *τελος* h : *τελος συν θῶ αγιω των πραξεων και των επιστολων των αγιων αποστολων ων και του ιουδα τετελειωται δια στιχων ξη'· αμην* f : *ιουδα επιστολη καθολικη* C al : *του αγιου αποστολου ιουδα επιστολη* L al : *ετελειωθη συν θεω και η του ιουδα καθολικη επιστολη. δοξα σοι ο θεος* (thrice repeated), *ο μακροθυμων επ' εμοι τω αναξιω δουλω σου* K : [*επ. ιουδα απ.* P :] *ιουδα επιστολη* A : txt Bℵ.

strictly temporal idea to the hearer) **to Him that is able** (exactly thus, Rom. xvi. 25) **to keep them** (the occurrence of *αὐτούς* (which is almost beyond doubt the true reading instead of *ὑμᾶς* or *ἡμᾶς*) can only be accounted for by the supposition that St. Jude writes here, as of all to whom he has been addressing himself, in the third person, as if he was praying to God for them. His reason for not using *ὑμᾶς* may have been his desire to include also in the term those who might be convicted, rescued from the fire, and compassionated, as well as his more immediate reader. But it is hardly likely, in the solemn close of his Epistle, that he should mean by *αὐτούς*, those *only*) **without falling** (see reff.: and for *πταίειν*, James ii. 10, iii. 2), **and to set (them) before-the-presence-of His glory** (which will be revealed when the Son of man shall come, *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων*, Luke ix. 26, in the *ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, Tit. ii. 13) **blameless** (see reff. and 1 Thess. iii. 13) **in** (element, in which they will be found) **great-rejoicing** (tripudiatio, the exuberance of triumphant joy : see reff.: and the verb in 1 Pet. i. 6 reff.), **to the only God our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord** (on the union of *θεός* with *σωτήρ*, see Prolegg. to Vol. III., ch. vii. § i. 34. Observe the qualification here), **be** (on account of *πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος* below, De Wette insists as necessary that *ἐστιν*, as 1 Pet. iv. 11, not *ἔστω*, is here to be supplied. But *ἔστω* might be in the Writer's mind, while the precise periods embraced by it might rather be left to the fulness of his devout spirit than marked by strict precision) **glory, majesty, might, and power, before all time** (before the whole age, scil. of the world. Thus we have eternity "a parte ante"), **and now** (thus, time present), **and to all the ages** (thus, eternity "a parte post"). **Amen** (the ordinary conclusion of a doxology : cf. Rom. i. 25, 1 Pet. iv. 11 (and 2 Pet. iii. 18, where as here it stands at the end of the Epistle)).

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ.

I. 1 [a] Ἀποκάλυψις [a] Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ἣν [b] ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ

a gen., = 2 Cor. xii only. (1 Cor. i. 7. Gal. i. 12. 2 Thess. i. 7. 1 Pet. i. 7, 13. Sir. xlii. 1 [xli 23.] -ύπτειν, Eph. iii 5. Dan. x. 1 Theod. b John xvii. 7, 8.

APN a a to n 1 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3 1' to 19. 2- 7. 30. 32 to 36 40 to 42. 4' to 51. 90 B'.

TITLE. rec *αποκαλυψις ιωαννου του θεολογου*, with f j 9. 17 : *αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιω. τ. θ.* b c n 1. 25. 33-8. 47(prefg *ἡ*). 50. 90 : *αποκ. ιω. τ. θ. και ευαγγελιστου* B 12-8: *αποκ. ιω. του αποστολου κ. ευαγ.* 41-2 : [*η αποκ. τ. απ. ιω. κ. ευαγ.* P :] *του αγιου ιω. τ. θεολ. αποκ.* 13 : *αρχη της αποκαλυψεως του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου* 32 : *ιω. του θεολ. κ. ηγαπημενου αποκ.* 4 : *αποκ. ιω. τ. αποστ. τ. θεολ.* 17 : *ιω. τ. θεολ. αποκ.* 19 : *αποκ. του αγιου αποστ. κ. ευαγ. ιω. τ. θε.* 10. 37, simly e h : *αποκ. του αγιου ενδοξοτατου αποστ. κ. ευαγ. παρθενου ηγαπημενου επιστηθιου ιω. θεολ.* 30 : *αποκ. τ. αγ. κ. ενδοξου αποστ. κ. ευαγ. ιω. τ. θε. ην εν πατμω νησω εθεασατο* l : *αποκ. τ. αγ. ιω. τ. θε. ην ειδεν εν πατμω* m, simly *ην εν πατμω τη νησω εθεασατο* is added in 16 : *ιησου χριστου αποκαλυψις δοθεισα τω θεολογω ιωαννη* 26 : om k 48-9 : *ιωαννου αποκαλυψις* a d g : txt Cℵ. (The title of A has perished, but the subscription confirms txt.)

CHAP. I. 1. for *αυτω*, *αυτη* B. (So Tischdf [N.T. ed 7] agst Mai.)

CHAP. I. 1—3.] SUPERSCRIPTION: in which the contents and Writer of the book are declared, and the importance of its subject indicated by a blessing on those who shall read and hear it.

The Revelation (ἀποκάλυψίς ἐστιν ἡ τῶν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων δήλωσις, καταυγαζομένου τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς, εἴτε διὰ θείων ὀνειράτων, εἴτε καθ' ὕπαρ ἐκ θείας ἐλλάμψεως. Arethas. Here, the word need not be taken in any but this its general sense, as in 2 Cor. xii. 1, where it is plural; the particular purpose of this revelation follows, with the inf. δεῖξαι below. ἀποκάλυψις is one of those words which have passed, in their later usage, from indicating the *act*, to signify that with which the act is concerned: so καύχησις, 2 Cor. i. 12, vii. 14. Jerome on Gal. i. 11, 12, vol. vii. p. 387, says: "Verbum ipsum ἀποκαλύψεως, id est, revelationis, proprie scripturarum est, et a nullo sapientum sæculi apud Græcos usurpatum." But Plutarch, de placit. philos. i. 7, τίς ἐστιν ὁ θεός, says that Euripides was an atheist, but ἀποκαλύψασθαι οὐκ ἠθέλησε, δεδοικὼς τὸν ἄρειον πάγον. Porphyry's use of the word, vit. Plotin. c. 16, is no exception. It is said to be later Greek for ἀνακαλ.) **of Jesus Christ** (how is this genitive to be understood? Is our Lord the subject or the object? Clearly here the former: for it is not Christ who is here revealed, except in a remote sense: but Christ who reveals, as is plain in what follows: see also ref. Ebrard makes the gen. *possessive*, which comes to the same thing. Heinrichs understands ἀποκ. Ἰ. χρ. of the appearance of our Lord which is related below, after St. Paul's manner (but not in 2 Cor. xii. 1), and St. Peter's (reff.: and 1 Pet. iv. 13, v. 1), see also Luke xvii. 30. But see below. The not very important distinctions between ἀποκάλυψις and its result προφητεία are laid down at great length in Hengstenberg, h. l.), **which God** (the Father) **gave to Him** (Stern asks, "How are we to understand this? Is not Christ very God, of one essence with the Father from eternity? Did He not, by virtue of the omniscience of His divine nature, know as exactly as the Father, what should be the process of the world's history, what the fate of the Church? What purpose was served by a revelation from God to Jesus?" He proceeds to say that the words cannot refer

ὁ θεός, δεῖξαι τοῖς [c] δούλοις [c] αὐτοῦ ἃ [de] δεῖ [d] γενέσθαι [df] ἐν

c ch. ii. 20 of Christ.
d ch. xxii. 6.
e ch. iv. 1. Matt. xxiv. 6 ‖. xxvi. 54. Dan. ii. 28.
f Luke xviii. 8. Acts xii. 7. xxii. 18. xxv. 4. Rom. xvi. 20. Deut. ix. 3.

for δουλοις, αγιοις ℵ[1](txt ℵ[3a]).

merely to the revelation as made to *us*, but are clearly against such an interpretation: and gives, at some length and very well, that which in one form or other all will accept as the true explanation, in accordance with John vii. 16, xiv. 10, xvii. 7, 8. The man Christ Jesus, even in his glorified state, receives from the Father, by his hypostatic union with Him, that revelation which by His Spirit He imparts to His Church. For, Acts i. 7, the times and seasons are kept by the Father in his own power: and of the day and the hour knoweth no man, not the angels in heaven, nor even the Son, but the Father only, Mark xiii. 32. I may observe, that the coincidence in statement of this deep point of doctrine between the Gospel of St. John and the Apocalypse, is at least remarkable), **to shew** (is this infinitive of the purpose dependent on ἔδωκεν, or on the subst. ἀποκάλυψις? Is it the purpose of God in giving, or the purpose of the revelation in revealing, that is asserted? At all events, Heinrichs is wrong, who takes ἣν ἔδωκεν δεῖξαι together, "*which God gave* (empowered) *Him* to shew." But of the others, the construction with ἔδωκεν is the more probable, as being the more usual: "that He might shew," &c. **δεῖξαι** must not here be confined to its stricter meaning of shewing in vision, as Hengst.; for then, as De W. remarks, we must confine τοῖς δούλοις αὐτ. to the Apocalyptic Seer alone: but must be taken in its wider sense of exhibiting as knowledge, informing of. So in Matt. xvi. 21: where however Hengst. strangely denies this meaning, and upholds that of prove, demonstrate: which our Lord did not do till after His resurrection) **to His** (*Christ's*, most probably, as below in this verse, and in ref.: for thus the αὐτός is kept to the same subject throughout) **servants** (here meaning all Christians, not, as Hengst., prophets only: indeed his sense of δεῖξαι, which necessitates this, brings confusion into the whole sentence. That John himself is one of these δοῦλοι below, does not affect this general meaning) **what things must** (by the necessity of the divine decree: see besides reff., Matt. xvii. 10, al.) **come to pass shortly** (i.e. '*before long*:' see reff. especially Luke. The context, the repetition below, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς, and the parallel ch. xxii. 6, followed ib. 7 by ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχύ, fix this meaning here, as distinguished from the other of '*swiftly*,' which indeed would be hardly intelligible with the historic aorist γενέσθαι. This expression, as De W. well remarks, must not be urged to signify that the events of apocalyptic prophecy were to be close at hand: for we have a key to its meaning in Luke xviii. 7, 8, where our Lord says, ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων αὐτῷ ἡμέρας κ. νυκτός, **καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς**; λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν τάχει: where long delay is evidently implied. Hengstenberg repudiates this, and says it is self-evident that these words can only be adduced here "nach unrichtigen Auslegung." But surely the two cases are exactly parallel: and Hengst.'s strong language, here as elsewhere, proves nothing. His own interpretation of the words, natural as he seems to think it, is forced and unwarrantable. He (in common with many others) takes them to mean that the events spoken of would very soon *begin* to take place. The axe, he says, lay at the root of the Roman Empire when John wrote this, as it did at the root of the Persian Empire when Daniel wrote. But this interpretation is not borne out by the Greek. ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει is not "which must soon *begin* to come to pass," but, in the well-known sense of the aorist, "which, in their entirety, must soon come to pass:" γενέσθαι being in fact, a past tense, "must *have* come to pass," "be fulfilled:" so Bengel most truly, "Totus liber tanquam unum verbum uno momento pronunciatione debet accipi." So that we are driven to the very same sense of ἐν τάχει as that in Luke xviii. above, viz. to *God's speedy time*, though He seem to delay: in spite of the scorn which Hengst. pours on this meaning. His maxim, that a Prophet, speaking to men, must speak according to men's ideas, is quite worthless, and may be confuted by any similar prophetic saying, even by the one which he brings in its favour, Hagg. ii. 7: and his complaint, that thus we make the Seer and even the Lord Himself like bad physicians who delude their patients with false hopes (so, in the main, Stern also), is unworthy of a Christian Expositor, after our Lord's own plain use of the same method of speech again and again in His prophecies in the Gospels and in this book. It re-

[f]τάχει, καὶ [g]ἐσήμανεν [dh]ἀποστείλας [b]διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, [2] ὃς [ik]ἐμαρτύρησεν τὸν [l]λόγον

g = (of proph.), John xii. 33. xviii. 32. xxi. 19. Acts xi. 28 (xxv. 27 only) ‡. (Exod. xviii. 20 al.) h = Esth. iii. 13. Prov. xxvi. 6. see Matt. xi. 2. 2 Kings xii. 25. i constr., 1 Tim. vi. 13. ch. xxii. 16, 20. aor. epistol., Philem. 19. 1 John ii. 14. 2 John 12. k 1 John v. 10 reff. l = Jer. i. 2.

C ex— ACP ℵ a to ii. 1 2. 4. 6. 7. 10-3 16 to 19. 2- 7. 5? 12 to 38. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 59 Br.

for τω δουλω, του δουλου ("ex alliteratione" Beng.) A. ιωανει ℵ[1].

mains to observe, that these words cannot with any fairness be used as furnishing a guide to the interpretation of the prophecy. They are far rather to be regarded as a prophetic formula (see Beza), common with him to whom a thousand years are as one day, and used in order to teach us how short our time, and the time of this our world, is. See, on the whole, Ebrard's able note, and his remarks on the absurdity of Hengstenberg's pressing the words in favour of his præterist scheme. τὴν ἔκβασιν δὲ τῶν χρηματιζομένων ἐν τάχει ὑπισχνεῖται προβῆναι, οὐχ ὡς ἔτυχεν, ἀλλὰ παραμετρῶν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τοῖς θείοις, οἷς καὶ τὰ πολυχρονίως καὶ χιλιαστῶς ἐκτελούμενα ὡς ἡ χθὲς ἡμέρα, καὶ ἡ ἐν νυκτὶ φυλακὴ κρίνεται. Arethas. There is a profitable and consolatory exegesis of the words in Ambrose Ansbert, B. P. M. ix. pt. 2, p. 310. Dionysius of Alexandria, as cited in Eus. H. E. vii. 25, omits the words ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι, joining δεῖξαι with ἐν τάχει); **and He** (Ἰησοῦς χριστός, not ὁ θεός, see ch. xxii. 16: the subject is changed, and the relative construction abandoned. So almost all Commentators) **signified (it)** (it is remarkable (see reff.), that with one exception, this prophetic use of σημαίνω is confined in the N. T. to the Evangelist St. John) **sending by His angel** (the aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. verb, not necessarily antecedent to it. ἀποστ. διά, as in reff. No word, as τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν, need be supplied, the verb being used absolutely after the manner of the Heb. שָׁלַח בְּיַד of Exod. iv. 13 and ref. 2 Kings. Still less must διά be taken with ἐσήμανεν, as Hengst. The Angel mentioned is perhaps the same who informs the Seer in ch. xvii. 1, 7, 15, xix. 9, xxi. 9, xxii. 1, 6, which latter place takes up this; ib. 8 ff.; and who is spoken of by our Lord ib. 16. It is remarkable that this angel does not appear as the imparter of the visions until ch. xvii. Some indeed, as Ewald, have fancied that they trace his presence in ch. iv. 1 and throughout: but ch. xvii. 1 is too manifestly the introduction to a new appearance for this to be the case; and previously to that the Seer receives his information from different persons. Our Lord Himself opens the Apocalyptic vision. It is another voice which calls John up to the place of heavenly vision, ch. iv. 1. In vii. 13, one of the four and twenty elders speaks to him; in x. 8, it is the former voice again which addresses him, and in ib. 9, it is the angel who stands on the earth and the sea that gives him the book. Only in the great close of the prophecy, opening with ch. xvii., does one angel stand by him; referred to, as here, under the name ὁ ἄγγελος. In the visions of Daniel and Zechariah an angel mediated: Dan. viii. 16, ix. 20, x. 10 ff., Zech. i. 1, 19, al.) **to His servant John** (on the whole question of the writer of the book, see prolegomena), 2.] **who testified of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, whatsoever things he saw** (these words must, in all fairness of construction, be referred to this present book, and not, as by some of the older Expositors, and recently by Ebrard, to the Gospel of St. John. The reasons given by Ebrard for such reference will not hold. He objects to ἐμαρτύρησεν being taken of this book, that such a use of the aor. would be peculiar to the Epistolary style, whereas this book, though containing Epistles, is not itself an Epistle. Even were the usage thus confined, it might be answered from verse 4, that the whole *is* in an Epistolary form. But the usage is not thus confined, as every scholar knows. Witness Thucyd. i. 1, Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον κ.τ.λ. Again, Ebrard objects that the sense thus obtained would be a strange one: "God gave the Revelation to Christ; He signified it by His angel to John, which last hereby makes it known." But I own I am unable to see any strangeness in it. It seems to me the obvious way in which a faithful account of this Revelation would be prefaced by its Writer. On the other side, the objections to Ebrard's reference are to me insuperable. First, as to its *introduction with the simple relative* ὅς. We may safely say that had any previous writing or act been intended, we should have had ὃς καί, or in St. John's simple style, even more than this, ὃς καὶ τὸ πρότερον, or ὃς καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ βιβλίῳ. The ὅς as it stands, I submit, carries on the action, and does not identify John as the same who at a previous time did some other action. Next,

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν [km] μαρτυρίαν [l] Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, [n] ὅσα [n] εἶδεν. [3] μακάριος ὁ [o] ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς [p] λόγους τῆς [pq] προφητείας καὶ [r] τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα· ὁ γὰρ [s] καιρὸς [s] ἐγγύς.

m ver. 9. ch. xii. 17. xix. 10 bis. xx. 4 only. see John i. 19. 1 John v. 9 (ch. vi. 9. xi. 7. xii. 11). n see ver. 19. o Acts viii. 28. xv. 21. 2 Cor. iii. 15. Neh. viii. 3, 8, 18. p = ch. xxii. 7, &c. q = Matt. xiii. 14. 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. 2 Chron. xv. 8. r Gospp. (not Luke) & Acts pass. but John princ. Paul, = 1 Tim. vi. 14 only. Prov. iii. 21. s ch. xxii. 10 reff. Joel i. 15.

2. rec aft οσα ins τε, with 1 Areth: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Dion Andr Primas. ιδεν Aℵ B 16. 33: txt C[P] &c. aft ειδεν ins και ατινα εισι και α(τινα) χρη γενεσθαι μετα ταυτα h l n 10-2-6-8. 37-8. 45-9. 90 B[r]; και ατινα εισι 13.
3. for τους λογους, τον λογον ℵ B: του λογου 36. aft λογ. ins τουτους C. aft της προφητειας ins ταυτης l 16 vulg(with am demid &c agst fuld tol &c) syr-dd copt (Vict) Primas.

as to the *things witnessed*. The words ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κ. ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰ. χρ. cannot with any likelihood be taken to mean "the (personal) Word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ;" for why, if the former term refer to Christ personally, should He be introduced in the second member under a different name? Besides, the words occur again below, ver. 9, as indicating the reason why John was in the island Patmos; and there surely they cannot refer to his written Gospel, but must be understood of his testimony for Christ in life and words: moreover, ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ is itself otherwise explained in this very book, ch. xix. 10. But there is yet another objection to the supposed reference to the Gospel, arising from the last words, ὅσα εἶδεν. First, the very adjective ὅσα refutes it. For the Evangelist distinctly tells us, John xx. 30, that in writing his Gospel, he did not set down ὅσα εἶδεν, but only a portion of the things which Jesus did in the presence of His disciples, whereas in the case of this Revelation it was otherwise: he set down all which he saw, as a faithful transmitter of the Apocalyptic vision to the churches. But still more does the verb εἶδεν carry this refutation. In no place in the Gospel does St. John use this verb of his eye-witnessing as the foundation of his testimony; indeed he only uses it of himself at all on two occasions, John i. 40, and xx. 8. But in this book, it is the word in regular and constant use, of the seeing of the Apocalyptic visions; being thus used in it no less than 55 times. And some of these usages are such that there can be no doubt this place is connected with them; e. g., ver. 19, γράψον οὖν ἃ εἶδες, and the repetition itself so frequently occurring καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδού. Taken then as representing the present book, τὸν λόγον here will be the aggregate of οἱ λόγοι ver. 3: ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησ. χρ. will be the πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας, embodied in writing for the Church in all ages).

3.] **Blessed is** (or *be*, in the ordinary meaning of μακάριος: not necessarily referring on to eternal blessedness, as Hengst.) **he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy and observe the things written in it; for the time is near** (it can hardly be reasonably denied that in the ὁ ἀναγινώσκων and the οἱ ἀκούοντες, the Apostle had in his mind the one public reader and the many hearers. Ebrard attempts to deny this, but it seems to me unsuccessfully. His instance of St. John's passing from a singular to a plural, πᾶς ὀφθαλμός, καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, ver. 7, would be applicable only if we had here πᾶς ὁ ἀναγινώσκων. Considering that no *such* transition is elsewhere found, we can hardly escape the inference that it was intended. And so the great majority of Commentators: so Andreas ("plures uno legente possunt audire," Gloss. ord.), Bede ("doctores et auditores"), Lyra ("*qui legit*, quantum ad doctores: *qui audiunt*, quantum ad discipulos"), &c.: Bengel ("unus, ille primum, per quem Johannes librum ex Patmo in Asiam misit, legebat publice in ecclesiis, et multi audiebant"), Ewald, Hengst., De Wette, Stern, Gräber, &c. Others have explained the change of number variously: e. g., Beza, ex Hebraismo; Cotter (in Pool), "quia soli legimus, audimus conjuncti:" Ribera, "quoniam multo plures audiunt, quam legunt:" &c. If the words are to be understood as above, they form at least a solemn rebuke to the practice of the Church of England, which omits with one or two exceptions the whole of this book from her public readings. Not one word of the precious messages of the Spirit to the Churches is ever heard in the public services of a Church never weary of appealing to her *Scriptural* liturgies. Surely it

t = Acts ii. 9 al.
u see 2 John 3 reff., and note.
v ver. 8. ch. iv. 8. (xi. 17. xvi. 5. Exod. iii. 14.) soloec., ver. 5. Winer, edn. 6, § 10. 2.
x = ch. xi. 6 al.

4 Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ [t] Ἀσίᾳ. [u] χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ [u] εἰρήνη ἀπὸ [v] ὁ ὢν καὶ [v] ὁ ἦν καὶ [v] ὁ ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν [w] ἑπτὰ [w] πνευμάτων ἃ [xy] ἐνώπιον τοῦ

w ch. iii. 1. iv. 5. v. 6. (Zech. iv. 2, 10.)
y ch. iv. 5, 6, 10. vii. 9, 15. xiv. 3 al.

ACPℵ 1 a to a: 2. 4. 5 10-... to 13 2 7. 30. 32 to 35 4. to 42 ... to 51. 90 B.

4. rec ins του bef ο ων, with 4 (30. 48, e sil): ins θεου B (11[2]) 33(sic, Del; του θεου, 35-6 e sil) rel arm Andr-coisl Vict Primas: ins κυριου c Cassiod: om AC[P]ℵ h l n 1. 2. 6. 10-2-6-7. 37-8. 49. 51 B[r] Andr-p. for ἃ, των Aℵ 47 Andr-a: om 80. rec aft ἃ ins εστιν, with [P] n 1. 10-corr[1] 33 (h l 16. 37-8. 49 B[r], e sil); εισιν 36: om ACℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

is high time, that such an omission should be supplied. Notice that not three classes of persons, but two only, are here indicated: he that reads, and they that hear and do. Had there been an article before τηροῦντες, these latter would have formed a separate class from the ἀκούοντες. The E. V. is right in the sense, in rendering τῆς προφ., '*this prophecy:*' it = τῆς προφ. τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, ch. xxii. 7. **τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα** are the several exhortations to repentance, faith, patience, obedience, prayer, watchfulness, stedfastness, which are scattered up and down in the prophecy. The *time being near* makes the book of the more importance, and the blessedness of reading and observing it greater. The *nearness* spoken of is to be understood as the ἐν τάχει, ver. 1, which see. We know little now of relative nearness and distance in point of time: when the day of the Lord shall have opened our eyes to the true measure, we shall see, how near it always was).

CH. I. 4—III. 22.] INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPHECY, in the form of a *sevenfold Epistle* to the seven churches of Asia. And herein, vv. 4—6, *address and greeting*, ending with *doxology*. (Ebrard, who seems to love singularity for its own sake, objects to the above arrangement, because the sevenfold epistle has not yet begun, and prefers calling this a dedicatory title to the whole book. But the other view is far simpler and better. The sevenfold Epistle is clearly before St. John's mind, and, full of the images of the vision which he had seen, he only interrupts it by solemn ejaculatory references to the glories of that vision and the sublime announcement of the Lord's coming, and then hastens on to introduce it by a prefatory account of his own circumstances when the Epistles were entrusted to him and of the appearance of the Lord who thus entrusted them.) **John to the seven churches which are in Asia** (the form of address is exactly that in the Epistles of St. Paul: see Rom. i. 1 ff., 1 Cor. i. 1 ff., &c. That St. Paul in Rom. and elsewhere is careful to designate himself and his office, and St. John introduces himself without any such designation, belongs doubtless in part to the individual character of the two Apostles, but is besides a strong testimony that the John who here writes needed no such designation in the eyes of those to whom he was writing. See this, and other evidence as to the authorship, urged in the prolegomena. See on the seven churches prolegg. § iii. 7 ff. Ἀσία, as always in the N. T., is the proconsular province so called. "Constabat,—ut a Cicerone alicubi dicitur illa proconsularis Asia, quæ inter præcipuas Romani orbis provincias olim habita,—ex Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, Lydia; sub quibus insuper, sub Mysia nempe et Lydia, intelligi debent Ionia et Æolis, ac addi præterea vicinæ maris Ægæi insulæ. Qui amplissimus terrarum tractus, præ aliis Romani orbis provinciis, ingenti imprimis urbium, et multarum ex iis insignium et magnarum, numero gaudebat. Dicebatur Proconsularis, quod eadem a viro consulari sub Proconsulis nomine regebatur." Spanheim de usu numismatum, p. 610 (from Hengstenb.)); **grace be to you and peace** (so St. Paul in all his Epistles except the two to Timothy) **from Him who is and who was and who is to come** (a paraphrase of the unspeakable name יהוה, resembling the paraphrase אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה in Exod. iii. 14, for which the Jerusalem Targum has, as here, *qui fuit, est, et erit:* as has the Targum of Jonathan in Deut. xxxii. 39, Schemoth R. iii. f. 105. 2: "Dixit Deus S. B. ad Mosen: Ego fui et adhuc sum, et ero in posterum." Schöttg., Wetst., De Wette. "ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *instans*, i. e., *futurus:* ut Marc. x. 30. Caret lingua Hebræa participio quale est ἐσόμενος." Ewald. Each of the appellations by itself is to be regarded as a proper name—ὁ ὤν, —ὁ ἦν (not ὃ ἦν: the imperf.—or aor.—being used in the lack of a past participle of εἰμί), and ὁ ἐρχόμενος: and it follows from what is remarked above that the meaning of ἐρχόμενος is not here to be pressed as referring to any future *coming*,

[y] θρόνου αὐτοῦ, [5] καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ [z] μάρτυς ὁ [z] πιστός, ὁ [ab] πρωτότοκος τῶν [a] νεκρῶν, καὶ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν

z = ch. iii. 14. (Ps. lxxxviii. 37.) solœc., ver. 4. ch. ii. 20 reff. Exod. v. 14. xviii. 6 al. a = Col. i. 18. constr., Col. i. 15. Gen. iv. 4. b as above (a). Luke i. 7. Rom. viii. 29. Heb. i. 6 al[2]. only.

5. rec ins *εκ* bef *των νεκρων* (*from Col* i. 18), with h 10 (1. 37. B[r], e sil) Andr-p(and comm): om AC[P]ℵ в rel vulg syr-dd copt Meth, Ep-of-ch-of-Lyons(in Eus) Epiph

any more than in its English representative, "He that is *to come.*" By doing so we should confuse the meaning of the compound appellation which evidently is all to be applied to the Father, ὡς αὐτοῦ περιέχοντος ἐν ἑαυτῷ πάντων τῶν ὄντων τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὰ μέσα καὶ τὰ τελευταῖα, as the second alternative in the Catena. In the first (Arethas?) ὁ ὤν is supposed to mean the Father (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν, as said to Moses), ὁ ἦν the Son (ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος), and ὁ ἐρχόμενος the Spirit, as ever proceeding forth and descending on the Church. Hengstenb., who presses the literal sense of ἐρχόμενος, avoids this confusion, but falls into that of making the covenant Jehovah, Father, Son, and Spirit, come to judge the world and the Church. At least so it would seem: for when he comes to this the weak part of his exegesis, he obscures his meaning by raising a cloud of rhetorical description of what shall take place at that coming. He connects ἐρχόμενος with ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφ. below, in spite of the καὶ ἀπὸ . . . καὶ ἀπό intervening. It is needless to say, that that ἔρχεται is to be referred to the last subject only, viz. to Ἰησοῦς χριστός. And wherever the ἔρχομαι ταχύ, with which he also connects it, occurs, it is distinctly said of the glorified Saviour), **and from the seven spirits which (are) before His throne** (Andreas, in catena, takes these for the seven principal angels (ch. viii. 2): so Clem.-Alex., Beza, Lyra, Ribera, Hammond, Bossuet, Wetst., al. But this is highly improbable, as these angels are never called πνεύματα, and as surely mere creatures, however exalted, would not be equalized with the Father and the Son as fountains of grace. The common view is doubtless right, which regards the seven as τὰς ἐνεργείας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (so τινές in catena: Andr., Victorin., Primas., al.):—"Thou the anointing Spirit art, Who dost thy sevenfold gifts impart:" but rather perhaps to be regarded as expressing His plenitude and perfection, than to be separately assigned as (but qu.?) in the following lines of the hymn Veni Creator Spiritus. The key to this expression, which is an anticipation of the visions afterwards to be related, is ch. v. 6, where see notes: as also on ch. iv. 5. The ἑπτά can hardly be entirely without allusion to the ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι, and to the *sevenfold* imagery throughout. The number seven denotes completeness, and, as Schöttgen shews h. l., was much noted by the Jewish Commentators as occurring in the O. T. The seven spirits betoken the completeness and universality of working of God's Holy Spirit, as the seven churches typify and indicate the whole church. The reference to Isa. xi. 2 is but lamely made out, there being there but *six* energies of the Spirit mentioned. That to Zech. iv. 2, 10 is more to the point: see notes as above. The ὁ, without its verb, is solœcistic), **and from Jesus Christ** (as we have before had the Father and the Holy Spirit mentioned as the sources of grace and peace, so now the Son, coming last, on account of that which is to follow respecting Him: "quia de illo continuanda erat oratio," Vitr., who also notices that what follows has respect to His threefold office of Prophet, King, and Priest: see however below), **the faithful witness** (see John xviii. 37, εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. It is to the general mission of the Redeemer to bear witness to the truth, and not merely to the apocalyptic portion of His testimony which is to follow (De W.), that this title must be referred. This book (ver. 2) is ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ χρ.: but the *title* reaches far wider. Embracing as it does that μαρτυρία before Pontius Pilate, and indeed that of His whole life of witnessing to the truth, we can perhaps hardly say that it marks out his prophetic office with sufficient distinctness for us to believe it indicated here), **the first-born of the dead** (death is regarded as the womb of the earth, from which the resurrection is the birth: see note on ref. Col.: and Acts ii. 24 note. πρωτότοκος must not with Hengst. be diluted into πρῶτος. The ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, 1 Cor. xv. 20, is quite a different figure), **and the Ruler of the kings of the earth** (this kingly office of Christ is reached through his death and resurrection. In Ps. lxxxviii. 27, the combination of titles is much as here, κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν, ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τῆς γῆς.

βασιλέων τῆς γῆς. τῷ [c] ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς καὶ [d] λ[ο]ύσαντι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν [ἡμῶν] [e] ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, [6] καὶ [f] ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς [g] βασιλείαν, [g] ἱερεῖς τῷ [h] θεῷ καὶ [h] πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ ἡ [i] δόξα καὶ τὸ [i] κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

ACPℵ Β a to n. l 2. 4. 6. 10-3. 11 to 19. 26-7. 31 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

c pres., John iii. 35. d (λούειν) constr. with ἀπό, Acts xvi. 33. — here (John xiii. 10. Acts ix. 37. Heb. x. 22. 2 Pet. ii. 22) only. (ἀπολού., Acts xxii. 16. 1 Cor. vi. 11.) see Ps. l. 2. λύειν ἐκ, ch. xx. 7. e Heb. ix. 22, 25 reff. f change of constr., Mark vi. 9 al. Winer, edn. 6, § 59. 11. g ch. v. 10. (xx. 6. 1 Pet. ii. 9. Exod. xix. 6.) apposn., see Winer, edn. 6, § 63. ii. 2 fin. h Rom. xv. 6. 2 Cor. i. 3. xi. 31. Eph. i. 3. Col. i. 3. 1 Pet. i. 3. i Jude 25 (reff.).

Andr Areth Primas Bede. βασιλειων(but corrd) ℵ[1]. rec τω αγαπησαντι, with [P] h n 1. 10. 36 (37 Br, e sil) Andr-a-p Areth: του αγαπησαντος 12[2]: ος ηγαπησεν m 34-5[2] Andr-coisl: txt AC(ℵ) B rel syr-dd.—om τω ℵ[1]. λυσαντι ACℵ n 1. 6. 12[1]. 36-8. 69. 79 syr-dd arm Andr-a-txt Primas Cassiod: λουσαντι [P] B rel vulg copt æth Andr-p Areth, λουσαντως 12[2](sic, Birch), ελουσεν m 34-5[2] Andr-coisl.—λυσαντι και των της αμαρτιας κηλιδων λουσαντι τη εκχυσει του ζωοποιου αιματος και υδατος και ποιησαντι ημας βασιλειον ιερατευμα και λουσαντι (*from Andreas*) l 7. 16. 45. 69. om 2nd ημας ℵ[1] 36. rec for εκ, απο, with [P] B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth Primas: txt ACℵ n[1] 1. 12. 36-8 Andr. rec ins ημων, with C[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Bede: om A 1. 12-6 Andr-p Primas.

6. for εποιησεν, ποιησαντι B f 9. 13-6. 27. 36. ημιν A c 13. 27. 38. 55. 76: ημων C, *nostrum regnum* am(with fuld harl tol): txt [P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth. rec (for βασιλειαν ιερεις) βασιλεις και ιερεις, with [P] n 1. 36. 79 Andr-a-p: βασιλεις ιερεις 30-8: βασιλειον ιερεις B: βασιλειον ιερατευμα f 13. 27. 55 Andr-comm: βασιλειον και ιερατυμα 9: βασιλειαν και ιερεις ℵ[3a]: txt ACℵ[1] rel am syr-dd copt æth Andr-coisl Areth Vict. for τους αιωνας, τον αιωνα ℵ[1]. rec aft αιωνας ins των αιωνων ("*ex formula usitata*" Beng), with Cℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-p-coisl Areth: om A[P] j n 9 copt Andr-a. om αμην 33 tol: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel.

See also Isa. lv. 4, *ἰδοὺ μαρτύριον ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἔδωκα αὐτόν, ἄρχοντα καὶ προστάσσοντα ἔθνεσιν.* "That which the Tempter held forth to Jesus, Matt. iv. 8, on condition of worshipping him, He has now attained by the way of his humiliation unto death: viz. victory over the world, John xvi. 33." De Wette). Now follows, consequent upon the glorious titles of Christ which have been enumerated, an ascription of praise to Him for His inestimable love to us. **Unto Him that loveth us** (ἀγαπῶντι,—*present* part., not imperf. as Bengel,—includes in itself ἀγαπήσαντι, which is the feebler, as it is the more obvious reading. It is His ever-abiding character, that He loveth His own, John xiii. 1: out of that love sprang the mighty act of love which follows: but it did not exhaust its infinite depth: it endures now, as then. The waiting till He become, in the unfolding of the Father's purposes, the acknowledged Head over his Church, is in reality as great a proof of that love now, as the Cross was then) **and washed** (or, **loosed**) **us from our sins in His blood** (the aor. points to a definite event, viz. his sacrifice of Himself. In such an image as this, which occurs again ch. vii. 14, we have enwrapped together the double virtue of the atoning blood of Christ in justification, the deliverance from the guilt of sin, and sanctification, the deliverance from the power of sin: the forensic and the inherent purity, of both which it is the efficient medium: of the former by its application in faith, of the latter by such faith, in its power, uniting us to Him who is filled with the Spirit of holiness. See 1 John i. 7 and note), **6.] and He made** (the breaking up of the participial into the direct construction is Hebraistic: so De W., al. "It belongs to the delicacy of the Hebrew diction, to follow up the participle which gives the tone to the sentence by finite verbs, which, through the influence of the relative notion embodied in the participle, are themselves to be taken as conditioning clauses." Delitzsch on Habak. (in Hengst.)) **us a kingdom** (viz. the kingdom of God or of heaven, so much spoken of by our Lord Himself and his Apostles: consisting of those who are His, and consummated at His glorious coming. This kingdom is one in which his saints will themselves reign, see the parallel place ch. v. 10, where *καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* is added: and Dan. vii. 27: but above all the place which is here referred to, Exod. xix. 6, *ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον* (1 Pet. ii. 9)), **priests** (the βασιλείαν was the collective description: ἱερεῖς is the individual designation. See on the union of the two characters in the individual Christian, the note on 1 Pet. ii. 9) **to** (as *belonging to;*

7 Ἰδοὺ [k] ἔρχεται [l] μετὰ τῶν [lm] νεφελῶν, καὶ [no] ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ [p] οἵτινες αὐτὸν [nq] ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ [r] κόψονται ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ [s] φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. [t] ναί,

k — Matt. xvi. 27. Mal. iii. 1.
l Mark xiv. 62. Dan. vii. 13 Theod.
m Matt. xxiv. 30 ||. xxvi. 64. 1 Thess. iv. 17.
n John xix. 37, from Zech. xii. 10 (Ald. & some mss.).
o = Matt. xxiv. 30 ||. xxvi. 64 ||.
p = ch. ii. 24. ix. 4. xx. 4. Acts x. 41, 47 al.
q John, as above (n) only. Judg. ix. 54.
r mid. w. ἐπί, ch. xviii. 9 (but dat.). 2 Kings xi. 26 A(om ἐπί, B). Zech. xii. 10. w. acc., Luke viii. 52. xxiii. 27. absol., Matt. xi. 17. xxiv. 30 only. act., Matt. xxi. 8 || Mk. only.
s Matt. xxiv. 30. Zech. xii. 12.
t see 2 Cor. i. 20. ch. xxii. 20.

7. for μετα, επι C Ephr. οψονται ℵ 1. 12. for πας, παρ(sic) ℵ. for 1st αυτον, αυτω 37: om 1. om 2nd αυτον ℵ. om επ αυτον 1: om επ ℵ[1].

the Father being the ultimate object of reference, as His will is the origin, and His glory the result, of all that is brought about by the mediatorial work of Christ) **God and His Father** (to Him who is God and His Father: or, to His God and Father. The former is the more probable here, Ebr. remarks, on account of St. John's habit of repeating the possessive genitive after words of possession: e. g. ch. vi. 11, *οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν κ. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν*: ix. 21, *ἐκ τῶν φόνων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τ. φαρμάκων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ*, &c.: John ii. 12, which is more to the point here,—*ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ κ. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ] κ. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*. See notes on the places where the expression occurs in St. Paul (reff. Rom. Eph.), where I have taken the other rendering), **to Him be** (or, *is*, *belongs*: the like ambiguity is found in all doxological sentences) **the glory and the might unto the ages** (i. e. for ever. See note on Gal. i. 5): **Amen.**

7, 8.] *A solemn announcement of the coming of Christ*, and *declaration, by way of ratification, of the majesty and omnipotence of God* (see below). **Behold He** (the Person last spoken of: the subject being continued from the preceding verses) **cometh with the clouds** (*τῶν*, viz. of heaven: so expressed in reff. Dan., and Mark: cf. *ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ*, ch. xi. 12), **and every eye shall see Him** (by a well-known figure, not merely Hebraistic but common to all tongues, the acting member is said to do that which the man does by its means. This is to be understood of the whole human race, risen and summoned before Him), **and** (among them: the *καί* does not couple a separate class, but selects a prominent one) **they which** (*οἵτινες*, of the whole class: almost = "whoever:" "all they who") **pierced Him** (see John xix. 36 f. and note. As there St. John evidently shews what a deep impression the whole circumstance here referred to produced on his own mind, so it is remarkable here that he should again take up the prophecy of Zechariah (ref.) which he there cites, and speak of it as fulfilled. That this should be so, and that it should be done with the same word *ἐξεκέντησαν*, not found in the LXX of the passage, is a strong presumption that the Gospel and the Apocalypse were written by the same person. It is true, that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have used the verb *ἐκκεντεῖν*; but this hardly comes into consideration as affecting this presumption. The persons intended in this expression are beyond doubt those to whom our Lord prophesied in like terms, Matt. xxvi. 64; viz. those who were His murderers, whether the Jews who delivered Him to be crucified, or the Romans, who actually inflicted His death. That the meaning must not here be generalized to signify all who have by their sins crucified the Son of God afresh, is plain from the consideration that this class, *οἵτινες*, are taken out from among the *πᾶς ὀφθαλμός* which precedes, whereas on that supposition they would be identical with it; for we all have pierced Him in this sense), **and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn at Him** (i. e. their mourning shall be directed towards Him as its object: in fear for themselves in regard to the consequences of his coming: similarly *πρός τι*, John xiii. 28. The account to be given of the meaning in ref. 2 Kings, *ἐκόψατο ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς*, is in fact the same, the circumstances only making the difference. In Zech. xii. 10, both meanings are united.

The prophecy is in allusion to Matt. xxiv. 30; and its sense, that all, even the holiest of men, shall mourn at the visible approach of that day. But as Bengel well remarks, there will be then two kinds of mourning: "præ terrore hostili," and "præ terrore pœnitentiali." The former will prevail in the impenitent and careless world; the latter even in the comforted and rejoicing church. The holiest saint when that Presence is manifested, in the midst of his "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us," will personally feel with St. Peter, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." The whole is an adaptation and amplification of the words of Zechariah, l. c. See Vitringa's note. But we must

u ch. xxi. 6. xxii. 13.
v Luke i. 32. ch. xviii. 8. xxii. 6.
w ch. xvi. 14. xix. 15.
x ver. 4.
y as above (w). w. θεός, ch. iv. 8. xi. 17. xv. 3. xvi. 7. xix. 6. xxi. 22 only. Hos. xii. 5. w. κύρ., 2 Cor. vi. 18 only.
(ch. xviii. 4.) constr., see Matt. xxiii. 30.
19.

ACPℵ B a to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 35. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

[t] ἀμήν. 8 Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ [u] ἄλφα καὶ τὸ [u] ὦ, λέγει [vw] κύριος ὁ [vw] θεός, [x] ὁ ὢν καὶ [x] ὁ ἦν καὶ [x] ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ [wy] παντοκράτωρ.

9 Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ [z] συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ [a] θλίψει καὶ [b] βασιλείᾳ καὶ [c] ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενό-

z Rom. xi. 17. 1 Cor. ix. 23. Phil. i. 7 only +. (-εῖν,
a Phil. iv. 14. John xvi. 33. Acts xiv. 22. Ps. xxxiii.
b see Rom. xiv. 17. 1 Cor. iv. 20.
c w. gen. as in rec., ch. iii. 10 al.

8. *το α και το ω* 1. 10 (9. 51, e sil): *το αλφα και το ω* AC[P](ℵ) B a b c d f g h j k m n 2. 4. 6. 13-7-8-9. 25. 30-2-3-4-5-6-7. 42-6-8. 50 Br.—aft *αλφα* ins *και εγω* ℵ[1](ℵ[3a] disapproving). rec adds *αρχη και τελος*, with ℵ[1](ℵ[3a] has marked the words for erasure, but the marks have been removed apparently by the same hand) m 1. 34-5 (37. 41, e sil) vulg some-lat-ff; *η αρχη και το τελος* n 36 copt: om AC[P] B rel syr-dd æth arm Areth $Ambr_1$ Primas. rec (for *κυριος ο θεος*) *ο κυριος*, with 30(e sil) 34: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Hipp Andr Areth Orig-int Ambr Primas. (d def.)

9. rec aft *ὁ* ins *και* (with 2, e sil): om AC[P]ℵ B rel. for *συγκ.*, *κοινωνος* rel Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B f m n 18. 34-5-6. 49 (1. 13. 38. 51, e sil). rec ins *εν τη* bef *βασιλεια*, with [P] l (1, e sil) 16. 49 Andr-p; *εν* 36: om ACℵ B rel vulg copt Orig Dion Andr Areth Primas.—for *και*, *τη* 50: om *και βασ.* syr-dd æth. (d def.) rec (for *εν ιῡ*) *ιησου χριστου*, with n (1, e sil) Andr: *εν χρ. ιησ.* B rel harl syr-dd arm Andr-coisl Areth Primas: *εν κῡ ιῡ* æth: *εν χῶ* A 25: *εν ιῡ χῶ* ℵ[3a]: txt C[P]ℵ[1] 38 am(with

not adopt his notion, taken up also by Hengst., "Venire dicitur Christus in nubibus cœli, quoties gloriam majestatemque suam in singularibus gratiæ, severitatis et potentiæ suæ effectis demonstrat, et se ecclesiæ quasi præsentem exhibet:" for thus we confuse and indeed stultify the whole of this solemn announcement. The certainty of Christ's revealing Himself to his Church in mercies and judgments needed no such asseveration as is here used: but the certainty of His great personal second coming did and still does; being the one fact which the world and the church alike are disposed to lose sight of). **Yea, Amen** (both these words are used in ref. 2 Cor. as forms of ratification. The former is Greek, the latter Hebrew: and both together answer to the "Thus saith the Lord" of the prophets: *τούτοις δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις τὸ βέβαιον ἐπιμαρτυρῶν, ἐπεσφράγισε διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν ναὶ καὶ ἀμήν. τοῦ ναὶ μὲν ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς συνηθείας τὸ ἀμετάστατον τῶν εἰρημένων ἐξακριβοῦντος, τοῦ δὲ ἀμὴν παρ' Ἑβραίοις, εἰς τὸ μηδὲν ἂν γενέσθαι ἐμποδὼν μὴ ἐκβῆναι τὰ ἠπειλημένα ἐπαγομένου.* Andr. in Catena). **I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, He that is and that was and that is to come, the Almighty** (by whom are these words spoken? Certainly as they here stand, with *κύριος ὁ θεός*, and *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, they must be understood as uttered by the Eternal Father. And similarly we find Him that sitteth on the throne speaking in ch. xxi. 5 ff. In our ver. 17, and in ch. xxii. 13, it is our Lord who speaks. Nor need we be surprised, that He who is of one essence with the Father should assert of Himself the same eternal being as the Father. This need not lead us to force the reference of any passage, but each must be ruled by considerations of its own context. Schöttgen gives examples of the Rabbinical usage of "ab Aleph usque ad Tau," to signify "completely," "entirely:" and of the word את being a name of the Shechinah, because it comprehends all the letters. The *ἀρχὴ κ. τέλος* was a correct gloss, from ch. xxi. 6, xxii. 13). **ὁ παντοκράτωρ** answers in the LXX to the Hebr. צְבָאוֹת also to שַׁדַּי. See note on Rom. ix. 29.

9—20.] *Introduction to the Epistles. Appearance of our Lord to St. John, and command to write what he saw, and to send it to the seven churches.* 9.] *Description of the Writer, and of the place where the Revelation was seen.* **I John** (so again ch. xxii. 8: so Daniel, viii. 1, ix. 2, x. 2) **your brother** (no inference can be drawn against the apostleship of the Writer from this his designation of himself. Indeed from his entire silence respecting himself in his Gospel, we may well believe that here, where mention of his name was absolutely required, it would be introduced thus humbly and unobtrusively), **and fellow-partaker in the tribulation and kingdom and endurance in Jesus** (the construction and arrangement are peculiar. The conjunction of these terms seems to be made to express, a partaker, as in the kingdom, so in the tribulation and endurance which are in

μην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ [d] διὰ τὸν [e] λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [διὰ] τὴν [e] μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. 10 [f] ἐγενόμην [fg] ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ [h] κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἤκουσα [i] ὀπίσω

d = (1) ch. vi. 9. xx. 4. (2) Rom. iv. 25. Phil. ii. 30. e ver. 2 (reff.). f = ch. iv. 2. see Luke xxii. 44. Acts xii. 11. xxii. 17. (γιγν. ἐν ποιήσει, Herod. ii. 82.) g Matt. xxii. 43. ch. xvii. 3. xxi. 10. see Jude 20 reff. h 1 Cor. xi. 20 only † (see note). i see Ezek. iii. 12.

demid tol lipss) copt Orig. om τη καλουμενη 1. for δια (bef τ. λογ.), και C. rec ins δια bef την μαρτυριαν, with [P]ℵ B rel syr-dd Andr-p: om AC c m n 1. 4. 9. 34-5-7-8. 48 vulg copt Dion Andr Areth Primas Bede. rec aft ιησου ins χριστου, with ℵ[3c] B rel lips-4 syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas: om AC[P]ℵ[1] n 12. 36-7-8 vulg copt Dion Andr-a.

10. 6 omits vv 10-16. ins εγω bef εγενομην (εγ *written twice?*) A.

and by Christ: but the insertion of βασιλείᾳ between θλίψει and ὑπομονῇ is startling, and the effect of it must be to make the construction zeugmatic, ἐν χρ. Ἰ. not properly belonging to βασιλείᾳ. It can hardly be that the words are, as De W., "ordnungslos neben einander gestellt." More probably, the tribulation brings in the kingdom (Acts xiv. 22), and then as a corrective to the idea that the kingdom in its blessed fulness was yet present, the ὑπομονή is subjoined. "Tres hæreditatum uncias introducit Johannes, quibus se participem ostendit. Sed media harum, i. e. regnum, possideri non potest, nisi et hic tribulatio exercuerit, et illic patientia defenderit." Ambr. Ansbert), **was** ("befand mich:" not = ἦν, which announces the simple fact. When an *event* is notified with ἐγένετο, we express the meaning by "came to pass:" when a *person*, we have no word which will do it) **in the island which is called Patmos** (see Prolegomena, § ii. par. 4) **on account of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus** (the substantives form the same expression as occurred before ver. 2, where see note. There they indicated *this* portion of the divine word and testimony, of which John was a faithful reporter. Whether their meaning is the same here, will depend partly on what sense we assign to the prep. διά. In St. Paul's usage, as in reff., it would here signify *for the sake of*, i. e. for the purpose of receiving: so that the Apostle would thus have gone to Patmos by special revelation in order to receive this ἀποκάλυψις. Again, keeping to this meaning of διά, these words may mean, that he had visited Patmos in pursuance of, for the purposes of, his ordinary apostolic employment, which might well be designated by these substantives. And such perhaps would have been our acceptation of the words, but that three objections intervene. 1) From what has preceded in this verse, a strong impression remains on the mind that St. John wrote this in a season of tribulation and persecution. Why should he throw over his address this tinge of suffering given by the θλῖψις and ὑπομονή, if this were not the case? De W. will not allow this: but to my mind Hofmann is quite right in pressing it (Weiss. u. Erfull. ii. 308). 2) The usage of our Writer himself in two passages where he speaks of death by persecution (reff.) shews that with him διά in this connexion is "*because of*," "*in consequence of*." De W. naively says that had it not been for these parallel places, such a meaning would never have been thought of here. We may as simply reply, that owing to those parallel places, it must be accepted here. St. John's own usage is a better guide in St. John's writings than that of St. Paul. And Origen's ear found no offence in this usage, for he incorporated it into his own sentence, . . . κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον. See the passage, Prolegg. § i. par. 12. 3) An early patristic tradition relates that St. John was banished to Patmos. See the authorities in the Prolegg. ut supra, and the question discussed, whether we are justified in ascribing this tradition solely to our present passage. These considerations, mainly those arising from the passage itself, compel us, I believe, to understand the words of an exile in Patmos).

10, 11.] **I was** (on ἐγενόμην, see above. Not merely "*I was*," but "*I became*") **in the Spirit** (i. e. in a state of spiritual ecstasy or trance, becoming thereby receptive of the vision or revelation to follow. That this is the meaning is distinctly shewn by the same phrase occurring in ch. iv. 2: where after seeing the door open in heaven, and hearing the ἀνάβα ὧδε, he adds, εὐθέως ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι. See also ch. xxi. 10. Ebrard well says, "Der Rapport mit der Umgebung durch die Sinne ist unterbrochen, und ein Rapport mit der unsichtbaren Welt tritt ein:" "connexion with surrounding objects through the senses is suspended, and a connexion with the invisible world established." On the attempt made by some to give the words a different meaning, see

μου [l] φωνὴν μεγάλην [k] ὡς [k] σάλπιγγος [11] [l] λεγούσης ⌜Ὁ

k ch. iv. 1. Isa. xviii. 3. lviii. 1. see Matt. xxiv. 31. 1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Thess. iv. 16. l so ch. iv. 1.

ACP א a b n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 7. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

φωνην bef οπισω μου B rel (Andr-coisl) Areth: μεγαλην bef οπ. μου A 16. 38 Andr-a: txt C[P]א (n 36) (1. 41-9, e sil) vulg Primas.—φωνης . . . μεγαλης 34.—σαλπιγγος bef μεγαλην, omg ως, n.—οπισω μου ως φωνην μεγαλην ως φωνην σαλπιγγος 36.—οπισθεν A.

11. λεγουσαν א[3c]: -σις(sic) 1. rec aft λεγουσης ins εγω ειμι το Α και το Ω ὁ πρωτος και ὁ εσχατος και, with [P] l 1. 16. 36-8. 49(of these however [P] l 16 om ειμι; [P has αλφα for το α;] 16. 38 om 1st ὁ; 38 om 2nd ὁ; l 16. 38 om last και; 49 places a cross before εγω and aft εσχ.) Andr-a-p: om ACא B rel vss Andr-coisl Areth

below) ⌜on the Lord's day (i. e. on the first day of the week, kept by the Christian church as the weekly festival of the Lord's resurrection. On any probable hypothesis of the date of this book, this is the earliest mention of the day by this name.⌟ This circumstance, coupled with an exegetical bias, has led certain modern interpreters, of whom as far as I know, Wetstein was the first, to interpret the words of the day of *the Lord's coming*, ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. So Züllig, and in our own country, Drs. S. R. Maitland and Todd. But 1) the difficulty, of the thus early occurrence of this term, is no real one. Dr. Maitland says (see Todd's Lectures on the Apoc., Note B, p. 295), "I know of nothing in the Scripture or in the works of the ante-Nicene Fathers on which to ground such an assumption." To this we may answer, that the extent of Dr. Maitland's knowledge of the ante-Nicene Fathers does not, happily for us, decide the question. For, while he repudiates passages "professedly (?) brought forward from Ignatius, Irenæus, &c.," those of Tertullian ("die dominico jejunium nefas ducimus," de coron. c. 3, vol. ii. p. 70: "quomodo dominica solennia celebrabimus," de fug. pers. c. 14, p. 119), Dionysius of Corinth (τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν, ἐν ᾗ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν, Eus. iv. 23), Julius Africanus (τάχα τε σημαίνει τὸ πολυχρόνιον αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν ὑπερκόσμιον ὀγδοάδα, κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, de temp. 5), Epiphanius (πῶς τε ἀπολύειν εἰς ἐπιφώσκουσαν κυριακήν, φανερόν ἐστι; Hær. lxxv. 7, p. 910), Clem.-Alex. (οὗτος ἐντολὴν τὴν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διαπραξάμενος κυριακὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ, Strom. vii. 12 (76), p. 877 P.), are apparently unknown to him. Indeed he confesses (Todd, ut supra p. 301) to have found the word in Origen against Celsus viii. 22, vol. i. p. 758 (ἐὰν δέ τις πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνθυποφέρῃ τὰ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν κυριακῶν, ἢ τοῦ πάσχα, ἢ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς . . .), and concedes that there may be many more places, but this does not modify his opinion, nor its adoption by his successor Dr. Todd. It may be well to cite the testimonies from ⌜Ignatius (ad Magnes. 9, p. 669, μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες)⌟ and Irenæus (in the Quæstt. ad Orthod. in the works of Justin Martyr, 115, ed. Otto, vol. iii., p. 180 f., τὸ ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ μὴ κλίνειν γόνυ, σύμβολόν ἐστι τῆς ἀναστάσεως . . . . ἐκ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δὲ χρόνων ἡ τοιαύτη συνήθεια ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν, καθώς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Εἰρηναῖος . . ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα λόγῳ, ἐν ᾧ μέμνηται καὶ περὶ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς, ἐν ᾗ οὐ κλίνομεν γόνυ, ἐπειδὴ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κυριακῆς κατὰ τὴν ῥηθεῖσαν περὶ αὐτῆς αἰτίαν): whence it is hardly possible but that the word should have occurred in Irenæus. Mr. Elliott, Hor. Apoc. iv. 367 note, has pointed out that the Peschito renders οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν, 1 Cor. xi. 20, "not as befitteth the day of the Lord ye eat and drink" (Etheridge), which is an interesting proof of the early usage. This chronological objection being disposed of, and the matter 2) taken on its own merits, it really is astonishing how any even moderate Greek scholars can persuade themselves that the words can mean that which these Commentators maintain. They must be bold indeed who can render ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν, "*I was transported by the Spirit* (or, *in spirit*) *into*,"—in the face of ch. iv. 2: and κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, "*the day of the Lord's coming*," in the face of the absence of a single precedent, and of the universal usage of the early Church. No such rendering would ever have been thought of, nor would it now be worth even a passing mention, were it not that an apocalyptic system has been built upon it.

What Drs. M. and T. say of the art. τῇ as making for their sense, is really past comprehension: as it is, that Dr. T. should call it the *emphatic* article. I need hardly remind students that it is in this connexion any thing but emphatic, being merely designative, as in ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ, Acts xx. 26; τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ib. xxi. 26; (ἐν) τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, so often used by St. John in his Gospel. One day being known by the name κυριακή, any thing happening on it would be de-

βλέπεις [m] γράψον [m] εἰς [m] βιβλίον καὶ πέμψον ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις, εἰς Ἔφεσον καὶ εἰς Σμύρναν καὶ εἰς Πέργαμον καὶ εἰς Θυάτειραν καὶ εἰς Σάρδεις καὶ εἰς Φιλαδέλφειαν καὶ εἰς Λαοδίκειαν. [12] καὶ [o] ἐπέστρεψα [p] βλέπειν τὴν [p] φωνὴν [q] ἥτις [r] ἐλάλει [r] μετ' ἐμοῦ· καὶ [o] ἐπιστρέψας εἶδον ἑπτὰ [st] λυχνίας [su] χρυσᾶς, [13] καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν [ἑπτὰ] [t] λυχνιῶν

m Isa. xxx. 8. see ch. xvii. 8. xx. 12, 15.
o act., Matt. xii. 44. Mark xiii. 16. Acts xvi. 18 al. Num. xxi. 33.
p see Ezek. xliii. 6.
q 1 John i. 2 reff.
r = John (iv. 27 bis. ix. 37. xiv. 30. ch. iv. 1. x. 8. xvii. 1. xxi. 9, 15) only, exc. Mark vi. 50. Gen. xxxv. 13. see Matt. xvii. 3.
s Zech. iv. 2, 11.
t Matt. v. 15. Luke viii. 16 ‖ Mk. xi. 33. Heb. ix. 2 only, exc. Rev. here &c. 4 times, & ch. ii. 1, 5. xi. 4.
u Rev. passim. elsewhere 2 Tim. ii. 20. Heb. ix. 4 (bis) only.

Primas. om *ο βλεπεις* and 1st *και* א[1] (ins א[3a]). ins *το* bef *βιβλιον* א. rec om *επτα* (with 1. 26, e sil): ins AC[P]א B rel vss Andr Areth Primas. rec aft *εκκλησιαις* ins *ταις εν ασια*, with copt Bede: om AC[P]א B rel am (with demid fuld harl lipss tol) syr-dd Andr Areth Primas. *σμυρνην* e: *ζμυρναν* א: *μυρναν* (*1st letter of σμυρν. absorbed by last of εις*) A g[2] 1. 32-5. 50. 69 Andr-b: *μυραν* g[1]. rec *θυατειρα*, with א rel: *θυατειρας* 1: *θυατηρας* 12: txt AC B d f m 11. 34-5.—for *εις θυατειραν*, *εν θυατειροις* [P] 36. א has the names in the following order, *εις εφ. κ. ε. περγ. κ. ε. θυ. κ. ε. ζμυ. κ. ε. φιλ. κ. ε. λα.*, א[3a] adding *κ. ε. σαρδις*.

12. aft 1st *και* ins *εκει* B rel: om AC[P]א f m n 1. 34-5-6 (38. 40, e sil). rec (for *ελαλει*) *ελαλησε*, with [P] l 1. 16. 33: *λαλει* A: txt Cא B rel vulg Iren-int Andr Areth, *ελαλη* d g. (Tischdf [ed 7] follows Cא[3a] B al in editing *ιδον* here, ver 17, &c; but, from the constant confusion between *ει* and *ι*, it need hardly be considered a various reading at all.)

13. *εμμεσω* AC: *μεσον* א: txt [P] B rel. rec aft *των* ins *επτα*, with א B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth Bede: om AC[P] n 1. 12. 38(Bch). 46 am[1] syr-dd copt æth arm Iren-int Andr Cypr Ors. (*The word may have been either repeated mechanically or omitted for elegance.*) aft *λυχνιων* ins *των χρυσων* m 34-5 vulg(not tol) æth Andr-

signated ordinarily as happening ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ κυριακῇ, or, as ἡμέρα is one of those nouns which frequently lose the article, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κυριακῇ. In either case, the meaning, as far as the sense of κυριακή is concerned, is precisely the same. Nor does either the art., or the use of the word κυριακή by Chrys. in that sense (? I have not been able to find it), make it probable that *Easter* Sunday is meant): **and I heard behind me** (cf. Isa. xxx. 21) **a voice** (ref. Ezek.), **great as of a trumpet, saying** (the trumpet is the instrument of festal proclamation, Num. x. 10; Joel ii. 15, &c.: accompanies divine manifestations, Exod. xix. 19 f.; Joel ii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 31; 1 Thess. iv. 16. The similarity to the sound of the trumpet here was in the loudness and clearness of the voice: see also ch. iv. 1. From this latter it appears that this voice was not that of our Lord, but of one who there also spoke to the Apostle. Düsterd. remarks that the ὀπίσω μου leaves an indefiniteness as to the speaker), **What thou seest** (the present carries on the action through the vision now opening,—"*what thou art seeing*") **write** (forthwith: aor.) **into a book** (the prep. of motion gives the transference from the writer to the document), **and send to the seven churches, to Ephesus, and to Smyrna, and to Pergamum, and to Thyatira, and to Sardis, and to Philadelphia, and to Laodicea** (for all particulars respecting these churches see the Prolegomena, § iii.).

12—20.] The Vision, *in which our Lord appears to St. John, and the command is repeated.* This vision is the introduction, not only to the messages to the churches, but to the whole book: see further on ver. 19. 12.] **And I turned about to see the voice which was speaking with me** (the voice, the acting energy, being used for the person whose voice it was. ἥτις, giving the force of *qualis; of what sort it was* which was speaking, &c.): **and when I had turned about I saw seven golden candlesticks** (λυχνία is a word repudiated by the Atticist writers. So Phrynichus, App. p. 60, λυχνίον· οἱ ἀμαθεῖς αὐτὸ λυχνίαν καλοῦσι: and Eustathius, p. 1842. 26, λαμπτῆρες λέγει ὡς νῦν οἱ ἀγροτικοὶ λυχνίας φασίν, ἐφ' ὧν δᾷδες κείμεναι ἀνάπτονται. It is found in Philo, Josephus, and Lucian. See Lobeck's Phrynichus, p. 313 note. It is the vessel containing the λύχνος: better therefore rendered *candlesticks* than *lamps*, which gives more the idea of the light itself. The seven golden candlesticks are (united in one λυχνία) part of the furniture of the tabernacle, Exod. xxv. 31 ff. Again, in ref. Zech., we have the λυχνία χρυσῆ ὅλη with its seven λύχνοι. Here there are seven separate candlesticks, typifying, as that *one*, the entire church, but now no longer bound together in one out-

v ch. xiv. 14. Dan. vii. 13. x. 16 Theod.
w ch. xv. 6. xix. 14. Dan. x. 5.
x Ezek. ix. 2, 3, 11. Zech. iii. 4 (Sir. xxvii. 8).
y here only. Exod. xxviii. 27 (31).

[v] ὅμοιον [v] υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου, [wx] ἐνδεδυμένον [xy] ποδήρη καὶ [z] περιεζωσμένον πρὸς τοῖς [a] μαστοῖς [b] ζώνην [u] χρυσᾶν. [14] ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τρίχες [c] λευκαὶ ὡς [cd] ἔριον λευκόν, [e] ὡς [ce] χιών· καὶ οἱ [fg] ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς [gh] φλὸξ [gh] πυρός, [15] καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι [i] χαλκολιβάνῳ ὡς ἐν [k] καμίνῳ

z Luke xii. 35, 37. xvii. 8. Eph. vi. 14. ch. xv. 6 only. Dan. x. 5. a Luke xi. 27. xxiii. 29 only. Ezek. xvi. 4, 7. 2 Macc. iii. 19. b ch. xv. 6. Matt. iii. 4 ‖ Mk. x. 9 | Mk. Acts xxi. 11 bis only. Ezek. as above (x). c Dan. vii. 9. d Heb. ix. 19 only. Isa. i. 18. e Matt. xxviii. 3 only. f Dan. x. 6. g ch. ii. 18. xix. 12. h 2 Thess. i. 8 al. (but πῦρ φλογός). Dan. vii. 9. i ch. ii. 18 only †. (see note.) k Matt. xiii. 42, 50. ch. ix. 2 only. Dan. iii. 6, &c.

coisl. for *ομοιον*, *ομοιωμα* A, *similitudinem* harl. *υιον* ("*ex alliteratione*" Beng) ℵ B b c d f l m n 1. 2. 4. 9. 11-3-6-7-8-9. 27. 32-3-4-5. 41-2-5-8. 50. *ποδηρην* A 11, *ποδυρη* f. for *μαστοις*, *μαζοις* ("*ex alliterat. ad ζώνην, aut ex opinione Ammonii qui μαζοὺς ait virorum esse, μαστοὺς muliorum.*" Beng) A h n 10-7. 37. 49. 79. 80 B[r] Andr-a-p Areth: txt C[P] B rel Andr-coisl Andr-a-marg Areth, *μασθοις* ℵ e j l 46. rec *χρυσην*, with [P] ℵ[3a] B rel: txt ACℵ[1].

14. rec (for 1st *ως*) *ωσει*, with C[P] rel Andr-a-p: *και ως* (*και from precedg term*) B a e k m 13-9. 26-7. 30-3-4-5. 40-1-2. 50. 90: txt Aℵ b c d f g j l 2. 4. 9. 16-7. 25. 38. 47-8. 51 Areth. (*ωσει χιων* 38.)

ward unity and one place. Each local church has now its candlestick, to be retained or removed from its place according to its own works): **13.] and in the midst of the [seven] candlesticks one like to the Son of Man** (i. e. to Christ: see John v. 27. I will not deny that the anarthrous use of this title may mark out less sharply our Lord himself than the use with the articles; but in N. T. Greek we should be no more justified in rendering *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* in such a connexion as this, "a son of man," than *πνεῦμα θεοῦ*, "a spirit of God." That meaning would doubtless have been here expressed by *τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. The same remarks apply to ref. Dan.), **clothed in a garment reaching to the feet** (see the reff. in Dan. and Ezek., which the description and even the diction closely resemble. The *χιτὼν ποδήρης*, *vestis talaris*, was a sign of high rank or office: "sunt enim vestes pendulæ et laxæ, apud Persas imprimis, regum nobilium et sacerdotum insigne, cf. Esa. vi. 1, Ezek. x. 2:" Ewald. Arethas, in the catena, supposes the dress to be that of the Melchisedek-priesthood (see also Andreas and Vitr.); but without reason, as De W. shews. Cf. ref. Sir., *ἐὰν διώκῃς τὸ δίκαιον, καταλήψῃ καὶ ἐνδύσῃ αὐτὸ ὡς ποδήρη δόξης*), **and girt round at the breasts with a golden girdle** (in ref. Dan., Gabriel has his *loins* girt with gold of Uphaz. Bengel, and after him Züllig and De Wette, suppose a distinction —the girding round the loins betokening activity, while that round the breast is a sign of repose. But Hengst. well observes that this would hardly apply: for Christ is here in fulness of energy as ruler and orderer of His Church. Ebrard seems nearer the truth in regarding the higher girding as a sign of majesty. But perhaps after all the point is not to be pressed; for the angels in ch. xv. 6 are also girt *περὶ τὰ στήθη*. Nor is the golden girdle distinctive of regal majesty: for this they also bear, ibid. In 1 Macc. x. 89, xi. 58, the *πόρπη χρυσῆ* is the privilege of the *συγγενεῖς*, or *φίλοι τῶν βασιλέων*, not, as is commonly cited, of kings themselves): **14.] and his head and his hairs (were) white like white wool, as snow** (by the *κεφαλή* is perhaps indicated the forehead; not the face, which is afterwards described. It is only in colour, not in material, that His hair is compared to white wool; and the *ὡς χιών* is afterwards added to impress this still more. The whiteness signifies *purity* and *glory*, not as Aug. (Expos. ad Galat., c. 40, vol. iii. p. 2134: "quia et Dominus non nisi ob antiquitatem veritatis in Apocalypsi albo capite apparuit"), Vitr., Stern, al., *eternity*, either here or in Dan. vii. 9), **and his eyes as a flame of fire** (so Dan. x. 6: representing perhaps, as Vitr., "perspicaciam divinæ et puræ mentis, omnia arcana pervadentis." This may be, notwithstanding that Gabriel has eyes like lamps of fire in Daniel. Though *omniscience* could not be ascribed to him, the figure might be relatively consistent. But it is perhaps better to consider these physical details rather as in themselves characteristic, than as emblematic of attributes lying beneath them. The "fiery eye," among the sons of men, is indicative of energy and power of command: so also in the Son of man Himself): **15.] and his feet were like to chalcolibanus** (this word has defeated all the ingenuity of Commentators hitherto. The Vulg. has *aurichalcum* (or *ori-* see Cic de Off. iii. 23. 12, Hor. de

[l] πεπυρωμένοι, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ὡς [m] φωνὴ [m] ὑδάτων πολλῶν, [16] καὶ [n] ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ [op] ἀστέρας

l 1 Cor. vii. 9. 2 Cor. xi. 29. Eph. vi. 16. 2 Pet. iii. 12. ch. iii. 18 only. Prov. x. 20. ch. xix. 12.
m ch. xiv. 2. xix. 6. Ps. xcii. 4. see Jer. xxviii. (li.) 16.
n so particip., o Jude 13 reff.
p ver. 20. ch. ii. 1. iii. 1.

15. πεπυρωμενης (*erratum?*) AC: πεπυρωμενω ℵ 16. 46. 69 vulg Iren-int: txt [P] B rel.
16. om εχων, reading αστερες below, A 41 æth: ειχεν ℵ[1] m 34-5-6. rec αυτου bef χειρι, with rel: om (*as in ch.* ii. 1) χειρι g n 10 vulg arm Andr-p: txt AC[P]ℵ B c f h m 1. 4. 12-6-7. 32-4-5-6-7. 48-9 B[r] Andr Areth.—χ. α. bef τη δεξ. B: *manu*

Art. poet. 202), the Syriac and Arethas, "*brass from Lebanon*" (1st altern. in catena,—εἴτε τὸν ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ τῷ ὄρει μεταλλευόμενον), the Arabic "*Greek brass*,"—Andreas, and most of the German editions of the Bible, *a kind of incense so called* (2nd altern. in catena,—εἴτε καὶ τὸν χαλκοειδῆ λιβάνωτον νοητέον, ὃν ἰατρῶν παῖδες ἄῤῥενα καλοῦσιν, εὐώδεις καὶ αὐτὸν πυρὶ ὁμιλοῦντα ἀτμοὺς ἀποπέμποντα: Germ., Erzweihrauch), on the authority of Antonius of Nebrissa (in Salmasius (Wetst.), ὁ λίβανος ἔχει τρία εἴδη δένδρων, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἄῤῥην ὀνομάζεται χαλκολίβανος, ἡλιοειδὴς καὶ πυῤῥός, ἤγουν ξανθός), who understands by the word some superior species of frankincense, the so-called 'thus masculum:' for in Greek frankincense is called λίβανος, after the Heb. לְבֹנָה or לְבוֹנָה, from the root לָבַן, *albus fuit*. This writer refers to hymns of Orpheus in honour of Apollo and of Artemis, in which χαλκολίβ. occurs in the sense of a costly kind of incense (but all we find in the titles of hymns 7, 19, 21, 65, is λιβανόμαννα, possibly a mixture of frankincense and manna), and to Virg. Ecl. viii. 65,—'Verbenasque adole pingues et mascula thura.' Still it appears somewhat strained to refer χαλκολίβανος or -ον to 'thus masculum:' for, granted that 'masculum' may betoken its purity and clearness, how is χάλκος accounted for, which looks more like a hint at *hardness?* Besides, incense is not burnt ἐν καμίνῳ, in a smelting furnace, but in a censer or shallow vessel, and its colour while burning is no way observable. The interpretation, "brass from Lebanon," does not appear to be tenable, as there is no notice of Lebanon ever having produced brass of superior quality, such as this from the context must be. Suidas interprets it thus: χαλκολίβανον, εἶδος ἠλέκτρου τιμιώτερον χρυσοῦ. ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἤλεκτρον ἀλλότυπον χρυσίον μεμιγμένον ὑελῷ καὶ λιθείᾳ. And this, considering that in the similar and model passage, Dan. x. 6 LXX, we have χάλκος ἐξαστράπτων (as also in Ezek. i. 7), ib. Theod. χάλκος στίλβων (as also in Ezek. xl. 3), and in Ezek. i. 4, 27, and viii. 2, ἤλεκτρον,—seems the most likely direction in which to find the meaning. Still, as almost all Commentators confess, it must remain enigmatical, of what the word is compounded, and to what it precisely applies. According to usual analogy, not χάλκος but λίβανος is the central idea, and χάλκος the qualifying one, as in χαλκάνθη, χαλκόλιθος, χαλκοθήκη, &c. But this makes the difficulty greater; for we can assign no meaning to λίβανος which would fit this requirement. If conjecture were admissible (which it is not), I should, in despair of any way out of the difficulty, suggest whether the word might not have been χαλκολιβαδίῳ, a stream of melted brass: ΔΙ having been read ΛΙ or Ν. At all events this may rank with Hitzig's conjecture, χαλχοκλιβάνῳ), as if they had been burnt in a furnace (and so red-hot and glowing): **and his voice as the voice of many waters** (Ebrard sees an allusion to the quiet and majestic sound of the sea, appealing to ch. xvii. 1 and xiii. 1; but, as Düsterdieck remarks, there seems to be no such allusion here, but only to the *power* of the voice as resembling the rushing of many waters. So Dan. x. 6 Theod., ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ὡς φωνὴ ὄχλου: Ezek. xliii. 2, where the same expression is found (in the Heb., with which agree Vulg., Syr., &c., but not LXX), i. 24, where the sound of the wings of the creatures is ὡς φωνὴ ὕδατος πολλοῦ). 16.] **And having** (ἔχων, not = καὶ εἶχεν, but as in ref. St. John takes up the description from time to time irrespective of the construction, as if (De W.) with separate strokes of the pencil) **in his right hand seven stars** (not, as Heinr., *on* his right hand, as a number of jewelled rings, but *in* his right hand, as a wreath or garland held in it. De W. well remarks that *this*, which is the more natural rendering, is also required by the symbolism. If the seven churches which the seven stars symbolize, were *on* the Lord's hand as rings, they would seem to be serving (adorning?) Him, and not to be the objects of his action: but now that He *holds them in* his hand, He appears as their Guardian, their Provider, their Nourisher: and, we may add, their Possessor, who brings them out and puts them forth to be seen when He pleases. His universal Church would hardly be thus repre-

q Matt. xv. 11. Job xli. 11. r ch. xix. 15 (21). s Rev. (ii. 12, 16. vi. 8. xix. 15, 21) only, exc. Luke ii. 35. t ch. ii. 12. u Heb. iv. 12. ch. ii. 12 only. w. ῥομφ., Ps. cxlix. 6. Sir. xxi. 3. w. μάχαιρα, Judg. iii. 16. Prov. v. 4 only. v = ch. ii. 12. xiv. 14, &c. xix. 15 (Rom. iii. 15) only. Isa. xlix. 2. w = ch. iv. 5 al. x = John xi. 44 (vii. 24) only. Cant. ii. 14. y Matt. xiii. 43. xvii. 2. Ps. lxxxviii. 36. z = intr., John i. 4. v. 35. 2 Pet. i. 19. 1 John ii. 8. ch. xxi. 23 only. Gen. i. 17. a see Mark ix. 1. Rom. i. 4. 1 Cor. xv. 43 al. Judg. v. 31 B. b Dan. viii. 18 Theod. x. 8, 9 LXX. c Mark v. 22. John xi. 32. Acts v. 10 only. d Mark x. 16. Ps. cxxxviii. 5. e Dan. x. 12. Luke i. 13, 30. f ch. ii. 8. xxii. 13. Isa. xliv. 6. xlviii. 12. g John vi. 57. Luke xxiv. 5. Num. xiv. 21.

[p] ἑπτά, καὶ [qr] ἐκ τοῦ [qr] στόματος αὐτοῦ [rst] ῥομφαία [tu] δίστομος [rtv] ὀξεῖα [qrw] ἐκπορευομένη, καὶ ἡ [x] ὄψις αὐτοῦ [y] ὡς ὁ [y] ἥλιος [z] φαίνει [a] ἐν τῇ [a] δυνάμει αὐτοῦ. 17 καὶ ὅτε εἶδον αὐτόν, [bc] ἔπεσα [c] πρὸς τοὺς [c] πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡς νεκρός· καὶ [d] ἔθηκεν τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ [d] ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ λέγων [e] Μὴ φοβοῦ· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ [f] πρῶτος καὶ ὁ [f] ἔσχατος 18 καὶ ὁ [g] ζῶν, καὶ ἐγενόμην

ACPℵ B a to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

dextera sua Iren-int. φαινει bef ως ο ηλιος ℵ.

17. for προς, εις ℵ. ωσει ℵ 36. rec επεθηκε, with ℵ n 1. 10-7 (g h 12. 37. 41-9 Br, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P] B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec aft δεξιαν αυτου ins χειρα, with ℵ[3c] h n 1. 10. 36 (37. 41-9 Br, e sil) Andr: om AC[P]ℵ[1] B rel Andr-coisl Areth, and vulg Cypr Primas. rec aft λεγων ins μοι, with (1. 41, e sil) æth: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth. om μη φοβου ℵ[1](ins ℵ[3a]). for πρωτος, πρωτοτοκος A(and in ch. ii. 8 also) (Areth-comm).

sented, but only a portion of it which it pleases Him to take in his hand and hold forth as representing the rest): **and out of his mouth a two-edged sharp sword going forth** (cf. Isa. xi. 4, xlix. 2 (*ἔθηκε τὸ στόμα μου ὡς μάχαιραν ὀξεῖαν*): also our ch. ii. 16, and Wisd. xviii. 15, 16. The same figure occurs with reference to *men* in Ps. lv. 21, lvii. 4. lix. 7: and Wetst. and Schöttg. give examples of it from the Rabbinical writings. The thing signified may perhaps be as in 2 Thess. ii. 8, *ὁ ἄνομος ὃν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ* . . .: and in ch. xix. 21; but clearly we must not exclude (as Düsterd.) the attributes of the *word of God*, Heb. iv. 12, Eph. vi. 17. And this all the more, inasmuch as 1) here the Lord is represented not as taking vengeance on his enemies, but as speaking with his own, both in the way of comforting and of threatening: and 2) in ch. xix. 21, where this very sword is again alluded to as slaying the Lord's enemies, His title as *καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου* is *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*): **and his countenance** (not, as Düsterd., who wrongly quotes De W. as supporting him, *general appearance:* so also Ewald, al. Had this been so, how should the Apostle have noted the details just mentioned? for the whole figure of our Lord would have been too dazzling for him to contemplate. It is natural that after describing the eyes, and that which proceeded from the mouth, he should give the general effect of the countenance. And as matter of usage, John xi. 44 is decided, being spoken of a person, which ib. vii. 24 is not) **as the sun shineth in his strength** (see ref. Judges:—that is, when unclouded and in full power: not necessarily at midday, but at any time. The construction is again broken: *ὡς ὁ ἥλ. φαίνων* would be the regular connexion). 17, 18.] **And when I saw Him, I fell at his feet as dead** (the effect of the divine appearance: see Exod. xxxiii. 20; Job xlii. 6; Isa. vi. 5; Ezek. i. 28; Dan. viii. 17 ff., x. 7 ff. There is no discrepancy in this bodily action with the spiritual nature of the vision, as De W. thinks, either here or in the places where similar physical effects are described, ch. v. 4, xix. 10, xxii. 8 (Dan. vii. 15). Düsterd. well remarks in reply, that the *ἐν πν.* of ver. 10 does not supersede existence in the body. Just as dreamers express their bodily feelings by physical acts, e.g. by starting or weeping, so might St. John while in this ecstasy: cf. Acts ix. 3). **And he placed his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not** (see, besides reff., Luke ii. 10, Matt. xvii. 7, Mark xvi. 6. These places, and the whole character of our Lord's words, shew that the Apostle's falling down as dead was purely from fear, not, as Ebrard imagines, as an expression of ecstatic love); **I am the first and the last** (reff.: = *α* and *ω* above: not as the semi-Socinian Commentators, Grot., Wetst., "summus dignitate . . . contemtissimus:" it is the eternity of God which is expressed—of Him who is before all and after all, from and to everlasting), **and the living One** (not = *ὁ ζωοποιῶν*, however true the fact may be; nor here signifying *alive from the dead:* but is the well-known attribute of God, the Eternal, not in bare duration, but in personal Life. The *ζωοποιεῖν* is *included*, but the word expresses

νεκρὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ [gh] ζῶν [h] εἰμὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ ἔχω τὰς [i] κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ [k] ᾅδου. [19] γράψον οὖν ἃ [l] εἶδες καὶ [m] ἃ [mn] εἰσὶν καὶ ἃ [o] μέλλει [o] γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα, [20] τὸ [p] μυστήριον τῶν [q] ἑπτὰ [q] ἀστέρων οὓς εἶδες [r] ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ [s] λυχνίας τὰς [s] χρυσᾶς.

h constr., Gen. i. 6. i Matt. xvi. 19. Luke xi. 52. ch. iii. 7. ix. 1. xx. 1 only. Judg. iii. 25. 1 Chron. ix. 27. Isa. xxii. 22 only. k ch. vi. 8. xx. 13, 14. Acts ii. 27, from Ps. xv. 10. l see ver. 2. m plur., 1 Cor. x. 6. ch. iii. 2. Matt. vi. 28. Luke xxiv. 11. John xix. 31. Ps. cxliv. 10. Winer, edn. 6, § 58. 3. a. n = (see note) Matt. xxv. 26. xiii. 37. John xv. 1. 1 Cor. x. 4. Gen. xli. 26, 27. Ezek. xxxvii. 11. o Acts xxvi. 22. Isa. xlviii. 6. p = Eph. v. 32. ch. xvii. 5, 7. q ver. 16. r so John xx. 7. s ver. 12 (reff.).

18. om 1st *και* ℵ[1]. om *των αιωνων* j 38. rec aft *αιωνων* ins *αμην*, with ℵ[3a] B rel syr-dd Andr Areth: om ACPℵ[1] j 1. 36-8 vulg copt æth arm Orig, Iren-int Ath-int Andr-p. for *κλεις*, *κλειδας* B rel: txt AC[P]ℵ h l m n 1. 34-5-6. 47-9 B[r] (13. 27. 37-8. 41, e sil). rec *του αδου και τ. θανατου*, with n 1. 36 (12. 27, e sil) Andr-a: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Iren-int Andr Areth Ors.

19. rec om *ουν*, with (d?) j 1. 16. 38 Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Primas. ins *δει* bef *μελλει* Cℵ[1]: *μελλειν* ℵ[1]. rec *γινεσθαι*, with Aℵ[3a] rel Andr-coisl Areth: om k: txt C[P]ℵ[1] B b f h 6. 10-1-6. 49 B[r] (c? n?—so Scriv) Andr.

20. rec (for *ους*) *ων*, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ 1. 12. 46. 80[2]. for *επι της δεξ.*, *εν τη δεξια* A; *in dextera* vulg Primas.

far more. The E. V. is wrong in connecting these words with those that follow); **and I was** (not ἦν, but ἐγενόμην,—I *became*: it was a state which I passed into) **dead, and behold I am alive for evermore** (see Rom. vi. 9, Acts xiii. 34. ζῶν εἰμί expresses, more emphatically than would the simple verb, the residence and effluence of life. By this mention of His own death and revival, the Lord reassures his Apostle. He is not only the living One in His majesty, but He has passed through death as one of us, and is come to confer life even in and through death), **and I have the keys of death and of Hades** (I can bring up from death, yea even from the mysterious place of the spirits of the departed. The figure of the keys is often used in this book; see reff. Wetst. quotes from the Targum of Jonathan on Deut. xxviii. 12, "Quatuor sunt claves in manu Domini, ... clavis vitæ et sepulchrorum et ciborum et pluviæ;" and other testimonies of the same kind. We have the *gates* of death as opposed to the gates of the daughter of Zion, Ps. ix. 14; cf. also Job xxxviii. 17; and the gates of Hades, Matt. xvi. 18. Isa. xxxviii. 10).

19.] **Write therefore** ('because I have vouchsafed thee this vision,—I whose majesty is such, and whose manifested loving-kindness to thee.' The connexion is better thus than with ver. 11, as some: "Now that thy fear is over, write what I bade thee," Hengst. So Aret., who remarks, "ἔκστασις memoriam lædit." But it is very doubtful whether ver. 11 is spoken by our Lord at all: see there) **the things which thou sawest** (just now: the vision which was but now vouchsafed thee), **and what things they signify** (two meanings of ἃ εἰσίν are possible. 1) '*the things which are*,' viz. which exist at the present time. This has been taken by Arethas, Lyra, Corn.-a-lap., Grot., Calov., Vitr., Beng., Wolf, Züll., Hengst., Ebrard, Lücke, Düsterd., al. 2) as above, '*what things they* (the ἃ εἶδες) *signify*:' so Alcas., Aretius, Eichhorn, Heinr., Ewald, De W. In deciding between these, we have the following considerations: a) the use of the plural εἰσίν, as marking off this clause in meaning from the next, which has ἃ μέλλει γενέσθαι. If this latter is sing., why not this? Is it not because the μέλλει γενέσθαι merely signifies the future time, in which this latter class, *en masse*, were to happen, whereas this ἃ εἰσί imports, what these things, each of them, severally, mean? And b) this seems to be borne out by the double repetition of εἰσιν in the next verse, both times unquestionably in this meaning. So that I have no hesitation in taking the meaning given above), **and the things which are about to happen after these** (viz. after ἃ εἶδες: the next vision, beginning with ch. iv., which itself opens with μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον. I would take γενέσθαι in the sense of happening, not in the wide ages of history, but in *apocalyptic vision*: seeing that, ταῦτα meaning ἃ εἶδες, *a present vision*, ἃ μέλλει γενέσθαι will by analogy mean the things which shall succeed these, i. e. a future vision. Notice, it is not ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι as in ver. 1: not the necessity of prophecy, but only the sequence of things seen);

20.] **the mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest upon** (held in, and so standing over, as a wreath) **my right hand** (τὸ μυστ. is in apposition with ἃ εἶδες κ.τ.λ., and governed by

t (see note.) οἱ q ἑπτὰ q ἀστέρες t ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν n εἰσιν· καὶ αἱ s λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι n εἰσίν.

ACℵ B a to n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30 32 to 36. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

om εισιν ℵ[1]. rec αι επτα λυχνιαι, with ℵ[3a] m n 17. 49 (d f h l 12. 37 Br, e sil) copt Andr : επτα λυχνιαι (omg αι ℵ[1] 1) : αι λυχνιαι επτα 30-3-5 : txt AC[P] B rel vulg syr-dd Areth.—αι επτα λυχνιαι αι επτα (λυχνιαι) εκκλησιαι εισιν 38, the 2nd λυχν is erased. rec adds ας ειδες, with [P] n 1. 10-7. 49 (a d f h 12. 37. 41 Br, e sil) copt Andr : om ACℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth Cypr Primas.

γράψον. Lyra interprets the word well, "sacramentum stellarum," i. e. "sacrum secretum per ipsas significatum:" see reff.), **and the seven candlesticks of gold** (elliptic construction for '*and the mystery of the seven candlesticks*,' &c.). **The seven stars are (the)** (the prefixed predicate ἄγγελοι, though on that account wanting the article, is rendered definite by the definite gen., τῶν ἑπτ. ἐκκ., which follows) **angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks are seven churches** (the import of the ἄγγελοι has been much disputed. Very many Commentators take them for the *presiding presbyters*, or *bishops*, of the churches. So Primas., Bede, Joach., Lyra, Alcas., Corn.-a-lap., Ribera, Bossuet, Beza, Grot., Calov., al. m. So also Vitr., Whitby, and with some modification, Hengst. This view is variously supported. It derives probability from the analogy of the vision itself, in which, seeing that the candelabra represent the churches themselves, existing vessels containing much light, the stars, concentrated sparks of light, should represent some actually existing persons in or connected with the churches. Again it is supported by our finding that throughout the seven Epistles the angel is treated as representing and responsible for the particular church. But before we pass on to the other great section of interpretation, we may at once dismiss those forms of this one which make ἄγγελος the *ideal representative* of the governing body (as Hengst.), or an *ideal messenger* from the church (as Ebrard), or a proleptic idea of the office of Bishop, not yet instituted, as Rothe, or, in short, any idealism at all. As the ἐκκλησία is an objective reality, so must the ἄγγελος be, of whatever kind. This consideration will also affect the current of interpretation which takes the angels to be *the churches themselves*. So Andreas and Arethas (in Cat.,—ἄγγελον τῆς Ἐφέσου, τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκκλησίαν λέγει. οὐ γὰρ ὁ προστατῶν ἄγγελος ἡμαρτήκει, ὥστε δεῖν ἀκοῦσαι μετανόησον, ὁ δι' ἁγιότητα ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπάρχων ἀστὴρ ὤν . . . . . τίς δὲ καὶ χρεία γράφειν τῷ ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ διαλεγομένου παρόντι; κ.τ.λ.). The second line of interpretation is that which regards the ἄγγελοι as *angels*, in some way representing the churches. In favour of this is 1) the constant usage of this book, in which the word ἄγγελος occurs only in this sense: 2) the further usage of this book, in which we have, ch. xvi. 5, the ἄγγελος τῶν ὑδάτων introduced without any explanation, who can be none other than the angel presiding over the waters: 3) the expression of our Lord Himself Matt. xviii. 10, οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσιν τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, coupled with the saying of the church in the house of Mary the mother of John Mark, Acts xii. 15, with regard to their disbelief of Peter standing at the door, ὁ ἄγγελός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ: both asserting the doctrine that angels are allotted to persons, and are regarded as representing them: a subject full of mystery, and requiring circumspect treatment, but by no means to be put aside, as is commonly done. 4) The extension of this from individuals to nations in the book of Daniel, which is so often the key to apocalyptic interpretation. See Dan. x. 21, xii. 1: an analogy according to which there might well be angels not only of individuals, but of churches. 5) The fact that throughout these Epistles, nothing is ever addressed individually as to a teacher, but as to some one person reflecting as it were the complexion and fortunes of the church in a way in which no mere human teacher or ruler could. That there is no exception to this in ch. ii. 20, see maintained in note there.

6) To the objection advanced in the comment of Arethas above, οὐ γὰρ ὁ προστατῶν ἄγγελος ἡμαρτήκει κ.τ.λ., the reply may be made, with advantage to this interpretation, that there evidently is revealed to us a mysterious connexion between ministering angels and those to whom they minister, by which the former in some way are tinged by the fates and fortunes of the latter. E.g., in our Lord's saying cited above, the place of dignity there asserted of the angels of the little children is unquestionably connected with the character of those whose angels they are: and it cannot be following out such a revelation too far to say that, if some of the holy angels are thus and for this

II. [1] Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον

CHAP. II. 1. for της, τω (so also A in vv. 8, 18: *mechanical repetition of terminations preceding*) AC: τω της 36: txt [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. rec (for εν εφεσω) εφεσινης: εφεσῖ 1: εφεσιων 38: εφεσου 16, εφεσω 36: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg spec syr-dd copt Andr Areth.

reason advanced to honour, others may be similarly, and for the opposite reason, placed in less honour and relatively disgraced. That this idea is found expressed in the Rabbinical writings (see in Wetst.) is a mark of the further development of the truth which seems to have been first revealed to Daniel. 7) It will be perceived that this interpretation does not lie under any of the objections stated above as idealizing that which ought to be an objective reality. For it contemplates the angels of the churches as really existent, not as ideal beings. It is only when this latter is the case, that those objections can apply. 8) It will also be perceived, that both the circumstances, which were cited as making for the former interpretation, tell equally for this: viz. a) that just noticed, the actual existence of these persons in or belonging to the churches, and b) the fact that in the Epistles the angel is treated as representing and responsible for the particular church. So that I cannot but regard this second view as far the more likely one. It has been taken by Origen, Greg.-Naz., Jerome, Andr., Areth. (in Catena: holding as above, the churches themselves to be virtually meant, inasmuch as the angel himself could not need repentance, &c.: but never doubting that by ἄγγελοι the angels are meant), Wetst., Züllig, Wahl, Bretschneider, Bleek, De Wette (see above), al. The attempt to defend the interpretation of ἄγγελοι as bishops by the analogy of the שְׁלִיחַ צבּוּר, *legatus Ecclesiæ*, in the synagogue, appears to be futile, inasmuch as that officer held quite an inferior place, in no way corresponding to a bishop, or any kind of president of the church. I may also notice, that the weight laid by Brightmann, al., and recently by Ebrard, on the omission of the art. before ἄγγελοι is worth nothing (see the rendering above). Such a sentence as Ebr. suggests in case ἄγγελοι had been definite, οἱ ἀστ. ἀστ. οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν ἐκκ. εἰσιν, could hardly be written in Greek: it would have stood εἰσὶν οἱ ἀγγ. τῶν ἐκκλ. The fact, that each succeeding epistle is addressed τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν .... ἐκκλησίας, should have guided Commentators aright in this matter. As regards the symbolism, *stars* are the symbols of the angels of the churches, inasmuch as angels are beings of light, Heb. i. 7 (from Ps. civ. 4), where see note; Job xxxviii. 7, where they are called the morning stars. The same symbolism is used in the prophets of Lucifer, the day-star, the son of the morning, Isa. xiv. 12 ff., who would exalt his throne above the stars of God, ib. ver. 13; Rev. xii. 4, 9. See also Luke x. 18. That stars are also used to symbolize earthly authorities, is what might be expected from the very nature of the symbol, and should never have been alleged here as a reason against the literal interpretation of ἄγγελοι. The churches themselves are represented by candlesticks, agreeably with the universal symbolism both of the prophetic and evangelic Scriptures. Cf. Prov. iv. 18; Isa. lx. 1, 3; Matt. v. 14, 16; Luke xii. 35; Phil. ii. 15).

CH. II. 1—III. 22.] THE EPISTLES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES. Views have considerably differed respecting the character of these Epistles, whether they are to be regarded as simply historical, or historico-prophetical, or simply prophetical. The point on which all, I presume, will be agreed is, that the words contained in these Epistles are applicable to and intended for the guidance, warning, and encouragement of the whole Church Catholic, and its several parts, throughout all time. The differing interpretations will here be only briefly alluded to. An account of them will be found in Vitringa, Apocalypsis Johannis, &c. pp. 27—58: and (but scantily, as most interpreters pass over them but slightly) in the introductions to the principal Commentaries.

Before commenting on each individual Epistle, I would notice the similar construction of all. This may be thus described. Each Epistle contains, 1. A command to write to the angel of the particular church. 2. A sublime title of our Lord taken for the most part from the imagery of the preceding vision. 3. An address to the angel of the church, always commencing with οἶδα, introducing a statement of its present circumstances: continuing with an exhortation either to repentance or to constancy: and ending with a prophetic announcement, mostly respecting what shall be at the Lord's coming. 4. A promise made to ὁ νικῶν, generally accompanied with a solemn call to earnest attention, ὁ ἔχων οὖς κ.τ.λ.

1—7.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT EPHESUS. See Prolegg. § iii. 7. To

u Isa. iii. 16. Jer. ii. 1. Ezek. iii. 11 al
v = ch. vii. 1.
w 1 Cor. iii. 8. xv. 58. 2 Cor. vi. 5. ch. xiv. 13. Gen. xxxi. 42.
x = Luke xxi. 19. ver. 19. ch. xiii. 10 al.‡ (Ps. ix. 18.) see Sir. ii. 14.
y Mark ix. 23. Luke xvi. 2. Deut. xiv. 24.
z = Matt. viii. 17. John xvi. 12. Acts xv. 10. Rom. xv. 1. Gal. vi. 2. 4 Kings xviii. 14.
a = 2 Cor. xiii. 5. ch. iii. 10. 3 Kings x. 1.
b see 2 Cor. xi. 13.
c Acts vi. 13. ch. xxi. 8 only. Prov. xxx. 9.
d see above (z). absol., here only.
e 1 John ii. 12 reff.
f = Matt. xi. 28. John iv. 6. 2 Kings xvii. 2. Jer. xvii. 16.
g vv. 14, 20. (Matt. v. 23. Mark xi. 25, but w. τι. Job xxxi. 35.)
h gen. subj., 1 Cor. xvi. 24. Phil. i. 9. Col. i. 8. Philem. 5, 7. ver. 19.

ACP ℵ B a to a, 1. 2. 4. 6. 8. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Bʳ.

u Τάδε u λέγει ὁ v κρατῶν τοὺς q ἑπτὰ q ἀστέρας ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἑπτὰ s λυχνιῶν τῶν s χρυσέων, 2 Οἶδα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ τὸν w κόπον καὶ τὴν x ὑπομονήν σου, καὶ ὅτι οὐ y δύνῃ z βαστάσαι κακούς, καὶ a ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς b ἀποστόλους καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν, καὶ εὗρες αὐτοὺς c ψευδεῖς, 3 καὶ x ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις καὶ d ἐβάστασας e διὰ τὸ o ὄνομά μου καὶ οὐ f κεκοπίακες. 4 ἀλλ' g ἔχω g κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι τὴν h ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώ-

aft *αυτου* ins *χειρι* ℵ¹(ℵ³ᵃ disapproving): bef *αυτου* m 35. for *εν μεσω*, *επι* 1. rec *χρυσων*, with [P]ℵ B rel: txt AC.

2. rec aft *κοπον* ins *σου*, with ℵ B rel lips-6 copt Andr Areth: om ACP h n 10-2-7-8-9. 36-7. 46-9 vulg syr-dd arm Andr-a.—om *και τον κοπον* e k 30. *βασταξαι* [P] 1. Andr-b. homœotel in 1, 4th to 5th *και*. *και επειρ.*] om *και* A copt æth-rom Cassiod: ins C[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. rec *επειρασω*: *επειλασας* Bʳ: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. rec (for *λεγ. εαυ. απ.*) *φασκοντας ειναι αποστολους*: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth.—aft *απ.* ins *ειναι* ℵ³ᶜ B rel: om ACPℵ¹ 18. 25.—om *εαυτ.* 12.

3. rec *και εβαστασας και υπομονην εχεις*, with ([P] 1) 10-6-7. 38. 49 (Bʳ, e sil) Andr: om *κ. υπομ. εχεις* 33 (34-5, e sil): om *και εβαστασας* 37: txt AC(ℵ) B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Aug Primas.—*εβαπτισας* 1.—aft *εχεις* ins *και θλιψεις πασας* ℵ¹ (ℵ³ᵃ disapproving).—aft *εβαστασας* ins *με* [P] 16. 45-6. rec ins *και* bef *δια* (with 92?): om AC[P]ℵ B rel. rec (for *και ου κεκοπιακες*) *κεκοπιακας και ου κεκμηκας*: *κεκοπιακας και ουκ εκοπιασας* g: *και κεκοπιακας* 16. 37-8. 69 arm Andr-p: *και κοπιακας* (i. e. *κεκοπ.*) 1: *και ουκ εκοπιασας* [P]ℵ B rel: txt AC 51 vulg syr-dd copt, -*κας* 51.

4. *αλλα* ℵ B a b c d f g h j l m 10. 30. 46 Bʳ. for *τ. αγ. σ. τ. πρ.*, *πρωτην σου*

the angel of the church in Ephesus write: These things saith he that holdeth fast (cf. ver. 25, ch. iii. 11) **the seven stars in his right hand** (cf. John x. 28), **He that walketh in the midst of the seven candlesticks of gold** (assertions of Christ's being the Lord, the Governor and the Upholder of His Church, agreeably to the vision of ch. i.: coming in suitably in this first Epistle, as beginning the complete number): **I know** (am aware of: not as Lyra, "*id est, approbo.*" The context determines this to be the fact here, but not this word. The *ἔργα* might be *bad* ones, see John iii. 19) **thy works** (so in all the Epistles, except those to Smyrna and Pergamum) **and thy labour** (reff.) **and endurance** (*κόπος* and *ὑπομονή* form the active and the passive sides of the energizing Christian life. The omission of the *σου* after *τὸν κόπον* serves to bind the two together in one. They are epexegetic, in fact, of *ἔργα*; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 58: these being the resulting fruits of *κόπος* and *ὑπομονή*, see ch. xiv. 13), **and that thou canst not bear** (reff.) **evil men** (on *κακός* and *πονηρός*, see note, ch. xvi. 2. These are here regarded as a burden, an incubus, which the Ephesian church had thrown off. The assertion is as yet general: it is particularized in the next clause) **and didst try** (make experiment of, rather than put to the test, which is *δοκιμάζειν*, 1 John iv. 1) **those who call themselves apostles and are not, and didst find them false** (this is deeply interesting in connexion with St. Paul's prophetic caution, Acts xx. 28—30. That which he foretold had come to pass, but they had profited by his apostolic warning): **and hast endurance, and didst bear** (them, while trying them: or perhaps the verb is used absolutely) **for my Name, and hast not been weary** (there is a seeming inconsistency in *οἶδα τὸν κόπον σου . . . καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακες*, which caused those who were not aware of St. John's use of the last word (reff.) to alter the sentence as in var. readd. "Novi laborem tuum, nec tamen laboras, i. e. labore non frangeris." Beng. *ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἀπεκαρτέρησας, οἱονεί, οὐκ ἀπηγόρευσας, οὐ προδέδωκας, οὐκ ἐλιποτάκτησας διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου*, Areth. in Catena). **Howbeit I have** (nothing need be supplied: the following clause is the object to *ἔχω*) **against thee** (reff.) **that thou hast left** (deserted; or let go: see reff.) **thy love which was at**

την [i] ἀφῆκας. [5] [k] μνημόνευε οὖν πόθεν [l] πέπτωκας, καὶ [m] μετανόησον καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἔργα ποίησον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαί [n] σοι καὶ [o] κινήσω τὴν [p] λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ [o] τόπου αὐτῆς, [q] ἐὰν μὴ [m] μετανοήσῃς. [6] ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἔχεις, ὅτι μισεῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν, ἃ κἀγὼ μισῶ. [7] Ὁ

i = Matt. xxiii. 23. Rom. i. 27. Judg. ix. 9, &c. A.
k = Acts xx. 31. Eph. ii. 11. ch. iii. 3. Exod. xiii. 3.
l = Rom. xi. 11, 22. 1 Cor. x. 12. Prov. xxiv. 16.
m absol., ch. iii. 3. Matt. iii. 2. iv. 17 al. Wisd. v. 3.
n dat., = ver. 16 only. (Matt. xxi. 5, from Zech. ix. 9.) Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 5.
o = ch. vi. 14 (reff.).
p ch. i. 12, &c. reff.
q pleonasm, Matt. v. 18. [2 Cor. xii. 7.] Winer, edn. 6, § 65. 6.

αγαπην A. αφηκες C‍ℵ[1] : txt A[P]ℵ[3a] B rel.

5. rec εκπεπτωκας, with [P] h l n 1. 10-7 (12-6. 37. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr, *excideris* vulg some-lat-ff: txt ACℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth Cypr₄ Pac Primas, -κες ℵ. elz aft ερχομαι σοι ins ταχυ, with B rel harl[1] syr-dd Andr Areth Primas; Steph ταχει, with 1(ταχεῖ): om AC[P]ℵ vulg copt æth Aug Jer Vict-tun.

6. om ἃ A copt.

first (towards whom? Arethas, in Cat., understands τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον χορηγίαν: Grot. similarly, "multum remisisti de prima illa cura circa pauperes:" Calov., "sedula cura et vigilantia cum fervore ac zelo pro verbi divini puritate adversus pseudoprophetas:" Eichhorn, strangely enough, "quod nimis morose et severe coerces improbos doctores:" Heinrichs, De Wette, and Ebrard think it is *brotherly love* which is meant. But there can I think be little question that the language is conjugal, and the love, as Aretius, Ansbert ("casti sponsi dilectionem abjecisti"), Vitringa, Züllig, Hengstenb., Düsterd., Stern (but applying it all to the bishop personally), al., the first fervent chaste and pure love of the newly-wedded bride: cf. Jer. ii. 2. τὴν πρώτην must not be taken as if it were comparative (*priorem*), but literally. In what particular the Ephesian church had left her first love, is not stated. Perhaps, as Ansbert, "dilectione sæculi æstuabat:" or, seeing that it is negative, rather than positive delinquency which is blamed, the love of first conversion had waxed cold, and given place to a lifeless and formal orthodoxy). **Remember therefore whence thou hast fallen** (the first fervour of love is regarded as a height, from which the church had declined. The Commentators cite Cic. ad Att. iv. 16, "non recordor unde ceciderim, sed unde resurrexerim"), **and repent** (quickly and effectually, aor.) **and do the first works** (the works which sprung from that thy first love: those resume); **but if not, I (will) come to thee** (a strong 'dativus incommodi:' = ἐπί σε, ch. iii. 3. Not Christ's final coming, but his coming in special judgment is here indicated), **and will move thy candlestick out of its place** (i. e. as Aretius, "efficiam ut ecclesia esse desinas:" see the fulfilment noticed in Prolegg. § iii. par. 7. Some take it too vaguely, as Ewald, "gratiam et benevolentiam meam tibi detraham:" others, as Grot., misled by their acceptation of the *first love* (see above), "efficiam ut plebs tua alio diffugiat, nempe ad ea loca ubi major habetur cura pauperum:" others again, going quite wrong, owing to a fancy that the Epistle is addressed to the *bishop*, "tollam a te ecclesiam, ne illi ultra præsideas;" so Zeger, al. Koppe and Heinrichs give a modification of the true meaning which is hardly justified: "primariam episcopatus sedem Epheso aliorsum transferam"), **if thou do not repent** (shalt not have repented; i. e. by the speedy time indicated in the previous aorist). **6.] Notwithstanding, this thou hast** (this one thing: there is no need to supply ἀγαθόν or the like: of what sort the τοῦτο is, is explained by what follows. We may notice the tender compassion of our blessed Lord, who, in his blame of a falling church, yet selects for praise one particular in which His mind is yet retained. This is for our comfort: but let us not forget that it is for our imitation also. μεταξὺ τῶν λυπηρῶν τίθησι καὶ τὰ πρὸς εὐθυμίαν ἄγοντα, ἵνα μὴ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῇ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Areth. in Cat.) **that thou hatest the works** ("non dixit Nicolaitas, sed facta: quia personæ sunt ex charitate diligendæ, sed eorum vitia odio sunt habenda." Lyra. It would have been well with the church, had this always been remembered. τὰ ἔργα, see below, must be referred to the moral delinquencies of this sect) **of the Nicolaitans** (there has been much dispute who these were. The prevailing opinion among the fathers was, that they were a sect founded by Nicolaus the proselyte of Antioch, one of the seven deacons. So Irenæus (Hær. i. 26. 3 (27), p. 105, "Nicolaitæ autem magistrum quidem habent Nicolaum, unum ex vii., qui primi ad diaconium ab apostolis ordinati sunt: qui indiscrete vivunt"), Tertullian

r here &c. (4 times). ch. iii. 6 &c. (3ce). xiii. 9. Matt. xi. 15. xiii. 9 al.

[r] ἔχων οὖς [r] ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

ACPℵ B a to n. 1. 2. 4. 6 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 28. 32 to 35. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

7. ins επτα bef εκκλησιαις A: add ταις επτα C: om [P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff.

(Præscr. Hær. 46, vol. ii. p. 63, "alter hæreticus Nicolaus emersit. Hic de septem diaconis qui in Actis App. allecti sunt, fuit." He then describes his execrable impurities), Clem.-Alex. (in two passages, which are worth citing, as I shall presently have to comment on them: 1) Strom. ii. 20 (118), p. 490 P.,—*τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ φάσκοντες ἑαυτοὺς Νικολάῳ ἕπεσθαι ἀπομνημόνευμά τι τἀνδρὸς φέροντες ἐκ παρατροπῆς τὸ δεῖν παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκί. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν γενναῖος κολούειν δεῖν ἐδήλου τάς τε ἡδονὰς τάς τε ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ τῇ ἀσκήσει ταύτῃ καταμαραίνειν τὰς τῆς σαρκὸς ὁρμάς τε καὶ ἐπιθέσεις. οἱ δὲ εἰς ἡδονὴν τράγων δίκην ἐκχυθέντες οἷον ἐφυβρίζοντες τῷ σώματι καθηδυπαθοῦσιν*: 2) ib. iii. 4 (25), p. 522 P.: *περὶ τῆς Νικολάου ῥήσεως διαλεχθέντες ἐκεῖνο παρελείπομεν· ὡραίαν, φησί, γυναῖκα ἔχων οὗτος μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὀνειδισθεὶς ζηλοτυπίαν εἰς μέσον ἀγαγὼν τὴν γυναῖκα γῆμαι τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐπέτρεψεν· ἀκόλουθον γὰρ εἶναί φασι τὴν πρᾶξιν ταύτην ἐκείνῃ τῇ φωνῇ τῇ ὅτι παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ*), Euseb. (H. E. iii. 29, citing Clem.-Alex., as above), Epiphanius (Hær. xxv. pp. 76 ff., where he gives a long account of Nicolaus and his depravation and his followers): so also Jerome (dial. adv. Lucif. 23, vol. ii. p. 197) and Aug. (de hæres. 5, vol. viii. p. 26), and many other fathers, citations from whom may be seen in Stern's notes, h. l.: also Areth. in Catena, referring to Epiph.

We have already seen, in Clem.-Alex., symptoms of a desire to vindicate Nicolaus the deacon from the opprobrium of having been the founder of such a sect; and we find accordingly in the apostolical constitutions, *οἱ νῦν ψευδώνυμοι Νικολαΐται* are spoken of: and Victorinus of Pettau, in our earliest extant commentary on the Apocalypse, says, "Nicolaitæ autem erant illo tempore ficti homines et pestiferi, qui sub nomine Nicolai ministri fecerunt sibi hæresin," &c. Thence we advance a step farther, and find another Nicolaus substituted for the deacon of that name. So in Dorotheus (cited in Stern) we find him described as a bishop of Samaria (*ὃς ἐπίσκοπος Σαμαρείας γενόμενος ἐτεροδόξησεν ἅμα τῷ Σίμωνι*). And an apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N. T. i. p. 498 (Stern), speaks of a Corinthian of this name, infamous for licentious practices. We come now to the second principal view with regard to this sect, which supposes their name to be symbolic, and Nicolaus to be the Greek rendering of Balaam, בְּלַע עָם, or, Chald., בְּלַע עַם, 'perdidit vel absorpsit populum.' Consequently the name Nicolaitans = Balaamites, as is also inferred from ver. 14. This view seems first to have been broached by Chr. A. Heumann in the Acta Eruditorum for 1712, and since then has been the prevailing one. (There is a trace in ancient times of a mystical interpretation, e.g. in Haymo, gloss. ord., who says, "Nicolaus, *stultus populus*, id est, Gentiles Deum ignorantes:" and Ambrose Ansbert, "si a proprietate ad figuram, ut solet, sermo recurrit, omnes hæretici Nicolaitæ esse probantur: Nicolaus enim interpretatur *stultus populus.*" What this means, I am as unable to say as was Vitringa: it perhaps arises from thus understanding בַּל עָם 'non-populus:' cf. Deut. xxxii. 21.) But this is very forced, and is properly repudiated by some of the best modern Commentators: e.g. by De Wette, Ebrard, and Stern. (See also Winer, Realw. sub voce: Neander, Kirchengesch. i. 2. 774 ff.: Gieseler, Kirchengesch. i. 1. 113 note.) In the first place, the names are by no means parallel, even were we to make Balaam, as some have done, into בַּעַל עָם, lord of the people (Ἀρχέλαος): and next, the view derives no support from ver. 14 f., where the followers of Balaam are distinct from the Nicolaitans: see note there. And besides, there is no sort of reason for interpreting the name otherwise than historically. It occurs in a passage indicating simple matters of historical fact, just as the name Antipas does in ver. 13. If we do not gain trustworthy accounts of the sect from elsewhere, why not allow for the gulf which separates the history of the apostolic from that of the post-apostolic period, and be content with what we know of them from these two passages? There is nothing repugnant to verisimilitude in what Clem.-Alex. relates of the error of Nicolaus; nor need all of those, who were chosen to aid the Apostles in distributing alms, have been, even to the end of their lives, spotless and infallible. At least it may be enough for us to believe that possible of one of them, which the post-apostolic Fathers did not hesitate to receive), which I also hate (this strong ex-

τῷ [s] νικῶντι [t] δώσω [u] αὐτῷ [v] φαγεῖν [v] ἐκ τοῦ [w] ξύλου τῆς [w] ζωῆς, ὅ [x] ἐστιν ἐν τῷ [y] παραδείσῳ τοῦ [z] θεοῦ [[z] μου].

[8] Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίας γράψον Τάδε λέγει ὁ [a] πρῶτος καὶ ὁ [a] ἔσχατος, ὃς ἐγένετο [a] νεκρὸς

s = John xvi. 33. 1 John ii. 13. ch. xii. 11. absol., vv. 11, &c. ch. iii. 5, &c. xxi. 7.
t so John v. 26. Matt. xiii. 11. 2 Tim. i. 18 al. Gen. xxxi. 7.
u so ch. vi. 4 reff.
v John vi. 26, 50, 51. Heb. xiii. 10.
w ch. xxii. 2 (bis), 14, 19. Gen. ii. 9.
x = as above (w). Luke xxiii. 31 only. Exod. ix. 26. Xen. Anab. vi. 4. 4, 5.
y Luke xxiii. 43. 2 Cor. xii. 4 only. Gen. ii. 8 & fr.
z ch. iii. 2 reff.
a ch. i. 17, 18 (reff.).

νικουντι A. (so also ver 17.) om αυτω ℵ h 49 (10-7. 46. 88?) Areth. rec for τω παραδεισω) μεσω του παραδεισου (*see note*), with h m n 1. 10-7. 34-5-6 (16. 37. 49 Br e sil) copt Andr Areth-comm: μεσω τω παραδισω [P]ℵ[3a]: txt ACℵ[1] B rel vulg syr-dd æth Orig-int Cypr rec om μου, with AC[P]ℵ n 1. 18(Mid expr) 36 (26, e sil) Andr: ins B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Orig-int Cypr.

8. for της, τω A (so also vv 1, 18): ὁ g. rec (for εν σμυρνη εκκλ.) εκκλ. σμυρναιων: εκκλησιας μυρναιων (sic) 1: σμυρναιων εκκλ. n: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr-p-coisl Areth Primas Bede.—σμυρνης A: ζμυρνη ℵ. for πρωτος, πρωτοτοκος A. (So *ch* i. 17.)

pression in the mouth of our Lord unquestionably points at deeds of abomination and impurity: cf. Isa. lxi. 8; Jer. xliv. 4; Amos v. 21; Zech. viii. 17).

7.] *Solemn conclusion of the Epistle.* **He that hath an ear** (no fanciful distinction must be imagined between the singular, and the plural which is found in the Gospels (reff.): nor must we imagine with Hengst. that οὖς denotes the spiritual hearing or apprehension. We have precisely the same use of the sing. in Matt. x. 27, ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς ἀκούετε κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων: where the distinction will hardly be maintained), **let him hear what the Spirit** (τὸ πνεῦμα, speaking in its fulness, through Him to whom it is given without measure, to John who was ἐν πνεύματι, in a state of spiritual ecstasy and receptivity: cf. John xvi. 13) **saith to the churches** (Ebrard well notices that not a colon, but a full stop must be put here, as indeed might be shewn from the way in which the proclamation is repeated in ver. 29 and in ch. iii. 6, 13, 22. It directs attention, not to that which follows only, but to the whole contents of the seven Epistles). **To him that conquereth** (the verb is absolute, without any object expressed as in reff. John and 1 John. So of Christ Himself in ch. iii. 21), **I will give to him** (the personal pronoun is repeated both idiomatically and for emphasis) **to eat** (i. e. I will permit him to eat: not in the ordinary sense of *giving to eat*: see ch. iii. 21, δώσω αὐτῷ . . . . καθίσαι) **of** (the fruit of) **the tree** (see ref. Gen., from which the words come: and to suit which apparently the words μέσῳ τοῦ have been substituted for τῷ) **of life, which is in the paradise of (my) God** (the way to which tree was closed up after man's sin, Gen. iii. 24. The promise, and its expression, are in the closest connexion with our Lord's discourse in John vi., as will be seen by comparing Gen. iii. 22, μή ποτε ἐκτείνῃ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ φάγῃ, καὶ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,—with John vi. 51, ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. But we need not therefore say (as Ebrard: so also Calov.) that Christ *is* the tree of life here, nor confuse the figure by introducing one which in its character is distinct from it. Still less, as Grot., is the tree to be interpreted as being the Holy Spirit. See, for the imagery, ch. xxii. 2, 14, 19. There is meaning in τοῦ θεοῦ (μου). The two former words as following παραδείσῳ, come from Ezek. xxviii. 13, and set forth the holiness and glory of that paradise as consisting in God's dwelling and delighting in it: and the adjunct μου (John xx. 17), if read, connects this holiness and glory with Him who is ours, and who has every right to make the promise in virtue of his own peculiar part in God. On the whole image and expression, see Schöttgen, h. l., who adduces many parallels from the rabbinical writings).

8—11.] The Epistle to the Church at Smyrna. See Prolegg., § iii. 8. **And to the angel of the church in Smyrna** (in accordance with the idea of the angel representing the bishop, many of the ancient Commentators have inferred that Polycarp must have been here addressed. Whether this were chronologically possible, must depend on the date which we assign to the writing of the Apocalypse. He was martyred in A.D. 168, 86 years after his conversion, Eus. H. E. iv. 15) **write: These things saith the first and the last, who was** (became) **dead and revived** (see ch. i. 17, 18, and for this sense of ζῆν, reff. The words here seem to point on to the promise in vv.

καὶ [ab] ἔζησεν, [9] Οἶδά σου τὴν [c] θλῖψιν καὶ τὴν [d] πτωχείαν, ἀλλὰ [e] πλούσιος εἶ, καὶ τὴν [f] βλασφημίαν [g] ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων [h] Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ [i] συναγωγὴ τοῦ [i] σατανᾶ. [10] μὴ φοβοῦ ἃ μέλλεις πάσχειν. ἰδοὺ [[j] δὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος [k] ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς [l] φυλα-

b = ch. xiii. 14. Matt. ix. 18. John v. 25. Ezek. xxxvii. 3.
c ch. i. 9 reff. Ps. xliii. 24.
d 2 Cor. viii. 2, 9 only. Job xxx. 27.
e = James ii. 5. (see ch. iii. 18. 2 Cor. vi. 10.)
f ch. xiii. 1, &c. Matt. xii. 31 al. Ezek. xxxv. 12.
g so John iii. 26.
h = Rom. ii. 28, 29.
i ch. iii. 9. see Num. xvi. 3. Prov. xxi. 16.
j Matt. xiii. 23. Luke ii. 15. Acts xiii. 2. xv. 36. 1 Cor. vi. 20. 2 Cor. xii. 1 (Heb. ii. 16) only.
k so John xvi. 17. 2 John 10.
l Matt. xviii. 30. Acts xvi. 23. Jer. xliv. (xxxvii.) 21.

9. rec ins *τα εργα και* bef *τ. θλιψιν* (*see ver* 2 *and ch* iii. 1, 8, 15), with ℵ B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Tich: om ACP 19. 47 vulg copt æth Andr-comm Primas Bede. rec (for *αλλα πλ.*) *πλ. δε*, with 1 Andr-coisl-comm: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Areth. rec om *εκ*, with [P] h n 1. 10-7. 33 (26. 34-6-7. 49 B^r e sil) Andr: ins AC(ℵ) B rel syr-dd copt arm Andr-coisl Areth Primas: *την εκ.* ℵ. *ιουδαιων* (*mechanical repetition of termination of preceding word*) Cℵ[1]: txt A[P]ℵ[3a] B rel. at end add *εισιν* ℵ[3c].
10. rec *μηδεν*, with [P]ℵ rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Cypr Primas: txt AC B g 38. 49 copt Andr-p. *παθειν* B 38(Bch) rel Andr-a Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ h l m n 10-8. 34-5-6 (1. 4. 16. 37. 40-2-9. 51 B^r, e sil) Andr. aft *ιδου* ins *δη* B rel syr-dd Andr-p Areth: om AC[P]ℵ f k l m n 1. 30[1]-3 (16. 34-5-6-8. 51. 90, e sil) Andr. rec (for *βαλλειν*) *βαλειν*, with B rel Andr Areth: *βαλλεῖν* 32: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] a e m 12-7-8. 30[1]-4-5-6-8(Alf). 90. 92 Andr-coisl.—(om 30[1]: *βαλλειν βαλιν*(sic) ℵ[1]: *ο διαβ.* bef *βαλλ.* g 38.) rec *εξ υμων* bef *ο διαβολος*, with ℵ (g) k(e sil) 1 Andr: txt AC[P]

10, 11): **I know thy tribulation and thy poverty** (in outward wealth, arising probably from the *θλῖψις*, by the despoiling of the goods of the Christians); **nevertheless thou art rich** (spiritually; see reff. To suppose an allusion to the name *πολύκαρπος* (Hengst.), is in the highest degree fanciful and improbable): **and** (I know) **thy calumny from** (arising from) **those who profess themselves to be Jews, and they are not, but** (are) **Satan's synagogue** (these slanderers were in all probability actually Jews by birth, but not (see Rom. ii. 28; Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 4 ff.) in spiritual reality; the same who every where, in St. Paul's time and afterwards, were the most active enemies of the Christians. When Polycarp was martyred, we read *ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος ἐθνῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων τῶν τὴν Σμύρναν κατοικούντων ἀκαταασχέτῳ θυμῷ καὶ μεγάλῃ φωνῇ ἐπεβόα*: and afterwards when faggots were collecting for the pile, *μάλιστα Ἰουδαίων προθύμως, ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς, εἰς τοῦτο ὑπουργούντων*, Mart. Polyc. c. 12, 13, pp. 1037, 1042. This view is strengthened by the context. Had they been, as some have supposed, e. g. Vitringa, Christians, called Ἰουδαῖοι in a mystical sense, they would hardly have been spoken of as the principal source of calumny against the Church, nor would the collective epithet of *Satan's synagogue* be given to them. Respecting the latter appellation, see some interesting remarks by Trench, N. T. Synonyms, § i. He brings out there, how *ἐκκλησία*, the nobler word, was chosen by our Lord and His Apostles for the assembly of the called in Christ, while *συναγωγή*, which is only once found (James ii. 2) of a Christian assembly (and there, as Düsterd. notes, not with *τοῦ θεοῦ*, but with *ὑμῶν*), was gradually abandoned entirely to the Jews, so that in this, the last book of the canon, such an expression as this can be used. See also his Comm. on the Epistles to the Seven Churches, p. 95. See the opposite in Num. xvi. 3, xx. 4, xxxi. 16,—*συναγωγὴ κυρίου*). **10.] Fear not the things which thou art about to suffer** (in the ways mentioned below. *ἅ* indicates manifold tribulation, as there): **behold [for certain** (*δή* gives the tone of present certainty and actuality: see reff. It is in fact originally no more than a shortened form of *ἤδη*: see Hartung, Partikellehre, i. 245 ff.)], **the devil** (Hengstb. after Züllig, would lay stress here on the import of the name of the great adversary, as connected with the *βλασφημία* above. But this again would be forced and unnatural, especially after the recent mention of *σατανᾶ*. Of course it is understood from the context, that the devil would act through the hostility of human agents, and among them eminently these Jewish enemies. Trench, in loc., remarks on the reference to the devil, as the primary author of all assaults on the Church, found in the Acts of the ancient martyrs: e. g. the Ep. from the Churches of Lyons and Vienne: the Martyrdom of Polycarp, 3, 17, pp. 1032, 1041: Martyr. Ignat.) **is about to cast (some) of you into prison** (literally: the constant

κὴν ἵνα [m] πειρασθῆτε, καὶ [n] ἕξετε [n] θλῖψιν [o] ἡμερῶν [o] δέκα. [p] γίνου πιστὸς [qr] ἄχρι [r] θανάτου, [s] καὶ δώσω σοι τὸν [t] στέφανον τῆς [t] ζωῆς. 11 ὁ [u] ἔχων [u] οὖς [u] ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ὁ [u] νικῶν οὐ μὴ [v] ἀδικηθῇ ἐκ τοῦ [w] θανάτου τοῦ [w] δευτέρου.

m see 1 Pet. iv. 12.
n John xvi. 33. 1 Cor. vii. 28. Sir. ii. 3.
o Dan. i. 12, 14.
p Matt. x. 16. xxiv. 44. Luke xii. 40. John xx. 27.
q = Heb. iv 12.
r Acts xxii. 4. ch. xii. 11 (2 Macc. xiii. 14).
s = John ii. 19. Eph. v. 14. James iv. 7, 8.
t James i. 12 only. see 2 Tim. iv. 8. Prov. iv. 9 bis.
u ver. 7 (reff.).
v = ch. vi. 6 reff. Isa. x. 20.
w ch. xx. 6, 14. xxi. 8.

...του δευτερου k. ACPℵ B a (o j, l m n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

B rel. πειραθητε 1. for εξετε, εχετε C 1. 11: εχητε A[P] 12(Mill). 36 copt Primas: εξητε d: txt ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Tich Bede. ημερας B rel Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ h l m n 10-7. 34-6 (1. 16. 37. 49 Br, e sil) Andr Primas. om γινου ℵ[1](ins ℵ[3a]).

accompaniment of persecution, Acts xii. 4; xvi. 23: not, as Heinr., put for all kinds of misery), **that ye may be tried** (by temptations to fall away: not, that ye may be *proved*,—"ut fidem suam inter maxima pericula probare eoque consummatam virtutem consummare possint," as Ewald. This might be the end which Christ had in view in permitting the persecution: but ἵνα here rather gives the purpose of the agent in the previous clause, ὁ διάβολος): **and ye shall have tribulation ten days** (the expression is probably used to signify a short and limited time: so in Gen. xxiv. 55; Num. xi. 19; Dan. i. 12: see also Num. xiv. 22; 1 Sam. i. 8; Job xix. 3; Acts xxv. 6. Wetst. quotes Ter. Adelph. v. 1. 36, "decem dierum vix mihi est familia." So Arethas in Catena, εἰς ὀλίγον χρόνον τούτων ἡ θλῖψις, καὶ οὐδ᾽ ὅσον δέκα ἡμέραις παραμετρεῖσθαι ἀξία. And so, recently, Trench. All kinds of fanciful interpretations have been given: so in Gloss. ord.,—"Deus suos ad bella mittens Decalogo armat" (another variety of which is, "tribulatio ecclesiæ durabit quamdiu observatio præceptorum Decalogi, quod est usque ad finem mundi:" so Lyra, altern.):—"x. diebus, i. e. toto hoc tempore in quo per *septem* dies contra *tria* principalia vitia pugnatur, avaritiam, cupiditatem, vanam gloriam." Similarly Ansbert. And again, "significatur totum tempus usque ad finem sæculi, eo quod omnes numeri sequentes denarium sunt replicationes ipsius et partium suarum." Lyra introduces "the year-day principle:" —"posset etiam aliter salvo meliori judicio exponi, ut per decem dies intelligantur decem anni, secundum illud, Ezech. iv. 6, '*Diem pro anno dedi;*' forte tantum duravit persecutio Smyrnensis ecclesiæ." This has been taken up by Cluver. in Calov., Brightmann, al. Bede, Haymo, and Joachim understand it of the ten persecutions from Nero to Diocletian: Perer., Ribera, and Corn.-a-lap., "decem, id est, multis, diebus:" Ambr., "quia, licet ista tribulatio pluribus diebus et mensibus duret, decem tamen diebus erit atrocissima:" and recently Ebrard understands the ten days of ten divisions, or periods, in the persecution). **Be** (γίνου, not ἴσθι, see reff.: new circumstances of trial requiring new kinds and degrees of fidelity; which does not remain as it is, but takes accession) **thou** (it is quite futile to attempt to distinguish in these Epistles between what is said to the Angel in the singular, and what is said to the Church in the plural. This is shewn by the former part of this verse,—ἃ μέλλεις πάσχειν .... followed by ἐξ ὑμῶν. Only where there is occasion to discriminate, is the plural used: cf. ver. 24 f.: but wherever the whole church is spoken of it is in the singular, under the person of its representative angel) **faithful unto** (reff. not, "*until:*" but "*even unto,*" i. e. up to the point or measure of: Let not thy faithfulness stop short of enduring death itself. Cf. Phil. ii. 8) **death, and** (reff.) **I will give thee the crown** (τὸν στ., as being the well-known prize promised to the faithful: as in reff. Trench, in loc., has an interesting note on the question whether this is a *diadem* of royalty, or a *garland* of victory: and decides for the former, seeing that the στέφανοι of ch. v. can only be royal crowns,—that the word is employed by all the Evangelists of the "Crown of thorns,"—and that the imagery of this book is not any where drawn from Gentile antiquity, but is Jewish throughout) **of life** (gen. of apposition: the life itself being the crown: see note, and distinction, on 2 Tim. iv. 8). 11.] *Conclusion: see above*, ver. 7. **He that conquereth shall not be injured** (οὐ μή gives great precision and certainty to the promise: there is no chance (οὐ) that he should be (μή) .... See Winer, edn. 6, § 56. 3 note) **by** (ἐκ as proceeding out of as the source or origin) **the second death** (defined to be, in ch. xx. 14, ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός. In this he shall

x ch. i. 16 (reff.).
y = here, &c. 4 times. ch. iii. 11. Mark vii. 3, 4, 8. Col ii. 19. 2 Thess. ii. 15. (Heb. iv. 14. vi. 18 w. gen.)
z = 1 John ii. 22, 23 reff. (Gen. xviii. 15.)
a 1 Tim. v. 8. ver. 20 reff.

12 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Περγάμῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὴν [x] ῥομφαίαν τὴν [x] δίστομον τὴν [x] ὀξεῖαν, 13 Οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς, ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ, καὶ [y] κρατεῖς τὸ ὄνομά μου, καὶ οὐκ [za] ἠρνήσω τὴν [ab] πίστιν [b] μου [καὶ] ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις [αἷς] Ἀντίπας ὁ [c] μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός [μου], ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη [d] παρ᾽ ὑμῖν, ὅπου

ACPℵ1 a b c e j. l n a. 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 11. 3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 44 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B.

b see ch. xiv. 12 reff. c Acts i. 8. iii. 15. xxii. 20. ch. xi. 3. see Ps. lxxxviii. 37. constr., d = Col. iv. 16. 2 Tim. iv. 13 al.

13. rec (aft οιδα) ins τα εργα σου και, with B rel syr-dd Andr Areth (σου bef τα εργα 27): om ACPℵ 38 vulg copt æth Jer Primas Quæst. for 1st μου, σου ℵ[1] (txt ℵ[3a]). rec ins και bef εν ταις ημεραις, with AC 51 vulg copt Bede: om [P]ℵ B rel demid syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth Primas Quæst. rec aft ημεραις ins εν, with Pℵ (d?) 1. 10-7. 34-6 B[r] (16. 37. 49, e sil) Andr Areth: μου g: om AC B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Primas Quæst. om αις (homœotel?) AC: ins Pℵ[3a] (ταις ℵ[1]) B rel demid syr-dd æth Quæst. rec ὁ μαρτυς μου ὁ πιστος, with [P]ℵ B rel vss: [ὁ] μαρτυς ὁ πιστος, omg μου both times, 12. 36 (om 1st ὁ 36): ὁ μαρτυς μου ὁ πιστος μου ("*ex alliteratione ad πιστιν μου.*" Beng.) AC f syr-dd.

have no part, nor it any power over him).

12—17.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT PERGAMUM (see Prolegg. § iii. 9; Trench, p. 106). **And to the angel of the church in Pergamum write: These things saith He that hath the sharp two-edged sword** (this is the logical order in English of the epithet-predicates, τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν. ἡ ῥ. ἡ δίστομος is the sword with two edges: and to the whole of this is added ἡ ὀξεῖα. The designation of our Lord is made with reference to ver. 16 below): **I know where thou dwellest; (viz.) where is the throne of Satan** (it is not easy to say, what these words import. Andr. and Areth. say in the Catena, θρόνον τοῦ σ. τὸν Περγ. καλεῖ, ὡς κατείδωλον οὖσαν ὑπὲρ τὴν Ἀσίαν πᾶσαν. And so Vitringa and Bengel. But Vitr. himself asks, "an Satanas in illa superstitione (Æsculapii cultu) se magis prodidit Pergami, quam in Dianæ cultu Ephesi?" Grot. Wetst. al. fancy that σατανᾶς was the serpent form under which the god Æsculapius was worshipped at Pergamum. But even the fact itself is doubtful; and the interpretation halts, in that the text is not ὁ θρόνος τοῦ δράκοντος, instead of τ. σατανᾶ. Zornius, mentioned in Wolf, h. l., explains it of the famous Pergamene library, and the writings of the Sophists therein contained. A more likely direction in which to find the solution is that taken by Lyra, "id est, ejus potestas, infideles inclinando ad persecutionem ecclesiæ:" for above, ver. 10, the act of persecution is ascribed to the devil: and here we learn by what follows, that he had carried it at Pergamum to the extent of putting Antipas to death; which seems not to have been reached elsewhere at this time. Whether this may have been owing to the fact of the residence of the supreme magistracy at Pergamum, or to some fanatical zeal of the inhabitants for the worship of Æsculapius, or to some particular person or persons dwelling there especially hostile to the followers of Christ (Hengst., Ewald), must remain uncertain. The above view, with unimportant modifications, is adopted by De Wette, Ebrard, Stern (who combines the others with it), Gräber, Düsterd., al.—I may remark, that it is plainly out of the question to attempt, as has been done by some, to connect such an expression as this with the prophecies of the latter portion of the book, and to anticipate for the insignificant Pergamum a leading place in their fulfilment. The expression is relevant, as the context shews, merely to the then existing state of the city (ὅπου κατοικεῖ below), and not to any future part which it should take in the fulfilment of prophecy), **and thou holdest fast** (reff.) **my name** (the profession of thy faith in Me) **and didst not deny the faith of me in the days of Antipas** (or, taking the other form of the text, '*in which* Antipas:' see var. readd. As the shorter text runs, and probably also if we read the ταῖς of the Codex Sinaiticus, Ἀντίπας is regarded as indeclinable, which circumstance has apparently led to all the perplexing varieties of reading) **my witness, my faithful one** (or, if we omit the second μου, *my faithful witness*: the appositional nominative, see above, ch. i. 5. A motive for its use here may have been the nominatival form of the gen. Ἀντίπας. This consideration of itself would obviate the untenable objection which Düsterd. brings against the above account of the con-

ὁ σατανᾶς κατοικεῖ. [14] ἀλλ' [e] ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὀλίγα· ὅτι ἔχεις ἐκεῖ [y] κρατοῦντας τὴν [f] διδαχὴν Βαλαάμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν

e ver. 4. f = John vii. 16, 17. 2 John 9, 10 al. fr.

rec κατοικει bef ο σατανας, with syr-dd æth: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg copt arm Andr Areth.—om οπου ο σ. κ. 38.

14. αλλα B a b c d f g j 13. 30-3. om κατα σου ℵ[1](ins ℵ[3a]). om οτι C am(with fuld harl[1] tol lips-4, agst demid lips5) syr-dd copt Primas: ins A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. εχει A. εδιδαξε B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ d m n 13. 34 (1. 37. 40-2, e sil).

struction, viz. that there is no reason to suppose it to have been used except in the case of the Sacred Name, as in ch. i. 5: but see Düsterd.'s own text in ver. 20: and reff. there), **who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth** (of Antipas = Antipater (Jos. Antt. xiv. 1. 3),—after the analogy of Hermas for Hermodorus, Lucas and Silas for Lucanus and Silvanus, —nothing is known to us with certainty, except from this passage. Andreas says that he had read the account of his martyrdom: Ἀντίπας δέ τις τοὔνομα μάρτυς ἐν Περγάμῳ γέγονεν ἀνδρειότατος, οὗπερ ἀνέγνων τὸ μαρτύριον: and Areth. in Cat. says, οὗ καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον εἰς ἔτι σώζεται. Ribera gives the following account from Simeon Metaphrastes: "Pergami episcopum hunc fuisse tradunt, et ejus martyrium Metaphrastes Simeon scripsit, qui ad extremam eum senectutem pervenisse dicit, et cum res Christianorum propter Domitiani persecutionem magno in discrimine versarentur, nullo timore captum sæpius in publicum prodiisse et inter crudelissimorum tortorum minas intrepide sinceram fidei doctrinam ac Christi laudes prædicasse. Ita Christianis præsidio, dæmonibus terrori erat, qui ab ipso se fugari et sacrificiis suis privari fatebantur. Quare a præfecto urbis captus et in Christi confessione generose persistens ad Dianæ templum tractus et in bovem æneum, quem multo ante igne inflammaverant, conjectus, vitam in gratiarum actione precibusque finivit. Et tanta (inquit Simeon) præstitit virtute, ut locus hic ubi martyrium pertulit, in hodiernum usque diem miraculis excellat, et magnæ in eo fiant curationes." The Greek and Roman menologies contain similar accounts at his day, April 11th. It is hardly possible to withhold indignation at the many childish symbolic meanings which have been imagined for the name, in defiance of philology and of sobriety alike. First is that of Aretius, ἀντί-πᾶς, the enemy of all, i. e. the child of God and enemy of the world; which has been taken up by Hengstenberg, who ought to have known better, and Antipas identified with the historic Timotheus. Such folly would hardly be credited, were it not before our eyes:—"Ist man bis hieher gefolgt, so wird man es nicht zu kühn finden, wenn wir die Beramtlung aufstellen, das durch Antipas Timotheus bezeichnet werde. Die beiden Namen 'Furchtegott' und 'Gegenall' stehen in inniger Correspondenz mit einander," &c., Hengst. p. 190. This Commentator also finds remarkable meaning in the way in which the name is written in A, Ἀντείπας. Then that of E. Schmidt and others, who hold Ἀντίπας to be = Ἀντίπατρα: that of Cocceius, who makes Antipas represent the Athanasians, seeing that ἀντίπατρος = ἰσόπατρος = ὁμοούσιος. I mention such interpretations, to shew how far men may go wrong when once they surrender their judgment to their fancy in search of a mystic sense for plain history. On ὅπου ὁ σατ. κατοικ., see above). 14, 15.] **Nevertheless I have against thee a few things** (not "a little matter," as Luth., Hengstb.; nor does ὀλίγα imply that more than one matter is blamed, as Beng.: nor is it used by *litotes*, to mean "graviter de te conqueror," as Heinr. and Ebrard; nor is any reference to be thought of to the sins of Christ's people having been removed by His atonement, and thus spoken of lightly by Him, as Aretius: but is used as a word of comparison with the far greater number of approved things which remained, and is plural, inasmuch as ὀλίγον would refer, not to the objective fewness, but to the subjective unimportance, of the grounds of complaint; which latter was not so. This use of the plural comes under the case treated by Winer (§ 27. 2), where only one thing is really meant, but the writer speaks of that one generically; e. g. τεθνήκασιν οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχ. τοῦ παιδίου, Matt. ii. 20, where Herod only is meant. And so De Wette and Düsterd.): **thou hast there** (in Pergamum: the locality is specified probably on account of the description which has been just given of it as the place where a faithful martyr had suffered unto death) **men holding** (cf. κρατεῖς τὸ ὄν. μου above) **the teaching of Balaam** (διδαχήν: not simply as De W., "doctrine corresponding to the

g = Matt. xvi. 23. Rom. xiv. 13. 1 Cor. i. 23. Josh. xxiii. 13.
h ch. i. 4.
i ver. 20. Acts xv. 29. xxi. 25. 1 Cor. viii. 1, &c.
x. 19 only †.

τῷ Βαλὰκ βαλεῖν [g] σκάνδαλον [h] ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν [i] εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ [j] πορνεῦσαι. 15 οὕτως ἔχεις καὶ σὺ [y] κρατοῦντας τὴν [f] διδαχὴν Νικολαϊτῶν ὁμοίως. 16 [k] μετανόησον [οὖν]· εἰ δὲ μή, [k] ἔρχομαί [k] σοι ταχὺ καὶ

ACPℵB a to j, l m n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

j 1 Cor. vi. 18. x. 8 (bis). ver. 20. ch. xvii. 2. xviii. 3, 9 only. Ps. lxxii. 27. k ver. 5.

elz (for τω) τον, with ℵ3a rel Andr-coisl Areth: om B: Steph εν τω, with 1. 18. 92²: txt AC 11.—βαλαακ C B c g² 2. 6. 32. 92 fuld Andr-a.—[τω βαλααμ τον βαλακ P:] ὁ βαλααμ τον βαλακ 12(om (ὁ?) βαλααμ 12²).—om τω βαλακ ℵ¹. for βαλειν, βασιλει A: βαλλειν ℵ3a. ins και bef φαγειν B rel Andr Areth; του 9. 13-6. 23. 69: om AC[P]ℵ h n 1. 10-7-8. 36 (27. 37-8. 41-2-7-9. 51, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a.

15. rec ins των bef νικολαιτων, with [P]ℵ l n 1. 10-7 (g h j 4. 16-7. 37-8. 41-7-9. 51 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: om AC B rel. rec (for ομοιως) ο μισω, with 1 (lips-4 Andr-a): om 38(leaving a slight gap) æth: ομοιως ο μισω [P] 12-3-7 Andr-b: txt ACℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth.

16. rec om ουν, with [P]ℵ f n 1. 10-7. 36 (h 37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd: ins AC B rel copt æth arm Andr Areth. συ(*itacism*) ℵ¹. ροφαια (sic) 1.

character of the advice of Balaam," but used in strict correspondence with **ὃς ἐδίδασκεν** following: that which a man teaches being his doctrine. And *κρατεῖν* this *διδαχήν*, is to follow the teaching), **who taught Balak** (the dat. seems to be a Hebraism, לְ יָרָה, Job xxi. 22: so Ewald, De W., Ebrard, Düsterd.: not a dat. commodi, "for Balak" to serve his purpose, understanding "*men*" as an object after *ἐδίδασκεν*, as Hengstb. Certainly it is not expressly asserted in Num. xxxi. 16 that it was *Balak* whom Balaam advised to use this agency against Israel: but the narrative almost implies it: Balak was in power, and was the most likely person to authorize and put in force the scheme. And so Josephus, Antt. iv. 6. 6, makes Balaam on departing call to him *τόν τε Βάλακον καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν Μαδιανιτῶν*, and give them the advice) **to put a stumbling-block** (properly *σκανδάληθρον*: see reff., and a minute investigation of the word by Trench in loc.: an occasion of sin) **before** (in the way, or before the face of) **the sons of Israel, to eat** (i.e. inducing them to eat. See var. readd.) **things offered to idols** (from Num. xxv. 1, 2, it was not only participation in things offered to idols, but the actual offering sacrifices to them, of which the children of Israel were guilty. But seeing that the *participation* was that which was common to both, our Lord takes that as the point to be brought forward: "satis hic habuit Christus id dicere, quod illi Israelitæ cum Nicolaitis habebant commune." Grot.) **and to commit fornication.** 15.] **Thus thou also hast** (as well as those of old: not, as the Church at Ephesus, ver. 6 (De W.). "Sicut Balac tenuit doctrinam pestiferam Balaam, sic apud te sunt aliqui tenentes doctrinam Nicolai erroneam." Lyra) **men holding** (see above) **the teaching of the Nicolaitans** (the art. though not expressed, is in fact, in this later usage, contained in the proper name) **in like manner** (viz. in eating things offered to idols, and fornication. We may remark, 1) that it is most according to the sense of the passage to understand these sins in the case of the Nicolaitans, as in that of those whom Balaam tempted, literally, and not mystically. So Victorin., Andr., Areth., Ribera, Calov., Beng., Heinr. (doubtfully), Ewald, De W., Hengst., Ebrard, Düsterd., Trench, al.: 2) that the whole sense of the passage is against the idea of the identity of the Balaamites and the Nicolaitans; and would be in fact destroyed by it. The mere existence of the etymological relation is extremely doubtful (see above on ver. 6): and even granting it,—to suppose the two identical, would be to destroy the historical illustration by which the present existing sect is described).

16.] **Repent [therefore]** (Lyra, a-Lapide, Tirinus, Bengel, al., join the preceding *ὁμοίως* to this clause, understanding it, as well as the church at Ephesus, ver. 5. The command is addressed not only to the Nicolaitans, but to the church, which did not, like that of Ephesus, hate them, but apparently tolerated them): **but if not, I (will) come to thee** (dat. incommodi, see above on ver. 5) **quickly** (here again, though in the common eschatological phrase, not of the Lord's final coming; as indeed the language shews, for then He no longer *πολεμήσει*), **and will make war with them** (the Nicolaitans. This making war must not be understood as Grotius, "Prophetas excitabo in Ecclesia, qui id faciant quod Episcopus negligit, et fortiter se opponant Nicolaitis" (similarly Calov.)) **with** (**ἐν**, in, as armed

[l] πολεμήσω μετ' αὐτῶν [m] ἐν τῇ [n] ῥομφαίᾳ τοῦ στόματός μου. 17 ὁ [o] ἔχων [o] οὖς [o] ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. τῷ [o] νικῶντι δώσω [p] αὐτῷ [q] τοῦ [r] μάννα τοῦ [s] κεκρυμμένου, καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ [t] ψῆφον λευκήν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν [t] ψῆφον [u] ὄνομα καινὸν γεγραμμένον ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων.

l Rev. (ch. xii. 7 bis. xiii. 4. xvii. 14. xix. 11) only, exc. James iv. 2. 1 Kings xvii. 32.
m = Luke xxii. 49 al. fr. Jer. xxi. 5.
n ch. i. 16.
o ver. 7 (reff.).
p ch. vi. 4 reff.
q gen., as Acts xxvii. 36.
r John vi. .49. Hec ix. 4 on y. Deut. viii. 3.
s = Col. iii. 3. Ps. (xvi. 14.) xxx. 19.
t = here bis (Acts xxv. 19) only. Exod. iv. 25.
u ch. iii. 12. Isa. lxii. 2. lxv. 15.

17. νικουντι AC. (so A in ver 7.) om 1st αυτω ℵ. rec ins φαγειν απο bef του μαννα, with [P] h l n 1. 10-6-7. 49 (37 B[r], e sil); φαγειν εκ 36; εκ (alone) ℵ: φαγειν (alone) 11-9: aft του ins φαγειν f 13: aft μαννα ins φαγειν 34-5: om AC B rel vulg copt æth Andr-coisl Primas. [for μαννα, ξυλου P.] om 2nd δωσω αυτω ℵ 38. om ο ℵ[1](ins ℵ[3a]) n: om ο ουδεις to λαμβανων 1. rec (for οιδεν) εγνω (with 51, e sil): txt AC[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth.

with or arrayed in: but sometimes in the Rev. it is difficult to trace the proper meaning of ἐν, and it seems almost purely instrumental: cf. Winer, edn. 6, § 48, d) **the sword of my mouth** (many expositors (e. g., Grot., Wetst., Vitr., Beng., Stern, Hengst., Trench, al.) suppose an allusion to the sword of the angel, armed with which he withstood Balaam in the way (Num. xxii. 23, 31), or to that and the sword by which those who sinned in the matter of Baal-peor (Num. xxv. 5), and eventually Balaam himself (Num. xxxi. 8), were slain: but seeing that the connexion with ch. i. 16 is so plainly asserted by our ver. 12, it seems better to confine the allusion to that sword, and not to stretch it to what after all is a very doubtful analogy).

17.] *Conclusion.* For the former clause see on ver. 7. We may notice that in these three first Epistles, the proclamation precedes the promise to him that conquereth: in the four last, it follows the promise. **To him that conquereth I will give to him** (see above on ver. 7) **of the manna which is hidden** (on the partitive gen. see ref., and Winer, edn. 6, § 30. 7, b. In this manna, there is unmistakably an allusion to the proper and heavenly food of the children of Israel, as contrasted with the unhallowed idol-offerings; but beyond that, there is an allusion again (see above on ver. 7) to our Lord's discourse in John vi., where He describes Himself as the true bread from heaven: not that we need here, any more than in ver. 7 (see note there), confuse the present figure by literally pressing the symbolism of that chapter. Christ's gifts may all be summed up in the gift of Himself: on the other hand, He may describe any of the manifold proprieties of his own Person and office as His gift. This manna is κεκρυμμένον, in allusion partly perhaps to the fact of the pot of manna laid up in the ark in the holy of holies (Exod. xvi. 33: cf. our ch. xi. 19: not to the Jewish fable, "Hæc est arca quam . . . Josias abscondit ante vastationem templi nostri, et hæc arca futuro tempore, adveniente Messia nostro . . . manifestabitur." Abarbanel on 1 Sam. iv. 4, cited by Düsterd.), but principally to the fact that our spiritual life, with its springs and nourishments, κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ, Col. iii. 3. See also Ps. lxxviii. 24; cv. 40. The distinction between κεκρυμμένον, reconditum, and κρυπτόν, occultum, pressed here by Trench after Cocceius, does not appear to be warranted, further than that the participle represents more the objective fact, while the verbal adjective sets forth the subjective quality), **and I will give to him a white stone** (see below), **and on the stone** (the prep. of motion betokens the act of inscribing) **a new name written, which none knoweth except he that receiveth it** (the views concerning this stone have been very various. Bede interprets it "corpus nunc baptismo candidatum, tunc incorruptionis gloria refulgens." And similarly Lyra, "corpus dote charitatis decoratum, quod dicitur calculus sive lapillus, quia est extractum de terra, sicut et lapis," adding, "nomen novum, quia tunc quilibet beatus manifeste et corporaliter per dotes corporis gloriosi erit ascriptus civitati cœlestium." But both these are surely out of the question. Some have connected this with the mention of the manna, and cited (as Wetst., who gives it merely among others and expresses no opinion) the Rabbinical tradition, Joma 8, "cadebant Israelitis una cum manna lapides pretiosi et margaritæ." Others again think of the precious stones bearing the names of the twelve tribes on the breastplate of the High-priest, the order for which was contemporary with the giving of the manna, Exod.

[18] Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Θυατείροις ἐκκλησίας γράψον

18. for της, τω A (as also in vv 1, 8): om C: τοις c n. θυατειρη B d j 12. 9. 16. 23-6-7. 33-5. 41-2-5. 50: θυατειρα f: θυατειρης(sic) 34: txt AC [P (-τηρ-, so ver 24)] ℵ rel. om εκκλησιας A.

xxviii. 17; xxxix. 10, and regard this as indicating the priestly dignity of the victorious Christian. So Ewald, Züllig, Ebrard: the last remarks, that as the hidden manna was the reward for abstaining from idol-meat, so this for abstinence from fornication. But, as Düsterd. observes, these are never called ψῆφοι. Again some, as Arethas, Grot., Hamm., Eichhorn, Heinr., have reminded us of the Gentile custom of presenting the victors at the games with a ψῆφος or ticket which entitled them to nourishment at the public expense, and to admission to royal festivals. Titus, they quote from Xiphilinus, Epit. Dion. p. 228, used to cast small pieces of wood (σφαίρια ξύλινα μικρά) down into the arena, σύμβολον ἔχοντα, τὰ μὲν ἐδωδίμου τινός, κ.τ.λ., which whoever got was to bring καὶ λαβεῖν τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον. Hence they regard the white stone as the ticket of admission to the heavenly feast. But it may be replied, 1) the feast is mentioned separately under the name of the hidden manna: and 2) the description of the writing on the stone, which follows, will not suit this view. Again, others, regarding the connexion of the white stone with the manna, refer to the use of the lot cast among the priests, *which* should offer the sacrifice (so Schöttg., quoting the Rabbis): or to the writing a name, at election by ballot, on a stone or a bean (so Elsner, and perhaps Victorinus, who says, "gemma alba, adoptio in filium Dei"): or to the "mos erat antiquis niveis atrisque lapillis, His damnare reos, illis absolvere culpa," Ov. Met. xv. 41. So Erasm., Zeger, a-Lap., Aretius, Calov., Vitr., Wolf, al. Some expositors combine two or more of these expositions: as De Wette, understanding it as typical of justification and election; Bengel; Stern, who also notices the white stone as the mark of felicity, "Hunc, Macrine, diem numera meliore lapillo, Qui tibi labentes apponit candidus annos," Pers. Sat. ii., and "O diem lætum notandumque mihi candidissimo calculo," Plin. Ep. vi. 11. 3. But, as Düsterd. well observes, it is against all these interpretations, that no one of them fits the conditions of this description. Each one halts in the explanation either of the stone itself, or of that which is written on it. Least of all, perhaps, does the last apply: the verdict of *acquittal* would be a strange reward indeed to one who has fought and overcome in the strength of an acquittal long ago obtained, ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν, Col. iii. 13. The most probable view is that which Bengel gives a hint of ("scribebant veteres multa in lapillis"), and which Hengst. ("Das hier in Betracht kommende Moment ist allein das, daß man im Alterthume manches auf kleine Steine schrieb") and Düsterd. hold, that the figure is derived from the practice of using small stones, inscribed with writing, for various purposes, and that, further than this, the imagery belongs to the occasion itself only. Taking it thus, the colour is that of victory, see ch. iii. 4; vi. 2; iv. 4; xix. 14. The *name inscribed* yet remains for consideration. It is in this, as it would be in every case, the inscription which gives the stone its real value, being, as it is, a token of reward and approval from the Son of God. But *what name* is this? not what name *in each case*, for an answer to this question is precluded by the very terms, ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, κ.τ.λ.: but *of what kind*? Is it the name of Christ Himself, or of God in Christ? This supposition is precluded also by the same terms: for any mysterious name of God or of Christ would either be hidden from all (so ch. xix. 12, ἔχων . . . ὄνομα γεγραμμένον ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός), or known to all who were similarly victorious through grace. These very terms seem to require that it should be the recipient's *own name*, a *new* name however; a revelation of his everlasting title, as a son of God, to glory in Christ, but consisting of, and revealed in, those personal marks and signs of God's peculiar adoption of *himself*, which he and none else is acquainted with. "If the heart knoweth its own bitterness, and a stranger intermeddleth not with its joy" (Prov. xiv. 10), then the deep secret dealings of God with each of us during those times, by which our sonship is assured and our spiritual strife carried onward to victory, can, when revealed to us in the other blessed state, be known thoroughly to ourselves only. Bengel beautifully says, "Möchtest Du wissen, was Du für einen neuen Namen bekommen wirst? Überwinde! Vorher fragst Du vergeblich: und hernach wirst Du ihn bald auf dem weissen Stein geschrieben lesen." Trench, in loc., after Züllig, suggests that the white, or glistering stone, may be the Urim, in which the most precious stone of

Τάδε λέγει ὁ [v] υἱὸς τοῦ [v] θεοῦ, ὁ ἔχων τοὺς [w] ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ὡς [w] φλόγα πυρός, καὶ οἱ [w] πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι [w] χαλκολιβάνῳ, [19] Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν [x] διακονίαν καὶ τὴν [y] ὑπομονήν σου, καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου τὰ [z] ἔσχατα [a] πλείονα τῶν [z] πρώτων. [20] ἀλλὰ [b] ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι [c] ἀφεῖς τὴν γυναῖκά [σου] Ἰεζαβὲλ [d] ἡ

v Rev., here only. Matt. iv. 3. Acts ix. 20. Gal. ii. 20. 1 John iii. 8 al. fr.
w ch. i. 14, 15 (reff.).
x = Acts xi. 29. 1 Cor. xvi. 15. 2 Cor. ix. 12 al. ‡ (Esth. vi. 3 A (not Bℵ). 1 Macc. xi. 58).
y ver. 2.
z see Matt. xii. 45. 2 Pet. ii. 20. (Job xlii. 12.)
a see Heb. xi. 4 reff.
b ver. 4.
c = John xi. 44, 48. xii. 7. Acts xiv. 17. Ps. civ. 14. (form, Ex. xxxii. 32.)
d constr. (see note), ver. 13. ch. iii. 12. ix. 14. xiv. 12. Ezek. xxiii. 7, 12.

om 1st *αυτου* A 36-8 vulg Andr Epiph: ins C[P] B rel vss Andr Areth. *φλοξ* ℵ 12.

19. om 2nd *την* c 38. rec transp *πιστιν* and *διακονιαν*, with 1 (41-2, e sil): transp *αγαπην* and *πιστιν* g 51. 90: txt AC[P]ℵ[3c] B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—(om *την διακ. και* ℵ[1]: om *την* ℵ[3a] 38.) om *την* (bef *υπομονην*) A 36. om 2nd *σου* ℵ. rec ins *και* bef *τα εσχατα*, with 1. 33 (34. 47-8-9. 50. 90, e sil): om AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff.

20. (*αλλα*, so A B a b d g j m 13-8-9. 30-3 (34, e sil). 35 Andr-coisl.) rec aft *κατα σου* ins *ολιγα*, with 33 (41, e sil); *πολλα* n Andr-a Cypr Primas Vict-tun; *πολυ* ℵ 12. 17[1]. 36. 43 Andr-b Cypr: om AC[P] B rel vss Epiph Andr Tert. om *οτι αφεις* 1: om *οτι αφεις την γυναικα* [*σου*] 33. rec (for *αφεις*) *εας*: *αφιης* 34-5. 47 Andr-coisl Areth: *αφηκας* ℵ[3a] 26. 36 Andr-p: *ποθεις* 38; *tenes* Tert: txt AC[P]ℵ[1] B rel Epiph Andr-a. rec om 2nd *σου*, with C[P]ℵ l 1. 16. 35-6-8 (32. 41 B[r], e sil) vss Epiph Tert: ins A B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Cypr Primas. rec *ιεζαβηλ*, with 33 (16-8. 27. 32-7. 40-1-2, e sil): *ιαζαβελ* ℵ[1]: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel. rec *την*

all was covered by the twelve on which the names of the tribes were engraved; the writing on which no one knew. The suggestion is one well worth consideration).

18—29.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT THYATIRA. See Prolegg. § iii. 9. **And to the angel of the church in Thyatira write: These things saith the Son of God** (our Lord thus names himself here, in accordance with the spirit of that which is to follow; ver. 27 being from Ps. ii., in which it is written, *κύριος εἶπεν πρός με Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*), **who hath his eyes as a flame of fire** (connected with ver. 23, *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἐρευνῶν νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας*) **and his feet are like to chalcolibanus** (for **χαλκολ.**, see on ch. i. 15. There is here probably a connexion with ver. 27, *ὡς τὰ σκεύη τὰ κεραμικὰ συντρίβεται*, the work of the strongly shod feet): **I know thy works, and** (the four which follow are subordinated to the *ἔργα* preceding, as is shewn by *σου* placed after the four, not after each one. The *καί* then is the subordinating or epexegetic copula, as in *καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος*, John i. 16. See Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 3, c) **the love** (*ἀγάπη*, standing first, is probably quite general, to God and man) **and the faith** (general again: not = faithfulness, but in its ordinary sense) **and the ministration** (viz., to the sick and poor, and all that need it: the natural proof of *ἀγάπη* and *πίστις*—*πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*, Gal. v. 6) **and the endurance** (in tribulation: or perhaps the *ὑπομονὴ ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ* of Rom. ii. 7) **of thee, and** (that) **thy last works** (are) **more** (in number, or importance, or both) **than the first** (this praise is the opposite of the blame conveyed by ver. 5 to the Ephesian church). **20.] Notwithstanding I have against thee that thou sufferest** (*ἀφεῖς* from *ἀφέω*, see ref. Ex. and Winer, edn. 6, § 14. 3) **thy wife** (or, **the woman**) **Jezebel** (on the whole, the evidence for **σου** being inserted in the text seems to me to preponderate. It could not well have been *inserted*: and was sure to have been erased, from its difficulty, and possibly from other reasons, considering what was the common interpretation of the *ἄγγελος*. It does not create any real difficulty: finding its meaning not in the matter of fact at Thyatira, but in the history from which the appellation Ἰεζαβέλ is taken. In 3 Kings xx. 25 (1 Kings xxi. 25) we read *Ἀχαάβ, ὃς ἐπράθη ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιον κυρίου, ὡς μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν Ἰεζαβὲλ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ*: from which text the phrase is transferred entire, importing that this Jezebel was to the church at Thyatira what that other was to Ahab. It is not so easy to determine who is, or who are, imported by the term. The very fact of the name Jezebel being chosen (for it is impossible, even were this the actual name of a woman, that it should be used here with any other than the symbolic meaning), coupled with *τὴν γυναῖκά* (*σου* above explained, takes us out of the realms of simple fact into those of symbolism.

λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν [e] προφῆτιν, καὶ διδάσκει καὶ [f] πλανᾷ τοὺς [g] ἐμοὺς [g] δούλους [h] πορνεῦσαι καὶ φαγεῖν [h] εἰδωλόθυτα. 21 καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῇ [i] χρόνον ἵνα μετανοήσῃ, καὶ οὐ θέλει [k] μετανοῆσαι [k] ἐκ τῆς [l] πορνείας αὐτῆς. 22 ἰδοὺ [m] βάλλω

e Luke ii. 36 only. 4 Kings xxii. 14.
f = John vii. 12, 47. 1 John i. 8. ii. 26. iii. 7 al. Deut. xiii. 5.
g ch. i. 1.
h ver. 14 (reff.).
i = (& sing.) John v. 6. vii. 33. xii. 35. xiv. 9. Isa. liv. 7.
k here bis. ch. ix. 20, 21. xvi. 11 only.
l = Matt. v. 32. 1 Cor. vi. 13, 18 al. Ezek. xliii. 9.
m Matt. ix. 2. Mark vii. 30.

λεγουσαν, with [P]ℵ[3c] 1. 36-8: την λεγουσα(sic) ℵ[3a]: η λεγει B rel Andr Areth: και λεγει 42: txt ACℵ[1]. for εαυτην, αυτην ℵ B l 16. 40. 69. προφητην P B h[1] l m 36 (38?): προφητειαν ℵ[1]: txt ACℵ[3ac] rel.—add ειναι ℵ 36. rec διδασκειν και πλανασθαι, omg 1st και and τους, with vulg: διδασκει και πλαναται, omg τους, 1: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd copt æth Andr.—for 1st και, ἡ B[r]. rec ειδωλοθυτα bef φαγειν, with 1 (6. 41, e sil): txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff.

21. rec om και ου θελει μετανοησαι, with ℵ[1] 1. 12-7 (arm): κ. ει μεν θελει μετανοησαι 38: κ. ουκ ηθελησεν μετανοησαι A Primas Vict-tun: txt C[P]ℵ[3a] B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—rec aft εκ τ. πορν. αυτ. ins και ου μετενοησεν, with 1 arm (-σαν): om AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—ταυτης ℵ.

22. rec aft ιδου ins εγω, with (d?) 1(above the line). 38 (34, e sil): om AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. for βαλλω, βαλω [P]ℵ[3a] B 9. 27. 32-8 vulg-ed copt some-lat-ff: καλω ℵ[1]: txt AC rel.

The figure of "Jezebel thy wife" being once recognized in its historical import, it would not be needful that an individual woman should be found to answer to it: the conscience of the Thyatiran church could not fail to apply the severe reproof to whatever influence was being exerted in the direction here indicated. So that I should rate at very little the speculations of many Commentators on the supposed woman here pointed out. Düsterd., recently, remarks that ἡ λέγουσα has something individual about it. So it has: but may not this individuality belong just as well to the figure, as to the thing signified by it? The sect or individuals being once concentrated as Jezebel, ἡ λέγουσα would follow of course, in the propriety of the figure. On the whole, however, I should feel it more probable that some individual *teacher*, high in repute and influence at the time, is pointed at. The denunciation of such a teacher under such a title would be at once startling and decisive. Nor would probability be violated by the other supposition, that a favoured and influential party in the Thyatiran church is designated. The church herself is represented by a woman: why may not a party (compare the Jews, who are the συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ of ver. 9) within the church be similarly symbolized? However this may be, the real solution must lie hidden until all that is hidden shall be known. See more below), **who calleth herself a prophetess** (the appositional nom. again: see reff.: and again with an indeclinable proper name, as in ver. 13. This clause perhaps points at an individual: but there is on the other hand no reason why a sect claiming prophetic gifts should not be indicated: the feminine belonging as before to the historical symbol), **and she teacheth and deceiveth my servants, to commit fornication and eat things sacrificed to idols** (hence the propriety of the name Jezebel: for both these were the abominations of the historic Jezebel: 2 Kings ix. 22, 30 (cf. Jer. iv. 30; Nahum iii. 4): the latter indeed in its more aggravated form of actual idolatry, 1 Kings xviii. 19. This specification of the mischief done shews us that this influence at Thyatira was in the same direction as the evil works of the Nicolaitans at Pergamum, ver. 14. The fact that this was the prevalent direction of the false teaching of the day, is important in a chronological point of view: see Prolegg., § iii. par. 6). **And I gave her time** (not, "in my pre-ordination of what is to be," as the aor. in Mark xiii. 20, but denoting historically that which the Lord had actually done, in vain. Notice that the ἀφεῖναι, on which depended the time given her for repentance, is yet blamed in the church of Thyatira as a sin) **that she should repent, and she willeth not to repent of** (lit. "*out of:*" constr. prægn., so as to come out of: or the μεταν. itself is regarded as an escape. The construction (reff.) is confined to this book: we have the verb once with ἀπό, Acts viii. 22; and the subst. μετάνοια, Heb. vi. 1) **her fornication** (πορνεία is here to be taken, as in all these passages, in its literal sense. Otherwise, if taken figuratively, it would be only a repetition of the other particular, idolatry).

22.] **Behold** (arrests attention, and prepares the way for something unexpected and terrible), **I cast her** (evidently against her will: but there is not necessarily violence in the word: it is the ordinary

αὐτὴν εἰς [m] κλίνην, καὶ τοὺς [n] μοιχεύοντας μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς θλῖψιν μεγάλην, [o] ἐὰν μὴ [k] μετανοήσουσιν [k] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς, [23] καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς [p] ἀποκτενῶ ἐν [p] θανάτῳ, καὶ γνώσονται πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ [qr] ἐρευνῶν [s] νεφροὺς καὶ [r] καρδίας, καὶ [t] δώσω ὑμῖν ἑκάστῳ [tu] κατὰ τὰ

k και γνω... ACPℵ B a to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

n constr. absol. (see note), James ii. 11 al. fr.
o w. fut. indic., see Winer, edn. 6, § 41. 2.
p = Ezek. xxxiii. 27 (but without ἐν). ch. vi. 8.
q John v. 39. vii. 52. Rom. viii. 27. 1 Cor. ii. 10. 1 Pet. i. 11 only. Gen. xliv. 12.
r Rom. viii. 27. Prov. xxiv. 12.
s here only. Psa. vii. 9. xxv. 2.
t Ps. xxvii. 4. see Rom. ii. 6. Psa. lxi. 12.
u ch. xx. 12 al.

for κλινην, φυλακην (see ver 10) A. rec μετανοησωσιν, with C[P] B rel: txt Aℵ. rec(for 2nd αυτης) αυτων (repetition of preceding termination), with A j n 1. 17[1] (appy). 36. 49[1] arm Andr Cypr Primas: txt C[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld harl[1] lips-5 tol, against demid harl[2] lipss) syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Tert.

23. om 1st και A copt. εραυνων AC: txt [P]ℵ B rel. om 2nd τα C.

verb for being "cast" on a bed of sickness: see reff. and Matt. viii. 6, 14) **into a bed** (ἀντὶ τοῦ, εἰς ἀῤῥωστίαν, Areth.: will change her bed of whoredom into a bed of anguish: see Ps. xli. 3. So most Commentators. Perhaps the threat has reference to a future pestilence. Bede, Lyra, al., understand the bed to be "infernalis pœna," the latter referring to Isa. xiv. 11. Ansbert, curiously enough, "severitatis vel audaciæ lectum," into which God casts his enemies before their destruction), **and those who commit adultery** (not now πορνεύοντας, but a more general term, embracing in its wide meaning both the πορνεῦσαι and εἰδωλόθυτα φαγεῖν, and well known as the word used of rebellious and idolatrous Israel, cf. Jer. iii. 8, v. 7; Ez. xvi. 32 al.) **together with her** (μετ' αὐτῆς is not = αὐτήν, so that she should be the 'conjux adulterii,' but implies merely participation — those who share with her in her adulteries. These μοιχεύοντες μετ' αὐτῆς, as interpreted by the tone with which the rebuke began, will mean, those who by suffering and encouraging her, make themselves partakers of her sin. And this rather favours the idea that not one individual, but a dominant party, is intended. See below) **into great tribulation** (this clause forms a kind of parallelism with the former, so that εἰς θλίψιν μεγ. is parallel with εἰς κλίνην. But it is not to be regarded as interpreting κλίνη. Her punishment and that of her children (see below) is one thing; that of the partakers in her adulteries, those in the church who tolerated and encouraged her, another, viz. great tribulation. This is forcibly shewn by the ἔργων αὐτῆς following), **if they do not** (aor.: speedily and effectually, shall not have done so by the time which I have in my thoughts) **repent of her** (not *their:* they are Christ's servants who are tampering with her temptations and allowing themselves in her works, which are alien from their own spiritual life) **works. And her children** (emphatically put forward as distinguished from the last mentioned: q. d., "And as to her children, &c." These are her proper adherents: not those who suffer her, but those who are begotten of her, and go to constitute her. Some Commentators have vainly dreamt of the slaughter of Ahab's 70 sons, 2 Kings x.: but they were not *Jezebel's* children. The historical figure is obviously dropped here) **I will slay with** (in, but perhaps merely instrumental: see above, on ver. 16) **death** (the expression is probably a rendering of the Heb. מוֹת יוּמָת, as in Lev. xx. 10, which the LXX render by θανάτῳ θανατούσθωσαν, and which there occurs in reference to adultery. But we need not, as Hengst., suppose a direct reference to that passage: for there is nothing of adultery here: we have done with τοὺς μοιχεύοντας μετ' αὐτῆς, and are come to the judgment on τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς): **and all the churches** (this remarkable expression, meaning not, all the Asiatic churches, but all the churches in the world till the end of time, lifts the whole of this threatening and its accompanying encouragements out of proconsular Asia, and gives us a glimpse into the œcumenical character of these messages) **shall know** (the fanciful Hengst. imagines a reference in γνώσονται to the false γνῶσις: but in so common and solemn a formula of the O. T., this must surely be out of the question) **that I am he that searcheth the reins and the hearts** (which, see reff. is the attribute of God: and therefore of the Son of God. Cf. ver. 18 above, and note. Grotius says, "Per *renes* intelliguntur desideria, ut et Ps. cxxxix. 13, Jer. xii. 2, Prov. xxiii. 16: per *cor*, cogitata, 1 Sam. xvi. 7, 1 Reg. viii. 39 al." But it seems doubtful whether so minute a distinctioni s in the words; whether they are not rather a general designation for the whole inward parts of a man): **and I will give to you** ('will render, in My doom of judgment.' The strain of the Lord's message is sud-

v vv. 14, 15.
w = ch. i. 7 reff.
x -ύς, Luke xxiv. 1. John iv. 11. Acts xx. 9 only. Dan. ii. 22.
-ός, Rom. viii. 39. xi. 33. 1 Cor. ii. 10 al. Ps. cxxix. 1. Judith viii. 14.
y see Mark vii. 33. John xx. 2. xx. 25, 27. James iii. 3 al.

ⁿ ἔργα ὑμῶν. 24 ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείροις ὅσοι οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὴν ᵛ διδαχὴν ταύτην, ʷ οἵτινες οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰ ˣ βάθεα τοῦ σατανᾶ, ὡς λέγουσιν, οὐ ʸ βάλλω

for υμων, αυτου B 38 vulg(but not am demid harl lips-5) Tert: ημων 36: om ℵ[1]: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] rel.

24. rec (for 1st τοις) και, with vulg(ed and some mss): om k 2. 6. 16-7-8-9: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Primas.—om τοις λοιποις 92[1] arm: aft 1st τοις ℵ[1] has written εν (*from below*, ℵ[3a] disapproving). θυατειρη ℵ[3a]. om 1st ουκ ℵ[1]: for οσοι, οι ℵ[3a]: txt ℵ[3c](?). rec ins και bef οιτινες, with vulg-ed Quæst: om AC[P]ℵ B 38(sic, Del) rel vss Andr Areth Primas.—om [κ.] οιτινες ουκ εγν. 41. rec βαθη, with [P]ℵ e n 1(βάθη). 36: txt AC B rel. rec (for βαλλω) βαλω, with ℵ B f h n 10. 33 (37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg Primas: βάλω 1. 47: λεγω 41-2: txt AC[P] rel syr-dd Andr Areth.

denly changed into a direct address to those threatened) **to each according to your works** (ἔργα, not the mere outward products of the visible life, but the real acts and verities of the inward man, discerned by the piercing eye of the Son of God). **24.**] **But** (contrast to those addressed before) **to you I say, the rest who are in Thyatira, as many as have not** (not only do not *hold*, but are free from any contact with) **this teaching, such as** (οἵτινες, as usual, classifies) **have not known the depths** (deep places, in the resolved form) **of Satan, as they call them** (it was the characteristic of the falsely named γνῶσις, to boast of its βάθεα, or depths, of divine things. Iren. ii. 22. 1, p. 146, speaks of those "qui profunda bythi adinvenisse se dicunt:" and ib. 3, p. 147, "profunda Dei adinvenisse se dicentes." And Tert. adv. Valent. 1, vol. ii. p. 538 ff., should by all means be read, as admirably illustrating this expression. He there says, "Eleusinia Valentiniana fecerunt lenocinia, sancta silentio magno, sola taciturnitate cœlestia. Si bona fide quæris, concreto vultu, suspenso supercilio *Altum est*, aiunt." We may safely therefore refer the expression οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰ βάθεα to the heretics spoken of. But it is not so clear to whom as their subject the words ὡς λέγουσιν are to be appropriated, and again *whose* word τοῦ σατανᾶ is, whether that 1) of our Lord, 2) of the heretics, or 3) of the Christians addressed. If ὡς λέγουσιν belong to the *Christians*, then the sense will be, that they, the Christians, called the βάθεα of the heretics, the βάθεα τοῦ σατανᾶ, and were content to profess their ignorance of them. So Andr., Areth., Heinr., Züllig, Ebrard: and so far would be true enough; but the sentence would thus be left very flat and pointless, and altogether inconsistent in its tone with the solemn and pregnant words of the rest of the message. If ὡς λέγουσιν belong to the *heretics*, we have our choice between two views of τοῦ σατανᾶ: either 1) that the heretics themselves called their own mysteries τὰ β. τοῦ σατανᾶ. But this, though held by Hengst.,—and even by Neander, Pfl. u. L. edn. 4, p. 619 note, as a possible alternative, and recently by Trench,—can hardly be so, seeing that the words surely would not bear the sense thus assigned to them, viz. that they could go deeper than and outwit Satan in his own kingdom: and seeing moreover, that no such formula, or any resembling it, is found as used by the ancient Gnostic heretics: or 2) that the ὡς λέγουσιν applies only to the word βάθεα, and that, when, according to *their* way of speaking, τοῦ θεοῦ should have followed (cf. ref. 1 Cor.), the Lord in indignation substitutes τοῦ σατανᾶ. This has been the sense taken by most Commentators, e. g., Corn.-a-lap., Ribera, Grot., Calov., Wetst., Vitr., Bengel, Wolf, Eichhorn, Ewald, De W., Stern, Düsterd. And it appears to me that this alone comes in any measure up to the requirements of the passage, in intensity of meaning and solemnity, as well as in verisimilitude.

I need hardly remark that the rendering which I am sorry to see in Tregelles's very useful little English version of the purer text of the Apoc., "how they speak," is quite untenable. In the E. V., "as they speak," is meant to = "as they say:" but for "how they speak" (absol.) λαλοῦσιν would be required), **I cast not upon you any other burden** (it is better, seeing that no τοῦτο or τό follows after πλήν below, not to carry on the sentence as if ἄλλο, πλήν . . . were closely joined, but to break it off at βάρος: leaving however the πλήν to take it up (see below) by and by. And this being so, to what do the words refer? There can, I imagine, be little doubt as to the answer, if we

ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἄλλο [z] βάρος· [25] [a] πλὴν ὃ [b] ἔχετε [c] κρατήσατε ἄχρις οὗ ἂν [d] ἥξω. [26] καὶ ὁ [e] νικῶν καὶ ὁ [f] τηρῶν [gh] ἄχρι [h] τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου, [i] δώσω [k] αὐτῷ [ll] ἐξουσίαν [l] ἐπὶ [m] τῶν

z = Acts xv. 28 (Matt. xx. 12. 2 Cor. iv. 17. Gal. vi. 2. 1 Thess. ii. 6) only †. Sir. xiii. 2 (2 Macc. ix. 10) only. a = Matt. Luke passim. (not Mark, John, nor Luke in Acts.) Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 11 al4. elsw. here only. Judg. iv. 9. b = 1 John v. 12 reff. c = ver. 13 reff. d of Christ, Matt. xxiv. 50. Luke xii. 46. John viii. 42. Rom. xi. 26 (from Isa. lix. 20). Heb. x. 7, 37. 1 John v. 20. ch. iii. 3. e ver. 7 reff. f ch. i. 3 reff. g ver. 10 reff. h Heb. vii. 11 only. (μέχρι τ., Heb. iii. 14. ἕως τ., 1 Cor. i. 8.) i John i. 12. v. 27. xvii. 2. Matt. ix. 8. x. 1. xxviii. 18 al. Sir. xxx. 28 (xxxiii. 19). k constr., ch. iii. 12, 21. vi. 8. l w. gen., ch. xi. 6. xiv. 18. xx. 6 only. (ἐπάνω, Luke xix. 17.) w. acc., ch. vi. 8. xiii. 7. xvi. 9. xxii. 14. Luke ix. 1 al. gen. without ἐπί, Matt. x. 1. John xvii. 2. Sir. xvii. 2. m generic, as Matt. ix. 11. Acts iv. 1. x. 45.

25. αχρι Cℵ f 33 (34-5, e sil): εως A 47: txt [P] B rel. for αν ηξω, ανοιξω B rel: txt AC[P]ℵ h l m n 10-7-8. 38. 51 (c 1. 6. 26. 30-4-5-6-7. 47-9 Br e sil).
26. om επι ℵ[1] (ins ℵ[3a]).

remember some of the expressions used in the apostolic decree in which these very matters here in question, fornication and abstaining from unholy meats, were the only things forbidden to the Gentile converts. For our Lord here takes up and refers to those very words. In Acts xv. 28, we read *ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι κ. ἡμῖν μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τῶν ἐπάναγκες, ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων κ. αἵματος κ. πνικτῶν κ. πορνείας.* This act of simple obedience, and no deep matters beyond their reach, was what the Lord required of them. And this *βάρος* resolved itself into keeping the faith once delivered to the saints, as enjoined in the next sentence. This view is taken by Bede (2) (in substance: "non ego vobis novam mitto doctrinam: sed quam accepistis, servate in finem;" but he does not mention the allusion), Primas., Lyra, Corn.-a-lap., Stern, Hengst., Düsterd. Grot. al. give a more general meaning, true in part: "jactant illi se rerum multarum cognitione; eam a vobis non exigo." Bengel understands by *βάρος* the trouble given them by Jezebel and her followers: Ewald, the punishments about to befall the heretics, which were not to be feared by the Christians: Ebrard similarly,—they had had enough trouble already in enduring Jezebel, &c., and should not have any share in her punishment: De Wette, the burden of previous suffering implied in *ὑπομονή*; and so Bede (1), "non patiar vos tentari supra quod potestis," and Beza, understanding *βάρος* in the sense of "burden," so often occurring in the prophets when they denounce the divine threatenings. But to my mind the allusion to the apostolic decree is too clear and prominent to allow of any other meaning coming into question: at least any other which sets that entirely aside. Others may be deduced and flow from that one, which have meaning for the church now that those former subjects of controversy have passed away): but (though not (see above) directly and in the same sentence connected with *ἄλλο*, *πλήν* distinctly looks back to it and takes it up. It is, "*only:*" q. d., forget not that the licence just accorded involves this sacred obligation) **that which ye have** (cf. ch. iii. 11: not to be restricted in its sense to their steadfastness in resisting Jezebel and hers, but representing the sum total of Christian doctrine and hope and privilege; the *ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσα τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστις* of Jude 3), **hold fast** (the aor. is more vivid and imperative than would be the present; it sets forth not so much the continuing habit, as the renewed and determined grasp of every intervening moment of the space prescribed) **until the time when I shall come** (the *ἄν* gives an uncertainty when the time shall be, which we cannot convey in our language). **26.**] **And** (the announcement of reward to the conqueror *now first* precedes the proclamation to hear what the Spirit saith to the churches: and is joined, *here alone*, by *καί* to the preceding portion of the Epistle; being indeed more closely connected with it in this case than in any of the others; see below) **he that conquereth and he that** (by the second *ὁ*, this *καί* is precluded from being taken as introducing a clause merely epexegetical of *νικῶν*, as Düsterd., al. Rather must we say, that by it *ὁ τηρῶν κ.τ.λ.* is included in the class pointed out by *ὁ νικῶν*) **keepeth to the end** (it is remarkable that immediately after the words, so pointedly alluded to above, in the apostolic decree, Acts xv. 28, was added, *ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε*) **my works** (contrast to *τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς*, ver. 22: but extending beyond that contrast to a general and blessed truth. *μου*, gen. possess., which belong to Me, are the attributes of Myself and of mine), **I will give to him authority over the nations** (compare the *ἴσθι ἐξουσίαν ἔχων ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων* in Luke xix. 17, which is the reward of him who obeyed the command *πραγματεύσασθε ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι.* The authority here

n ch. xii. 5. xix. 15. Psa. ii. 9.
o = ch. vii. 17. Matt. ii. 6. John xxi. 16 al.
p = ver. 16.
q 1 Cor. iv. 21.
r as above (n). Acts xii. 10. ch. ix. 9 only. 3 Kings xxii. 11.
s = Rom. ix. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 20. ch. xviii. 12 al.
t Lev. vi. 28.
u here only †. (-μεως, l. c.)
v = Rom. xvi. 20. (John xix. 36 al.)
w = Acts ii. 33. (Lev. vii. 24.)
x ch. xxii. 16 only. cf. Sir. i. 6. (see note.)
y Job xxxviii. 12.
z ver. 7 reff.

ἐθνῶν, 27 καὶ [no] ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς [np] ἐν [nq] ῥάβδῳ [nr] σιδηρᾷ, ὡς τὰ [st] σκεύη τὰ [u] κεραμικὰ [tv] συντρίβεται, ὡς κἀγὼ [w] εἴληφα [w] παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου. 28 καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὸν [x] ἀστέρα τὸν [xy] πρωϊνόν. 29 ὁ [z] ἔχων [z] οὖς [z] ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

III. 1 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἐκκλησίας

ACℵ ℵ a to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 7. 10–3. 1[?] to 19. 2[?]–7. 30. 32 to 35. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. [?] Bʳ.

27. συντριβησεται [P] B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas : συντριβονται 36[2]: txt ACℵ 1 36[1]-8. 51 (1. 40, e sil) Andr-a. 28. προινον A B.

Chap. III. 1. for της, τω B. (Cf ch ii. 1, 8, 18.)

spoken of is that which shall be conferred on the saints when they shall inherit the earth, and reign with Christ in His Kingdom. It has been gradually realized, as the stone cut out without hands has broken in pieces other kingdoms; but shall only then find its entire fulfilment. Various insufficient meanings have been given: of which one of the most curious is that of Grot., "Evolvam illum in gradum presbyteri, ut judicet de iis qui non christiane sed ἐθνικῶς vivunt;" who also understands ver. 27 below of excommunication, "per gladium hic intelligitur verbum Dei, cujus pars est et excommunicatio"), **and he shall govern** (lit. "*shepherd.*" It is the LXX rendering of the Heb. תְּרֹעֵם, *break in pieces*, which they have taken as תִּרְעֵם, *shepherd*, in ref. Ps. The saying, as rendered by them, is sanctioned by being thrice quoted in this book, see reff.) **them with** (see 1 Cor. iv. 21) **a rod of iron** (a sceptre of severity: "inflexibili justitia," as Lyra), **as the vessels of pottery are broken up** (συντρίβεται, are crushed, or shivered, or broken up: the συν gives the idea of the multitudinous fragments collapsing into an heap: the "broken to shivers" of the E. V. is very good), **as I also have received from my Father** (viz. in Ps. ii. 9, in which Psalm it is said υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ver. 7. The power there conferred on Me, I will delegate to my victorious servant; see Luke xxii. 29). **And I will give to him the star of the morning** (it is not easy to say what, in strict exactness, these words import. The interpretations given, even in the Catena, are very various and inconsistent. Andr. and Areth. understand it of the Lucifer of Isa. xiv. 12, i. e. the devil, whom our Lord saw as lightning fall from heaven,—or, as there imported, the King of Babylon, the most powerful monarch on earth; so Züllig. Another meaning in the Catena is τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου λεχθέντα φώσφορον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῶν πιστῶν ἀνατέλλοντα, 2 Pet. i. 19. Victorinus says, "Primam resurrectionem scilicet promittit." Primas., Bede, Alcas., Corn.-a-lap., Calov., Vitr., Wolf, Beng., Stern, Ebrard, understand Christ Himself, who, ch. xxii. 16, declares Himself to be ὁ ἀστὴρ ὁ λαμπρός, ὁ πρωϊνός: and doubtless, as has been before remarked on the fruit of the tree of life, ver. 7, and on the hidden manna, ver. 17, in the mystical sense, Christ Himself is the sum and inclusion of all Christ's gifts: this truth serves to connect the symbolism of all these passages, but does not justify us in disturbing that of one by introducing that of another. Here the morning star clearly is not Christ Himself, the very terms of the sentence separating the two. Then again, we have Lyra,—"id est, corpus gloriosum dote claritatis refulgens,"—nearly the same words in which he before explained the white stone, ver. 17, only that there it was "*charitatis*:" Grot., "dabo et fulgorem, non qualis cuique stellæ, sed Luciferi, qui cæteras stellas multum vincit." And this interpretation is probably near the mark. In Dan. xii. 3 we read that the righteous shall shine ὡς οἱ ἀστέρες, and in Matt. xiii. 43 that they ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. And in Prov. iv. 18 we read that "the path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Still, this interpretation does not quite satisfy the words δώσω αὐτῷ: unless indeed the poetic imagery be, that he is imagined as clad in the glory of that star, putting it on as a jewel, or as a glittering robe. De Wette supposes it is to be given to him as its ruler: but such an interpretation would lead into a wide field of speculation which does not seem to have been opened by Scripture, and is hardly required by the passage itself). **29.**] See above, ver. 7.

Ch. III. 1—6.] The Epistle to the

γράψον Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὰ [a] ἑπτὰ [a] πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς [b] ἑπτὰ [b] ἀστέρας, Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι [c] ὄνομα ἔχεις ὅτι ζῇς, καὶ [d] νεκρὸς εἶ. 2 [e] γίνου [f] γρηγορῶν, καὶ [g] στήρισον τὰ λοιπὰ ἃ [h] ἔμελλον ἀποθανεῖν. οὐ γὰρ εὕ-

a ch. i. 4 reff. b ch. i. 16, 20. c = Mark ix. 41. 1 Pet. iv. 16. οὔνομα μὲν εἶχε, ὡς ἐπ' Ἀθήνας ἐλαύνει, κατίετο δὲ ἐς πᾶσαν τ. Ἑλλάδα, Herod. vii. 138. d = James ii. 17. Heb. vi. 1. e constr., ch. xvi. 10 reff. f = ch. xvi. 15. 1 Thess. v. 6 al. Neh. vii. 3. g Luke xxii. 32. Rom. i. 11. xvi. 25 al. Ps. l. 12 (14). h plur., ch. i. 19 reff.

Steph om 1st επτα, with n (6, e sil): ins AC[P]ℵ B rel. rec ins το bef ονομα (with 30-4, e sil): om AC[P]ℵ B 33(Del) rel Andr Areth. for 2nd οτι, και B rel Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ h l m n 10-7. 33-7-8 (1. 13-6. 34-5-6. 49 Br, e sil). ζωης 1.

2. εγρηγορων (but corrd) ℵ. rec στηριξον, with ℵ B rel Andr Areth: τηρησον b e k n 9. 13. 25-7. 30-6. 40: στηρησον h¹, στηρηζων l: txt AC[P] a¹ c d g h² 2. 4. 6. 10-1-2-7-9. 32. 48-9¹. 50. from α to πεπληρωμενα are in marg of 1. rec (for εμελλον) μελλει, with æth some-lat-ff: ημελλες B b j 19. 33. 50. 92: εμελλες rel: εμελλε a: ημελλε 2: εμελλεν l 1-marg(Treg) Areth: ημελλεν 16: εμελλ(εμελλεν or -λον) 1-marg(Del): txt AC[P]ℵ m n 34-5-6-8 vulg syr-dd copt Andr Primas. for αποθανειν, αποβαλλειν B rel(αποβαλειν h 17. 49 Br): αποθνησκειν n 26. 36 Andr-a Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ l m 1-marg 16. 34-5-8.

CHURCH AT SARDIS. The Spirit of this Epistle is one of rebuke and solemn denunciation. Even the promise, ver. 5, is tinged with the same hue. For the history, see Prolegg., § iii. 10. **And to the angel of the church in Sardis write: These things saith He that hath the seven spirits of God** (this designation of our Lord has not before occurred: but as Düsterd. observes, it is new rather in form than in substance. We have mention in ch. i. 4 of the seven spirits which are before God's throne: and we there found occasion to interpret them of the plenitude of the Godhead in its attributes and energies. See, for further elucidation, ch. iv. 5, v. 6. These spirits, this plenitude, Christ, the Lord of the church, possesses, is clothed and invested with, in all fulness. From Him the spiritual life of his churches comes as its source, in all its elements of vitality. He searches all the depths both of our depravity and of His own applications of grace. He has in his hand all the Spirit's power of conviction. He wields the fire of purification and the fire of destruction. Whether the Spirit informs, or rebukes, or warns, or comforts, or promises, whether He softens or hardens men's hearts, it is Christ who, searching the hearts as Son of God and feeling their feelings as Son of man, wields and applies the one and manifold Spirit.

The designation here has its appropriateness in the whole character of this solemn Epistle. The Lord of the church comes, armed with all the powers of the Spirit; searching the depths of hypocrisy, judging of the worthlessness of works not done in faith. The difficulty of this general attribute of Christ, and not any one selected specially as applying to Sardis being here introduced, seems to be best accounted for, not, as Ebrard, by the general prophetic import of the Epistle, but by the fact that the minatory strain of the Epistle justifies the alleging the whole weight and majesty of the divine character of our Lord, to create alarm and bring about repentance) **and the seven stars** (the former symbolism (reff.) still holds in all its strictness. Nor have we the least right here, as some (e.g. Arethas in Catena, and Wetst.), to suppose that the stars and the spirits are identical. The motive mentioned above would fully account for this designation also: The Lord of all the churches: He who appoints them their ministering angels, and has them, and all that is theirs, in His hand): **I know thy works, that** (there is no need of a καί being inserted: the ὅτι is the inference from the ἔργα) **thou hast a name that thou livest** (I need only mention for warning the childish fancy, that the Bishop of Sardis was named Zosimus or Vitalis: so some blamed by Corn.-a-lap.: so, with approval, Bengel and Hengst. The expression explains itself: see ref. Herodot.: thou hast a repute that thou livest: art *nominally*, as we commonly now say, Christian), **and** (the mere copula carries the contrast far more vividly and pathetically than when it is made rhetorically complete by inserting "yet." The καί is not as Ebrard, "hebraisirend für ἀλλά," but is common in classical Greek, and indeed in all languages, in this sense) **art dead** (spiritually dead: void of vitality and fruitfulness: sunk in that deep deadly sleep which, if not broken in upon and roused up, is death itself: so St. Paul, Eph. v. 14, ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων κ. ἀνάστα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, κ. ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ χριστός: see reff.). **Be** (γίνου, because a change is involved: be-

h 1 John i. 4 reff. Col. ii. 10 al.
i (ch. i. 4 reff.) = Luke xvi. 15. Acts iv. 19 al. fr. 3 Kings iii. 10.

ρηκά σου [τὰ] ἔργα [h] πεπληρωμένα [i] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [k] θεοῦ [k] μου. [3] [l] μνημόνευε [οὖν] πῶς [m] εἴληφας καὶ ἤκουσας, καὶ [n] τήρει καὶ [o] μετανόησον. ἐὰν οὖν μὴ [f] γρηγορήσῃς,

k = John xx. 17. ver. 12 four times [ch. ii. 7] only. l constr., ch. ii. 5. m ch. ii. 27. Acts vii. 53. n = 1 John ii. 3, 5 reff. o absol., ch. ii. 5 reff.

ευρηκαν B. εργα AC 1-marg: τα εργα [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. rec om μου, with 1 (13. 41, e sil) Andr-p Vig: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas.
3. om 1st ουν ℵ f. om και ηκουσας και τηρει (*passing from* και to και) B rel: om και τηρει æth: ins AC[P]ℵ h l m 10-7-8. 34-5-6 (1. 13-6. 27. 37-8 B[r] e sil). for

come what thou art not) **watchful** (we can hardly help in English substituting the adj. for the participle "watching;" thereby losing the objective vividness of the pres. part., and getting instead a subjective attribute of character. "Awake and watch" would be, in paraphrase, tantamount to the text), **and strengthen the remaining things, which were** (the time is transferred to that indicated by *στήρισον*: which were, when thou shalt apply thyself to strengthen them) **about to die** (there is a question whether these **λοιπά** are to be understood as *things*, matters in which the Sardian church was not yet totally without spiritual vitality, or as *persons*, who were not yet passed into the almost universal death-slumber of hypocrisy. The latter view is taken by (Andr., Areth., as reported in Düsterd.: but not in Catena, see below) Calov., Vitr., Eichh., De Wette, Stern, Ebrard, Düsterd., Trench, al. And there is nothing in the construction to preclude the view. But if I mistake not, there is in the context. For to assume that the **λοιποί** could be thus described, would surely be to leave no room for those mentioned with so much praise below in ver. 4. Had *τὰ λοιπά* not occurred, we might have well understood *στήρισον ἃ ἔμελλον ἀποθανεῖν* of confirming those thy weak members who on account of the general deadness were near losing their spiritual life altogether: but with *τὰ λοιπά* this can hardly stand. We must therefore take the other view,—"strengthen those thy remaining few graces, which in thy spiritual deadly slumber are not yet quite extinct." And so Andr. and Areth. in Catena (I transcribe the whole, by which it appears that *μέλη* has been carelessly taken to mean personal members: see under the other view above),—*τὸν ὕπνον τῆς ῥαθυμίας ἀποτιναξάμενος, καὶ τὰ μέλη σου τὰ ἀποθνήσκειν τελέως μέλλοντα δι' ἀπιστίαν στήριξον· οὐ γὰρ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων τὸν ἐργάτην στεφανοῖ τὸν δόκιμον ἀλλ' ἡ ἐπιμονὴ ἄχρι τέλους. τὸ στήριξον δὲ οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλὰ τὸ οἱονεὶ στερροποίησον καὶ ἐνδυνάμωσον χαλαρά τε ὄντα καὶ πρὸς πτῶσιν ἑτοιμότατα. ἐφ' ὅσον οὖν περιλείπεταί σοι, βραχέα ἐπιτηδεύματά, φησι, πρόσθες, ἵνα μὴ τέλεον ἀποστάσῃς* (qu. *ἐπισπάσῃς*) *θάνατον. ταῦτα γοῦν φύλαξον τὰ ἤδη ζῶντα, ἐκεῖνα δὲ στήριξον τὰ πρὸς θάνατον ἤδη ῥέποντα· οὐδὲν γάρ σου τῶν σπουδασμάτων πληρές ἐστιν· ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τέθνηκεν ἤδη, τὰ δὲ μέλλει*:—so also Grot., Beng., Ewald, al.): **for I have not found thy works** (or, without the τά, I **have not found** (any) **works** of thine) **complete in the sight of my God** (up to the mark and measure of being acceptable to Him: i. e. not wrought in that living faith which alone renders human works acceptable to God, by uniting them to Him on whom the Father looks with perfect approval. Düsterd. well observes, "The express reference to the absolute rule of all Christian morality is here put the more strongly and strikingly, because this church had *among men* a name that she lived." The **μου** binds on the judgement of Him who speaks to that of God). **Remember [therefore] how** (not subjective, "*with* what manner of reception," as even Düsterd., after many others, but objective, "after what sort," "quomodo institutus fueris," as Castalio: as οὕτως, Eph. iv. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 11. Trench would unite both) **thou hast received** (*perf.*: of the permanent deposit of doctrine entrusted) **and heardest** (*aor.*, of the act of hearing, when it took place), **and keep** (what thou hast received and heardest: *pres.*, of an abiding habit) **and repent** (not pres. now, as the command is of a quick and decisive act of amendment). **If therefore** (the **οὖν** is hardly, as De Wette, because it is assumed, in the present evil state of the Sardian church, that the exhortation will be in vain: far rather, as Düsterd. (alt.), Hengst., al., because repentance is so grievously needed. And it follows on the plain declaration which has been made of that present evil state; coming forcibly and unexpectedly, where we should rather have looked for δέ) **thou dost not watch** (aor.: shalt not have awaked and become watchful, before the

[p] ἥξω [q] ὡς [qr] κλέπτης, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῷς [s] ποίαν [s] ὥραν [p] ἥξω ἐπὶ σέ. [4] ἀλλὰ ἔχεις ὀλίγα [t] ὀνόματα ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἃ οὐκ [u] ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ [v] περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ

p ch. ii. 25 reff. q 1 Thess. v. 2, 4. 2 Pet. iii. 10. ch. xvi. 15. see Jer. xxix. 9 (xlix. 10). r as above (q). Matt. xxiv. 43. Luke xii. 39. s acc., John iv. 52 al. fr. see note and Matt. xxiv. 42. Luke xii. 39. t = Acts i. 15. ch. xi. 13. Num. xxvi. 53. u 1 Cor. viii. 7. ch. xiv. 4 only. Isa. lxv. 4 al. (-υσμός, 2 Cor. vii. 1.) v = ch. ii. 1. xxi. 24.

γρηγ., μετανοησης ℵ[1](txt ℵ[3a-c]). rec aft 1st ηξω ins επι σε, with ℵ B rel vulg(with am &c, agst demid fuld harl[1] tol lips-5) syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Vig: om AC[P] n 1. 12 copt Andr Primas. for γνως, γνωση ℵ(γνωση οιαν) B rel Andr-coisl: txt AC[P] n 10 (32). 36 (a c h 1. 6. 37. 42-8-9. 51 B[r], e sil).

4. rec om αλλα, with 1: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Orig-int Primas.—αλλ' [P] B rel (exc f 6. 38). ολιγα bef εχεις B rel Andr Areth: ολ. ονομ. bef εχ. c f k 6. 32. 47-9: txt AC[P]ℵ n 1. 17. 36-8. rec ins και bef εν σαρδεσιν, with 1: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas. for ἅ, οἳ n 1. 17. 37-8. 46 vulg copt Andr Areth Primas: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr-coisl. for αυτων, εαυτων C.

time about to be indicated in the threat which is coming), **I will come as a thief** (these words do not here refer to our Lord's final coming, but to some signal judgment in which He would overtake the Sardian church. Just as the formula derived from the great eschatological truth of the suddenness of His second coming is frequently applied to His final judgment in Jerusalem, so is it to other His partial and special advents to judgment in the case of individuals and churches), **and thou shalt not know** (οὐ μή, see on ch. ii. 11) **at what hour** (the accus. of the *time when* has been called a Hebraism: so even De Wette from Gesenius: or an Aramaism, according to Ewald. But it is common enough in later Greek, and is only, in its first form, a particular case of the accusative of measure, whether of space or time: see Krüger, § 46, anm. 1, where he cites such common expressions, as ἐξήλθομεν ἔτος τουτί τρίτον εἰς Πάνακτον, Demosth.: Πρωταγόρας τρίτην ἤδη ἡμέραν ἐπιδεδήμηκεν. The change which the construction underwent seems to have been that which was usual in such cases; it lost its own peculiar significance of measure and duration, and became used where a mere point of time was in question. But even thus it finds abundant justification in good Greek in such expressions as that in Homer, Il. φ. 111, ἀλλ' ἔπι τοι καὶ ἐμοὶ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή Ἔσσεται ἢ ἠώς, ἢ δείλης, ἢ μέσον ἦμαρ: in Herod. ii. 2, τὴν ὥρην ἐπαγινέειν σφίσι αἶγας: and in such accusatives as ἦμαρ, νύκτα, ἀρχήν, τέλος, πυκνά, and the like. See also Matthiæ, Gr. Gr. § 424, a) **I will come upon thee. Nevertheless** (notwithstanding this state of apathy even to spiritual death) **thou hast** (belonging to thee as members. Notice, as Bengel remarks, that these few had not separated themselves from the church in Sardis, notwithstanding its degraded state) **a few names** ("homines nominatim recensiti," as Vatabl. in Düsterd. See reff. The gloss. interlin. is good: "quasi paucos nominatos, i. e., bonos qui nominatione digni sunt." The term would hardly be used except of a limited number. Hengstenb., with his usual fancifulness, in which he is here followed by Ebrard, finds an allusion in the ἔχεις ὀλίγα ὀνόματα to the ὄνομα ἔχεις ὅτι . . . above. It hardly needs remark, that the whole sense and connexion is different, the stress there on ὄνομα, here on ἔχεις. Besides which, in my judgment nothing can be further from the solemnity of the passage than the existence of such mere verbal allusions) **in Sardis, which** (the peculiar form ὀνόματα carries its own gender through the first part of the verse; in the latter part the thing signified prevails, and we have ἄξιοι) **have not defiled their garments** (the aor. is from the standing-point of the future day presently introduced, as so commonly when life is looked back on from the great time of retribution. The meaning of the figure (which occurs also in Jude 23) has been variously given. There can be little doubt that the simpler and more general explanation is the right one: viz., who have not sullied the purity of their Christian life by falling into sin. So the gloss. interlin., Lyra, al. m. It seems unnecessary, and introducing confusion, to specify further; either the garments as importing their flesh (Areth., al.), their consciences (Alcas., Tirinus, Grot., Peiræus), the robe of Christ's righteousness put on by faith (Calov.), the robe of baptismal purity (Ansbert, Bede, Ribera, Corn.-a-lap., Hengst.), or again the keeping undefiled as consisting in abstinence from contact with the dead body of the rest of the church. This last view Ebrard attributes to Hengst., but it is not in his exposition here. He characteristically finds in ἐμόλυναν an allusion to Sardes = Sordes): **and**

w ver. 18. ch. vi. 11. vii. 9. xix. 14. Eccl. ix. 8. neut., John xx. 12 only. ellips., ch. i. 13.
x ch. ii. 7 reff.
y = Matt. vi. 29 al. fr.
z ch. iv. 4 only. Deut. xxii. 12. (Matt. xi. 8.) see ch. vii. 9 reff.

ἐν [w] λευκοῖς, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν. [5] ὁ [x] νικῶν * οὕτος [y] περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις [w] λευκοῖς, καὶ οὐ μὴ [ab] ἐξαλείψω τὸ [c] ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς [bc] βίβλου τῆς [c] ζωῆς, καὶ [de] ὁμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ [e] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [e] πατρός μου καὶ [f] ἐνώπιον τῶν [f] ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. [6] [g] ὁ [g] ἔχων [g] οὖς [g] ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

a Acts iii. 19. Col. ii. 14. ch. vii. 17. xxi. 4 only. Ps. l. 10. b Exod. xxxii. 32. Ps. lxviii. 28. c ch. (xiii. 8. xvii. 8.) xx. (12) 15. (xxi. 27.) Phil. iv. 3. Dan. xii. 1. d = John xii. 42. Rom. x. 9, 10. 1st xl. 9 (14). e see Matt. x. 32. Luke xii. 8. f so Luke xv. 10. ch. xiv. 10. see Isa. lii. 15. g ch. ii. 7 reff.

5. ο νικων is in margin of 1. * οὕτως ACℵ[1] a h 2. 9. 10-7-8-9. 26-7. 33(5, e sil)-7. 40-1-2-9. 51 vulg syr-dd copt arm Primas: ουτω 13 B[r]: ουτος [P]ℵ[3a] B rel Andr Areth. for περιβαλειται, περιβαλλεται C: περιβαλλεῖται m: περιπατησει 15. rec (for ομολογησω) εξομολογησομαι: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth.—(homœotel. αυτου 1st and 2nd, n 1. 27.) for 1st ενωπιον, εμπροσθεν ℵ.

they shall walk with me in white (so, not filling up λευκοῖς, E. V. admirably. The supply, ἱματίοις, comes below, ver. 5: where see note. The white here is not to be identified with the undefiled garments which they now wear: it is a new and glorious hue of victory: see ch. vi. 11; vii. 9; xix. 8. The allusion which Schöttg., Vitringa, al., have imagined, to their priesthood,—because when a judgment was held by the Sanhedrim on the priests, those who were condemned were clothed in black, while the blameless wore a white robe—seems, like so many of these rabbinical illustrations, to be far-fetched, and to spoil the simplicity of the passage. An allusion to Zech. iii. 3 ff. is far more obvious. μετ' ἐμοῦ, in remarkable accord with our Lord's prayer in John xvii. 24, πάτερ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὦσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ: see also Luke xxiii. 43) **because they are worthy** (the ἀξιότης here is found in the terms of the sentence itself. They have *kept their garments undefiled:* they of all others then are the persons who should walk in the glorious white robes of heavenly triumph. Exactly thus in ch. xvi. 6, αἷμα . . . ἐξέχεαν, καὶ αἷμα αὐτοῖς ἔδωκας πιεῖν· ἄξιοί εἰσιν. To dream of any merit here implied, is not only to miss, but to run counter to the sense of the whole saying and situation. The οὐκ ἐμόλυναν is only explained by ch. vii. 14, ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου: and as Vitringa excellently says, "*Dignitas* hic notat proportionem et congruentiam, quæ erat inter *statum gratiæ* quo fuerant in terris, et *gloriæ* quam Dominus ipsis decreverat æstimandam ex ipsa lege gratiæ"). **He that conquereth, he** (the reading οὕτως, found in so many manuscripts, may have arisen originally in the very usual confusion of ο and ω, and then have been retained, from not being altogether without meaning; "*thus*," i. e. as those first mentioned. But this would perhaps be ὁμοίως, not οὕτως) **shall be clad in white garments** (the concluding promise takes the hue of what had gone before, and identifies those just spoken of with these victorious ones): **and I will not wipe out his name out of the book of life** (this again takes its colour from the preceding. Those who have a name that they *live*, and are dead, are necessarily wiped out from the book of *life*: only he whose name is a living name, can remain on those pages. Here again the Rabbinical expositors have gone wrong in imagining that the genealogical tables of the priests are alluded to. Far rather is the reference to the ordinary lists of citizens, or of living members of any body or society, from which the dead are struck out. So Wetst., citing Dio Chrys. Rhod. xxxi. p. 336 c, ὅταν δημοσίᾳ τινὰ δέῃ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποθανεῖν ἐπ' ἀδικήματι, πρότερον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐξαλείφεται. And Aristoph. Pac. 1180, τοὺς μὲν ἐγγράφοντες ἡμῶν, τοὺς δ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω ἐξαλείφοντες δὶς ἢ τρίς. Thus they whose names have been once inscribed in this book, whether by their outward admission into Christ's church in baptism, or by their becoming living members of Him by faith, if they endure to the end as His soldiers and servants, and obtain the victory, shall not, as all His mere professed members shall, have their names erased from it. The figure itself, of the book of life, is found as early as Exod. xxxii. 32 f. See reff. for other places): **and I will confess his name in the presence of my Father and in the presence of his angels** (see Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8, both of which are here combined, cf. Luke ix. 26, ‖ Mark. The promise implies that in the great day the Judge will expressly acknowledge the name thus written *in the*

[7] Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Φιλαδελφείᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον Τάδε λέγει ὁ [h] ἀληθινός, ὁ [i] ἅγιος, ὁ ἔχων τὴν [j] κλεῖν [τοῦ] Δαυείδ, ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείσει, καὶ κλείει καὶ

h John (22 times) only, exc. Luke xvi. 11. 1 Thess. i. 9. Heb. viii. 2. ix. 24. x. 22. Isa. lxv. 16.
i ch. [iv. 11] vi. 10.
j ch. i. 18 reff. Isa. xxii. 22.

7. εκκλησιαις(but corrd) ℵ[1]. rec ο αγ. bef ο αληθ., with C[P] B rel vulg syr-dd: txt Aℵ. om την ℵ[1](ins ℵ[3a]). rec (for κλειν) κλειδα, with f m n 1. 17. 36 (13-6, e sil) Orig, Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Orig, Epiph Andr-coisl. om του AC 38: ins [P]ℵ B rel Orig, Andr Areth. for δαυειδ, αδου l[1] 16. 33. 45 copt mentd-by-Andr. for ὁ (bef ανοιγ.) και ℵ: om 90. rec (for κλεισει) κλειει, with c 1. 6. 11-2. 36. 49 (51, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas: κλειων n: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel copt Orig, Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Hil. (but -σῃ 33 al.) aft κλεισει ins αυτην B rel: om AC[P]ℵ c m n 6. 34-6-8. 40-7-9[1] (51, e sil). for και κλειει, κλειων A; *claudit* vulg(pref. *et* fuld lips-4 al) Iren-int Hil: και κλειων [P]ℵ m 1. 6. 11[1]-2-3. 34-6-8. 47[2]-9[1] Orig, Andr Primas: και ο κλειων n 40-7[1]: και κλεισει 35: ει μη ο ανοιγων B rel: ει μη ο ανοιγων και κλειων l 16. 37. 45: txt C c (51, e sil) vulg syr-dd Iren-int Promiss.

book of life, as belonging to one of His. Cf. ch. xx. 15; xxi. 27; also Matt. vii. 23 (xxv. 12), where He repudiates those whom He knows not). **6.**] See above, ch. ii. 7.

7—13.] The Epistle to the church at Philadelphia. It has been remarked, that this Epistle bears a tinge throughout of O. T. language and imagery, correspondent to the circumstances of the church as connected with the Jews dwelling there. For the history, &c., see Prolegomena. **And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write: These things saith the true One** (it is doubtful whether the distinction between ἀληθινός and ἀληθής, which lies on the surface in ordinary usage, can be held firmly, on thorough examination of the places where the word occurs in the N. T. It is not easy for instance to justify the meaning *"genuine," "answering fully to its name,"* in passages like John vii. 28: and more experience in the habit of later Greek to break down the distinctions of derivative nouns has shaken me in the assertion of this meaning wherever the word occurs. Here, it would certainly appear as if it were chosen to declare an attribute of our Lord opposed to the λεγόντ. καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ ψεύδονται below. Not that the meaning *genuine* would be out of place in such a connexion: but that where ἀληθινός is used *absolutely*, of a person, the two meanings, *genuine* and *truthful*, running up into one head of *truth*, we must not in later diction press the one subordinate meaning as against the other. See for the distinction, which, however, is too exclusively pressed, Trench, N. T. Synonyms, § viii. The senses here to be avoided are,—ὁ ἀληθῶς ἅγιος, as Corn.-a-lap. and Grot., thus losing the word altogether;—*the real Messiah*, in reference to the rejection of Him by the Jews, as Hengst. and Düsterd.; *He that bears the truth*, as the High-priest the Urim and Thummim, δήλωσιν κ. ἀλήθειαν, LXX, Exod. xxviii. 26 (30); so Vitringa: "promissis suis stans," as Ewald and Züllig), **the Holy One** (as opposed to the συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ below; not with reference to Christ's High-priesthood, as Vitr.: nor as Eichhorn and Heinr., "legatus divinus:" but expressive of moral attribute), **He that hath the key of David** (i. e. He that is the Heir and Lord of the abiding theocracy, as Düsterd. In Isa. xxii. 22, it is said of Eliakim son of Hilkiah, δώσω αὐτῷ τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυεὶδ ἐπὶ τῷ ὤμῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνοίξει καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀποκλείων καὶ κλείσει καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀνοίγων: which is manifestly the passage here incorporated into the Lord's message: and the sense is, that whatever inferior degrees there may be of this power of opening and shutting the church (= the house of David, with reference to the false Jews below), the supreme power, the one true key, belongs to the Lord Christ alone. It is hardly justified, and serves but little purpose, to attempt to set up a distinction between τὴν κλεῖν τοῦ Δαυείδ here, and τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυείδ in l. c. (so Hengst., Ebr., Düsterd.: see the idea well refuted in Vitringa.) The key is the same in both cases: but the One possesses it as his own by right, the other has it merely entrusted to him; laid on his shoulder. Some mistaken views have been: "potestatem aperiendi intellectum Scripturarum," Lyra, so also Primas., Bede, Zega, al.: that Δαυείδ should be Τάφεθ, or Τώφεθ, and that our words mean the same as ch. i. 18, ἔχω τὰς κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου (Wolf). This idea is quite distinct from that, and is closely connected with ver. 8, where the reference is entirely to the Church of God and success in God's work. The same

k so Luke xxi. 51. l Acts xiv. 27. 1 Cor. xvi. 9. 2 Cor. ii. 12. Col. iv. 3. Isa. xlv. 1. m Mark vii. 35. Acts xv. 17. ch. vii. 2. xiii. 12. xx. 8. [1 Pet. ii. 24.] Lev. xv. 4. n 1 John ii. 5 reff.

οὐδεὶς ἀνοίξει, [8] Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα· ἰδοὺ [k] δέδωκα ἐνώπιόν σου [l] θύραν [l] ἀνεῳγμένην, [m] ἣν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι [m] αὐτήν· ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν, καὶ [n] ἐτήρησάς μου τὸν [n] λόγον καὶ οὐκ [o] ἠρνήσω τὸ ὄνομά μου. [9] ἰδοὺ [p] διδῶ [q] ἐκ τῆς [r] συναγωγῆς τοῦ [r] σατανᾶ τῶν λεγόντων ἑαυτοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἶναι καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ [s] ψεύδονται, ἰδοὺ

i. 6 al. fr. o ch. ii. 13. Prov. xiv. 5. p = Acts x. 40. q 2 John 4 reff. r ch. ii. 9. s = 1 John

rec ανοιγει, with AC[P] 1(ανειγει) 15. 36 vulg Andr Primas: ανοιγων ℵ: txt ℵ B rel copt Orig, Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Hil.

8. τα εργα bef σου ℵ. ηνεωγμενην [P]ℵ c m 35. rec (for ην) και, with (k, e sil) 1 Andr: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Orig Andr-coisl Areth. om αυτην ℵ 49. for εχεις, εχει 1(Del).

9. rec διδωμι, with [P] B rel Andr Areth: δεδωκα ℵ: txt AC. for 2nd ιδου

Lord of all has the keys both of the prison and of the palace; but these words refer to the latter alone. Cf. on the whole sense, Matt. xvi. 19), **who openeth and no one shall shut, and shutteth** (the construction is altered to the direct from the participial: as in Amos v. 7, ὁ ποιῶν εἰς ὕψος κρίμα, καὶ δικαιοσύνην εἰς γῆν ἔθηκεν. This is said to be Hebraistic (De W.): but such irregularities are not confined to any particular language) **and no one shall open** (these words are to be taken not merely of the power of Christ to forgive sins, but generally, as indeed the next verse requires. Christ only has power to admit into and exclude from His kingdom; to enlarge the work and opportunities of His Church, and to contract them): **I know thy works** (these words stand by themselves; not, as De W. (so also Ewald and Bengel), as connected with ὅτι μικρὰν κ.τ.λ. below, the intervening sentence, ἰδοὺ . . . αὐτήν, being considered parenthetical. They are words of comfort and support to the Philadelphian Church): **behold I have given before thee a door opened** (i. e. have granted, in my possession and administration of the key of David, that a door should stand opened. For the construction, see ref. The door is variously understood: by Lyra, al. (see above on ver. 7) as "ostium apertum ad scripturas intelligendas:" by Areth., as τὴν εἴσοδον πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν: by Bengel, as an entrance into the joy of thy Lord and so to an uninterrupted progress in all good; Eichhorn and Heinrichs, "aditus ad me tibi patet," in the merely superficial sense of "bene tibi cupio:" most expositors take it to mean, as in reff. 1 Cor.; 2 Cor.; Col. (otherwise in ref. Acts), an opportunity for the mission work of the church. And this appears to be the true sense here, by what follows in ver. 9, promising conversion of those who were now foes. This connexion, which lies in the context itself, is made yet plainer by the ἰδοὺ δέδωκα . . . ἰδοὺ διδῶ . . . ἰδοὺ ποιήσω. **ἐνώπιόν σου**, because the course is naturally *forward*), **which no one is able to shut** (*it*, redundant: see reff.): **because** (not, as Vitr., *etiamsi*: ὅτι gives the reason of what preceded; the Lord will confer this great advantage on the Philadelphian church, *because*...) **thou hast little power** (not as E. V. "*a little strength*," thereby virtually reversing the sense of the words: μικρὰν ἔχεις δύν. importing "*thy strength is but small*," and the E. V. importing "*thou hast some strength*," the fact of its smallness vanishing under the indefinite term "*a little*."

The meaning of this μικρὰν must not be assigned as Lyra, "quia non dedi tibi gratiam miraculorum, sicut multis aliis episcopis illius temporis, recompensavi tibi intellectu sacrarum scripturarum excellenti" (see above), but it must be understood, as most Commentators, to have consisted in the fewness of the congregation of Christians there: possibly *also*, as Hengst., in their poverty as contrasted with the wealth of their Jewish adversaries), **and** (using that little well) **didst keep my word and didst not deny my name** (the aorr. perhaps refer to some time of especial trial when both these temptations, to break Christ's word and deny His name, were put before the church). **Behold, I give** (not, *to thee*, as Hengst., nor can we render it by "*patiar*" as Wolf: the sense is broken off in the following clause, and the διδῶ resumed by ἰδοὺ ποιήσω αὐτοὺς ἵνα: see reff. in both places) **of the synagogue of Satan** (see on ch. ii. 9, where the same expression occurs of outward Jews who were not real Jews), **who profess themselves to be Jews and they are not, but do lie,—behold I**

[t] ποιήσω αὐτοὺς [t] ἵνα [u] ἥξουσιν καὶ [vw] προσκυνήσουσιν [wx] ἐνώπιον τῶν ποδῶν σου, καὶ γνῶσιν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἠγάπησά σε. 10 ὅτι [n] ἐτήρησας τὸν [n] λόγον τῆς [y] ὑπομονῆς [y] μου, κἀγώ σε [z] τηρήσω [z] ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ [a] πειρασμοῦ τῆς μελλούσης

t John xi. 37. Col. iv. 16. ch. xiii. 12, 16. Eccl. iii. 14. u indic. fut., John xvii. 2. Gal. ii. 4. ch. vi. 4. viii. 3. xiii. 12. xiv. 13. xxii. 14. Exod. i. 11 A (not F). Winer, edn. 6, § 41. b. 1. b. v Isa. xlix. 23. w ch. xv. 4. Isa. lxvi. 23. x = ch. i. 4 reff. y so 2 Thess. iii. 5. 2 Cor. i. 5. Heb. x. 36. see ch. i. 9. z John xvii. 15 only. see Prov. vii. 5. a = 1 Pet. i. 6 reff.

και 1. 49. rec ηξωσι, with B rel Andr Areth: ηξω(sic) 1: txt AC[P]ℵ b c n 2. 10. 35-6. rec προσκυνησωσι, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ b c 1. 2. 13. γνωση ℵ f Primas: γνωσονται 15. 36 (49) vulg. om εγω B rel Areth Primas: ins AC[P]ℵ n 36 (l 1. 16. 38. 49 Br, e sil).

10. for οτι, και A: και οτι 38 arm. for τηρησω, εξηγαγον 36: om ℵ.

will make them (this αὐτούς is put as the object of the preceding verb rather than as the subject of the following, as in *οἴδαμεν τοῦτον, πόθεν ἐστίν*, not by a mere attraction of grammar, as usually represented (even in Winer, edn. 6, § 66. 5, a), but in the strictest logical propriety, *αὐτούς* being the object on which the action indicated by the preceding verb is exercised) **that they shall come** (for ἵνα aft. ποι., and for the fut. indic. after ἵνα, see reff.), **and shall worship before thy feet** (so in Isa. lx. 14, "the sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee: and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet: and they shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." See also Isa. xlix. 23; Zech. viii. 20—23. These passages are decisive against the sense given by Corn.-a-lap., "significatur summa fidelium devotio, reverentia et submissio erga ecclesiam ejusque prælatos. Hæc enim adoratio procedit ex apprehensione excellentiæ prælatorum plusquam humanæ et minus quam divinæ:" a sense unknown to Estius and the better R.-Cath. expositors. Areth. in the catena says well: *τούτους οὖν προσδραμεῖσθαι οὐ κατὰ τὸ τυχόν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς θερμότητος καὶ συντριβῆς φησί· τοῦτο γὰρ αἰνίττεται τὸ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας προσκυνῆσαι, καὶ ἐν ἐσχάτοις ἑλέσθαι τετάχθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, μόνον τοῦ μέρους εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀξιωθῆναι, ὡς καὶ Δαβὶδ ἀσπαστῶς φησιν ὁ προφήτης, "ἐξελεξάμην παραῤῥιπτεῖσθαι ἐκ τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκεῖν με ἐν σκηνώμασι τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν"*), **and that they may know that I loved thee** (the English idiom requires, "have loved thee:" but the aor. has its propriety, referring as it does to the time preceding that in which they shall do this. Düsterd. takes it as used of that great proof which Christ gave of His love by dying for His church, appealing to the same aor. in Eph. v. 25; Gal. ii. 20; 1 John iv. 10, 11. But thus we lose the especial reference to the particular church which seems to be involved in the recognition. It is the love bestowed on the Philadelphian church, in signalizing its success in the work of Christ, that these converted enemies shall recognize. Lyra's explanation is curious and characteristic,—"quia ego dilexi te, promovendo non solum ad fidem catholicam, sed etiam ad episcopalem dignitatem"). **Because thou didst keep the word of my endurance** (the λόγος preached to thee, enjoining that ὑπομονή which belongs to Me and mine, see ch. i. 9. μου belongs to ὑπομονῆς alone, not to the whole τὸν λ. τῆς ὑπ. as Düsterd., Winer (edn. 6, § 34. 3, b), al. Such a construction would, I conceive, be indefensible: certainly all the places which are quoted as for it, are against it: viz. ch. xiii. 3; Col. i. 13; Heb. i. 3. Had it been so here, I should have expected τὸν λόγον μου τῆς ὑπομονῆς), **I also** (I on my side: the καί expressing reciprocity. And this reciprocity depends, in its form, on the close juxtaposition of the ὑπομονῆς μου and κἀγώ, which is materially interfered with by referring μου to the whole sentence and resolving τῆς ὑπομονῆς into a mere epithet: see above) **will keep thee** (σε emphatic and prominent) **from** (ἐκ, from out of the midst of: but whether by *immunity from*, or by *being brought safe through*, the preposition does not clearly define. Nor can the distinction which Düsterd., al., attempt to set up between τηρεῖν ἐκ and τ. ἀπό, be safely maintained. In comparing John xvii. 15, *οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*, with James i. 27, *ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου*, it is not easy to see that the former implies passing scatheless through the evil, while the latter imports perfect immunity from it. This last we may grant: but is it not equally true in the other case? Rev. vii. 14, ἐρχ. ἐκ τῆς θλίψ., which they cite on their side, is quite different: the local meaning of ἐκ being made decisive by the local verb ἔρχεσθαι) **the hour of temptation** (the appointed season

b ἔρχεσθαι b ἐπὶ τῆς c οἰκουμένης c ὅλης d πειράσαι τοὺς e κατοικοῦντας e ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 11 f ἔρχομαι f ταχύ g κράτει ὃ h ἔχεις, ἵνα μηδεὶς λάβῃ τὸν i στέφανόν σου. 12 jk ὁ νικῶν, l ποιήσω k αὐτὸν m στύλον ἐν τῷ n ναῷ τοῦ o θεοῦ o μου, καὶ ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἔτι, καὶ γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ

ACPℵ 𝔅 a l. 1. 2. 4. 6. 10–3. 7. to 15. 7. 30 to 35. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

b so Heb. vi. 7. c Matt. xxiv. 14. Acts xi. 28. (xix. 27. xvii. 31.) ch. xii. 9. xvi. 14. Isa. xiv. 26. d ch. ii. 2 reff. e ch. viii. 13. xi. 10. xiii. 8. Acts xvii. 26. Lam. iv. 21. f ch. xxii. 7, 12, 20. (ii. 5, 16.) g ch. ii. 13, &c. reff. h = 1 John v. 12 reff. i see ch. ii. 10. j ch. ii. 7 reff. k constr., ch. ii. 26 reff. l = Matt. iv. 19. John vi. 15. ch. i. 6 al. m Gal. ii. 9. 1 Tim. iii. 15. ch. x. 1 only. = 3 Kings vii. 41. n 1 Cor. iii. 16. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Jer. vii. 4. o ver. 2 reff.

11. rec ins *ιδου* bef *ερχομαι*, with n 36 æth Bede: om AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with tol &c, agst demid fuld lipss) syr-dd copt gr-lat-ff.

12. for 1st *αυτον*, *αυτω* ℵ[1] 47. om *εν* ℵ[1]. om *ετι* ℵ. om *επ' αυτον* C n:

of sore trial, τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, of the well-known and signal temptation. But the article cannot be expressed in English, because it would unavoidably become the antecedent to "*which*" following) **which is about to come upon the whole world** (the time imported is that prophesied of in Matt. xxiv. 21 ff., viz. the great time of trouble which shall be before the Lord's second coming. As such, it is immediately connected with ἔρχομαι ταχύ following), **to try them that dwell upon the earth** (see ch. viii. 13, &c., as in reff., where the expression applies to those who are not of the church of Christ. In this great trial, the servants of Christ shall be kept safe, ch. vii. 3. The trial of the πειρασμός will operate in two ways: on the faithful, by bringing out their fidelity; on the unfaithful and unbelieving, by hardening them in their impenitence, see ch. ix. 20, 21, xvi. 11, 21. The expositors have in many cases gone away from this broad and obvious meaning here, and have sought to identify the ὥρα πειρασμοῦ with various periods of trial and persecution of the *Church*: a line of interpretation carrying its own refutation with it in the very terms used in the text. Thus Grot. understands it of the persecution under Nero; Lyra, of the future increase of that under Domitian, which was raging as the Apostle wrote: Alcas., Paræus, al., of those under Trajan: Primasius and Bede, of the troubles which should arise on account of Antichrist, which is nearer the mark. Andr. and Arethas give the alternative: ἢ τὸν ἐπὶ Δομετιανοῦ διωγμὸν λέγει, δεύτερον ὄντα μετὰ Νέρωνα ὡς Εὐσέβιος ἱστορεῖ ὁ Παμφίλου, ὅτε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς εἰς τὴν Πάτμον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Δομετιανοῦ κατεκρίθη, ἢ τὴν ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου κατὰ χριστιανῶν ἐσομένην παγκόσμιον, ἀναιροῦντος τοὺς χριστιανούς). **11.**] **I come quickly** (these words, which in different senses and with varying references form the burden of this whole book, are here manifestly to be taken as an encouragement and comfort to the Philadelphian church, arising from the nearness of the Lord's coming to reward her; cf. τὸν στέφανόν σου below): **hold fast that which thou hast** (ὃ ἔχεις, in the language of these Epistles, imports any advantage, or progress in grace, already possessed; cf. ch. ii. 6, τοῦτο ἔχεις, ὅτι . . . This is regarded as a treasure, to be firmly grasped, as against those who are ever ready to snatch it away. In this case the ὃ ἔχεις was a rich treasure indeed: cf. vv. 8, 10), **that no one take** (snatch away: but here the figure stops: it is not *for himself* that the robber would snatch it, but merely to deprive the possessor. So λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ch. vi. 4. The idea of the robber taking it for himself must, as De W. remarks, have been expressed by μηδεὶς ἄλλος) **thy crown** (ref.).

12.] The reward of the conqueror. **He that conquereth** (for the pendent nom., see ref.), **I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God** (i. e. he shall have a fixed and important place in the glorified church hereafter. That this, and nothing referring to any honour or dignity in the church militant (so Lyra, Aretius, Grot., Wetst., Schöttg., al.), or in that as leading on to the church triumphant (so Vitr., Corn.-a-lap., Stern, al.) is intended, is manifest from the whole diction of this passage, as well as from comparing the corresponding promises, which all refer to the blessings of the future state of glory. It is no objection to this view, that in the heavenly Jerusalem there is no temple, ch. xxi. 22: but rather a corroboration of it. That glorious city is all temple, and Christ's victorious ones are its living stones and pillars. Thus as Düsterd. well remarks, the imagery of the church militant, 1 Cor. iii. 16 ff.; Eph. ii. 19 ff.; 1 Pet. ii. 5 ff., is transferred to the church triumphant, but with this difference, that the saints are no longer the stones merely, but now the pillars themselves, standing in their immovable firmness. On θεοῦ

ὄνομα τοῦ °θεοῦ °μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς ᵖ πόλεως τοῦ °θεοῦ °μου τῆς ᑫ καινῆς ᑫ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ ʳ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ °θεοῦ °μου, καὶ τὸ ˢ ὄνομά μου τὸ ˢ καινόν. 13 ὁ ᵗ ἔχων ᵗ οὖς ᵗ ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

14 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον Τάδε λέγει ὁ ᵘ ἀμήν, ὁ ᵛ μάρτυς ὁ ᵛʷ πιστὸς καὶ ʷ ἀληθινός,

p Heb. xi. 22. Ps. xlv. 4. xlvii. 8. lxxxvi. 3. q ch. xxi. 2. see Gal. iv. 26. r constr., ch. ii. 20. s ch. ii. 17. t ch. ii. 7 reff. u 2 Cor. i. 20. אֱלֹהֵי אָמֵן Isa. lxv. 16. v ch. i. 5. Jer. xlix. (xlii.) 5. w ch. xix. 11. xxi. 5. xxii. 6.

επ' αυτω 36. om from 1st to 2nd ονομα B. om from 2nd to 3rd μου 1. elz καταβαινει, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC P(-βενν-) ℵ[1] n 1. 12. 51: της καταβαινουσης ℵ[3a]. om last μου B rel Andr(-a and -coisl-comm) Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ 10-7-8. 34-5-6 (h m n 1. 13. 37. 49 Br, e sil).

13. ὁ is written above the line by ℵ[1].

14. rec (for εν λαοδικεια εκκλ.) εκκλ. λαοδικεων, with 1: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt gr-lat-ff.—om εκκλ. g. aft αμην ins και ℵ[1](ℵ[3a] disapproving). for 2nd και, ὁ f l n 16. 45 syr-dd Andr-a: και ο Cℵ 2. aft αληθ. ins και ℵ.

μου, see note on ch. ii. 7), **and out of it he shall never more go out** (the subject is not the στύλος, but ὁ νικῶν; and the sense, that he who is thus fixed in his eternal place as a pillar in the heavenly temple, will never more, from any cause, depart from it. Those Commentators who have understood the promise of the church *militant*, have been obliged to take ἐξέλθῃ as a passive, "non ejicietur," justifying this by such expressions as μήτι ὁ λύχνος ἔρχεται Mark iv. 21. Lyra takes it in both senses—"nec per apostasin, nec per excommunicationem." And thus, except that the latter word will have no place, we may well understand the general word ἐξέλθῃ: none shall thrust him out, nor shall he be any more in danger of falling, and thus thrusting himself out. It is well worth noticing, as Wetst. has done, the recorded fact, that Philadelphia was notorious for calamities by earthquake. The language in which Strabo describes this is remarkable in connexion with this promise of the pillar which should not be moved; ἥ τε Φιλαδέλφεια . . . . οὐδὲ τοὺς τοίχους ἔχει πιστούς, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἡμέραν τρόπον τινὰ σαλεύονται καὶ διΐστανται· διατελοῦσι δὲ προσέχοντες τῆς γῆς τοῖς πάθεσι, καὶ ἀρχιτεκτονοῦντες πρὸς αὐτήν, xii. p. 868 B: and still more so in xiii. p. 936 B, —πόλις Φιλαδέλφεια σεισμῶν πληρής. οὐ γὰρ διαλείπουσιν οἱ τοῖχοι διϊστάμενοι, καὶ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλο μέρος τῆς πόλεως κακοπαθοῦν· οἰκοῦσιν οὖν ὀλίγοι τὴν πόλιν διὰ τοῦτο· . . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ὀλίγων θαυμάζειν ἐστὶν ὅτι οὕτω φιλοχωροῦσιν ἐπισφαλεῖς τὰς οἰκήσεις ἔχοντες· ἔτι δ' ἂν τις μᾶλλον θαυμάσειε τῶν κτισάντων αὐτήν. See also Tacit. Ann. ii. 47, where among the twelve cities of proconsular Asia which were overthrown by an earthquake, Philadelphia suffered, and was in consequence excused its taxes, and in common with the others entrusted to a senatorian commissioner to repair): **and I will write upon him** (the conqueror; not as Grot., the pillar) **the name of my God** (Wetst. quotes from the Rabbinical book Bava Bathra 75. 2, "R. Samuel filius Nachmanni ait, R. Jochananem dixisse, tres appellari nomine Dei S. B.,—justos (Is. xliii. 7), Messiam (Jer. xxiii. 6), Hierosolyma (Ezek. xlviii. 35)." Some think of the mitre frontlet of the high-priests, on which was inscribed "Holiness to the Lord," Exod. xxviii. 36: so Schöttg., Ewald, al. But this does not seem applicable here, where, from this and the following particulars, it is rather a blessed belonging to God and the holy city and Christ, that is imported, than the priestly office of the glorified Christian) **and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which descendeth** (the appositive nom., see reff.) **out of heaven from my God** (on the whole, see ch. xxi. 2, 3, and notes. It is *possible*, that the name Jehovah Shammah, Ezek. xlviii. 35, may be meant; but hardly probable, seeing that the Holy Name itself has before been mentioned as inscribed on him. The inscription of the name of the city would betoken citizenship), **and mine own new name** (not the name mentioned ch. xix. 16, which is known and patent, but that indicated ch. xix. 12, ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός: for this is clearly pointed at by the word καινόν. By the inscription of this new name of the glorified Saviour is declared, that he belongs to Him in His new and glorious state of eternal rest and triumph).

13.] See above, ch. ii. 7.

14—22.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH IN LAODICEA. **And to the angel** (not, the bishop or ruler, see on ch. i. 20) **of the**

ἡ [x] ἀρχὴ τῆς [y] κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, [15] Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι οὔτε [z] ψυχρὸς εἶ οὔτε [a] ζεστός. [b] ὄφελον [z] ψυχρὸς ἦς

ACPℵ 1 a l8 a, 1. 2. 4. 6. 13. 14–3. 16 to 19. 26. 7. 30. 32 to 35. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

x = Col. i. 18. see note.
y = Rom. viii. 19, &c. Col. i. 15. Judith xvi. 14.
z here 3ce. Matt. x. 42 only. Prov. xxv. 25. Sir. xliii. 20 only.
a here (3ce) only †. Lev. vi. 21 Aq.
b 1 Cor. iv. 8. 2 Cor. xi. 1. Gal. v. 12 only. 4 Kings v. 3. Job xiv. 13. Ps. cxviii. 5 only.

for κτισεως, εκκλησιας ℵ[1]: πιστεως b.

15. om ει ℵ[1]. om from ζεστος to ζεστος A 1. 47. rec (for ἦς) ειης, with k(e sil) 30-corr: txt C[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. (εις B 16. 32.)

church in Laodicea write: These things saith the Amen (see ref. Isa. Christ is the Amen, inasmuch as His words shall never pass away, but shall find certain ratification. This, and not the particular case which is treated in ref. 2 Cor., seems to be the reference here, where not the ratification of promises merely, but general fidelity and certainty are concerned: as Areth., in Catena, *ἰσοδυναμεῖ τοῦτο, τάδε λέγει ὁ ἀληθινὸς . . . ἀμὴν γάρ ἐστι τὸ ναί· ναὶ οὖν ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ λεγομένοις, ἤτοι ἀλήθεια καὶ οὐδὲν ψεῦδος*. That expression is illustrative of this, but this takes the wider range. Züllig has imagined that the title here owes its occurrence to this being the last among the Seven Epistles: but this probably is mere fancy), **the faithful and true** (on **ἀληθινός**, see above, ver. 7) **witness** (there does not seem in this title to be any allusion to the prophecies which are about to follow in ch. iv. ff. as some (Grot., De Wette) have imagined. Far rather does it substantiate the witness borne in the Epistle itself, as we have seen in the case of the other introductions. See a lengthened notice of the title in Trench, p. 181 f.), **the beginning of the creation of God** (= *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, ref. Col., where see note, as also Bleek on the Hebrews, vol. ii. 1, p. 43 note. In Him the whole creation of God is begun and conditioned: He is its source and primary fountain-head. The mere word *ἀρχή* would admit the meaning that Christ is the first created being: see Gen. xlix. 3; Deut. xxi. 17; and Prov. viii. 22. And so the Arians here take it, and some who have followed them: e.g. Castalio, "chef d'œuvre:" "omnium Dei operum excellentissimum atque primum:" and so Ewald and Züllig. But every consideration of the requirements of the context, and of the Person of Christ as set forth to us in this book, is against any such view. Others, as Calov., Bengel, Whitby, al., make *ἀρχή* = *ἄρχων*, which is impossible: as it is also to interpret *κτίσεως* of the new spiritual creation, the church, as Ribera, Corn.-a-lap., Grot., Wetst., al. There can be little doubt that *ἀρχή* is to be taken in that pregnant sense in which we have it, e.g., in Wisd. xii. 16, *ἡ γὰρ ἰσχύς σου δικαιοσύνης ἀρχή*,—ib. xiv. 27, *ἡ γὰρ τῶν . . . εἰδώλων θρησκεία παντὸς ἀρχὴ κακοῦ καὶ αἰτία καὶ πέρας ἐστίν*: and in the Gospel of Nicodemus, p. ii. cap. vii. Tischdf. Ev. Apoc. p. 307, where Satan is said to be *ἀρχὴ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ῥίζα τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, viz. the incipient cause. So Andr., Areth. in Catena (*ἡ προκαταρκτικὴ αἰτία τῆς κτίσεως*), Lyra, Vitr., Wolf, Stern, Hengst., De Wette, Ebrard, Düsterd., al. The latter asks the questions, "How could Christ write if it were only this present Epistle, if he were himself a creature? How could every creature in heaven and earth adore him, if he were one of themselves (cf. ch. xix. 10)? We need only think of the appellation of our Lord as the A and Ω (ch. xxii. 13: cf. i. 8) in its necessary fulness of import, and we shall see that in the A lies the necessity of his being the *ἀρχή* of the Creation, as in the Ω that of his coming to bring the visible creation to an end"): **I know thy works, that** (see above, ver. 1, where the construction is the same: I have thy whole course of life before me, and its testimony is, that . . .) **thou art neither cold nor hot** (the peculiar use of the similitude of physical cold and heat here, makes it necessary to interpret the former of the two somewhat differently to its common acceptation: so that while *ζεστός*, from *ζέω* (cf. *τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες*, Rom. xii. 11), keeps its meaning of *fervent*, warm, and earnest in the life of faith and love, *ψυχρός* cannot here mean "dead and cold," as we say of the listless and careless professor of religion: for this is just what these Laodiceans were, and what is expressed by *χλιαρός* below. So that we must, so to speak, go farther into coldness for *ψυχρός*, and take it as meaning, not only entirely without the spark of spiritual life, but also and chiefly, by consequence, openly belonging to the world without, and having no part nor lot in Christ's church, and actively opposed to it. This, as well as the opposite state of spiritual fervour, would be an intelligible and plainly-marked condition: at all events, free from that danger of mixed motive and disregarded principle which belongs to the lukewarm state inasmuch

ἢ [a] ζεστός. 16 [c] οὕτως ὅτι [d] χλιαρὸς εἶ καὶ οὔτε [a] ζεστὸς οὔτε [z] ψυχρός, [e] μέλλω σε [f] ἐμέσαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου. 17 ὅτι λέγεις [ὅτι] πλούσιός εἰμι, καὶ [g] πεπλούτηκα, καὶ [h] οὐδὲν [h] χρείαν [h] ἔχω, καὶ οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι σὺ εἶ [i] ὁ [k] ταλαί-

c = Rom. i. 15. d here only†. e = & w. inf. aor., Rom. viii. 18. ver. 2. ch. i. 19. xii. 4 al. f here only. Isa. xix. 14 only. g = Luke xii. 21. 1 Cor. iv. 8. 2 Cor. viii. 9. Hos. xii. 8. Matt. vi. 8 al. fr. h constr., here only. elsw. w. gen., i = Luke vi. 24. xi. 46. xviii. 13. k Rom. vii. 24 only. Isa. xxxiii. 1. (-ρία, James v. 1. -ρεῖν, James iv. 9.)

16. οτι bef ουτως ℵ: om ουτως 36. χλιερος ℵ[1]. for 1st ουτε, ου a to m, 2. 4. 9. 13-6-7-8. 32-4-7. 41-2-8-9. 50. 90 Br. rec ουτε ψυχρος ουτε ζεστος, with A[P] 17-8 (19, e sil) vulg: txt Cℵ B rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Salv.—om all between ει and μελλω 10 harl[1] spec æth Primas.—ζεστρος (but ρ erased) ℵ. aft ψυχρος ins ει ℵ[1](ℵ[3a or c] disapproving and inserting ει after ζεστος).—ℵ[1] proceeds παυσε (= παυσαι) του, for which ℵ[3] has μελλω σε εμιν εκ του. for μου, σου ℵ[3].

17. om 2nd οτι [P]ℵ B rel spec Andr Cypr: ins AC c g m n 17[1]. 34 (1. 6. 32-8. 40-8, e sil) vulg Andr-coisl Areth Oros Bede. rec ουδενος, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: txt AC 12. οτι ταλαιπωρος ει(omg συ and ο) ℵ[1]: om ο 36: om ει k.

as a man in earnest, be he right or wrong, is ever a better man than one professing what he does not feel. This necessity of interpretation here has been much and properly pressed by some of the later Commentators (De Wette, and more clearly still, Düsterd.), but was by the older ones very generally missed, and the coldness interpreted of the mere negative absence of spiritual life. So Andr., Areth. in Catena, ψυχρός, ὁ ἐστερημένος τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐνεργείας καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως: Grot., "qui nullam habet evangelii notitiam ac proinde nec ullos motus christianos:" so Bengel, Ebrard, and many others. There have been some singular interpretations, e. g. that of Lyra, "*frigidus*, devitans transgressiones pœnæ timore:" of Ansbert, "quia nimirum ille eos glaciali quodammodo more constringit, qui dixit, 'Sedebo in monte testamenti, in lateribus aquilonis.' Aquilo itaque valde frigidissimus ventus," &c.: of Hengstenberg, who regards both hot and cold as spoken of Christ's servants in relation to Christ, and cold as equivalent to poor in spirit, conscious of one's own coldness and desire for warmth. Any thing more opposed to the context cannot be imagined): **would that** (reff., for both indic. and opt. usages) **thou wert cold or hot: so** (see ref. It expresses the actual relation of facts to the wish just expressed, as not fulfilling it: = "quod cum non ita fiat") **because thou art lukewarm** (τοῦ μηδέπω θερμαίνοντος, ὃ χλιαρὸν καλεῖται, Galen. It is one of the many derivatives from χλίω, to melt), **and neither hot nor cold, I shall soon spue thee out of my mouth** (τῇ μεταφορᾷ τοῦ χλιαροῦ δεόντως ἐχρήσατο, ὃ καὶ ἰατρῶν παῖδες πλάδον ἐργαζόμενον εἰς ἔμετον ἐρεθίζειν παραλαμβάνουσιν. Areth. in Catena. The μέλλω is a mild expression, carrying with it a possibility of the determination being changed, dependently on a change in the state of the church). **17, 18.**] In these verses, the χλιαρότης is further expanded, as inducing miserable unconsciousness of defect and need, and empty self-sufficiency. And the charge comes in the form of solemn and affectionate counsel. **Because** (this ὅτι forms the reason of συμβουλεύω below: = *seeing that* . . . Cf. a similar construction in ch. xviii. 7, 8) **thou sayest [that] I am rich, and am become wealthy, and have need in nothing** (the three expressions form a climax: the first giving the fact of being rich, the second the process of having become so (in which there is not merely outward fact, but some self-laudation: cf. ref. Hosea), the third the result, self-sufficingness. From the whole context it is evident that not outward worldly wealth, but imagined spiritual riches, are in question. The former is held to be meant by Andr., Areth., Aretius, Corn.-a-lap., Bengel, Ewald, Züllig, al., the latter by Bede, Lyra, Ribera, Alcas., Grot., Calov., Vitringa, Eich., De W., Hengst., Ebrard, Düsterd., Trench. Stern thinks the wealth is partly worldly (Cicero, Epist. ad div. ii. 17, iii. 5; Strabo xii. 16: see on the wealth of Laodicea the Prolegg.), and partly spiritual. But thus the correspondence in our sentence would be confused. Stern is doubtless so far right, that the imagined spiritual self-sufficingness was the natural growth of an outwardly prosperous condition: but the great self-deceit of which the Lord here complains was not concerning worldly wealth, which was a patent fact, but concerning spiritual, which was a baseless fiction), **and knowest not that thou** (σύ, emphatic; "thou, of all others:" corresponding to the use of the

l 1 Cor. xv. 19 only†.
m = Matt. xxiii. 16, &c. John ix. 40, 41. Isa. xliii. 18.

πωρος καὶ [ˡ ὁ] ˡ ἐλεινὸς καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ ᵐ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμνός, 18 ⁿ συμβουλεύω σοι ἀγοράσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ χρυσίον ᵒ πεπυρωμένον ᵖ ἐκ πυρός, ἵνα ˢ πλουτήσῃς, καὶ ᑫ ἱμάτια ᑫ λευκά,

n = & constr. dat., John xviii. 14 only. Exod. xviii. 19. inf., Acts ix. 23. dat. and inf., 1 Macc. ix. 69. o ch. i. 15 reff. p = John xiii. 4. Rom. xiii. 11. ch. vii. 14. q ver. 5.

rec om 2nd ὁ, with C[P]ℵ f g h n 1. 17. 36 (13. 30-2. 47. 90, e sil) Andr-a: ins A B rel Andr-coisl Areth.—om κ. ο. ελ. Andr-p. rec ελεεινος, with [P] B rel: txt ACℵ L.

18. χρυσιον bef παρ' εμου B rel copt Areth: om π. ε. c j m 34-5 Andr-coisl: txt AC[P]ℵ n 1. 17-8. 36 (16. 49, e sil). εκ πυρας B: om 16.

article below) **art the wretched and [the] pitiable one** (ὁ, as distinguished above others (not as De W., al., "*the well-known*"), as the person to whom above all others the epithets belong. And these epithets are especially opposed to οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω), **and poor and blind and naked** (are these adjectives all subordinate to ὁ preceding, or are they new predicates dependent on εἶ? Better the latter, if only for the reason that the counsel which follows takes up these three points in order, thereby bringing them out as distinct from and not subordinate to the two preceding), **I advise thee** (there is a deep irony in this word. One who *has need of nothing*, yet needs counsel on the vital points of self-preservation) **to buy** (at the cost only of thy good self-opinion. That a πτωχός should be advised to *buy gold* and *raiment*, and *ointment*, might of itself shew what kind of buying is meant, even if Isa. lv. 1, ἀγοράσατε . . ἄνευ ἀργυρίου κ. τιμῆς, had not clearly defined it. Yet notwithstanding such clear warning not to go wrong, the Roman-Catholic expositors have here again handled the word of God deceitfully, and explained, as Lyra, "*Emere*, operibus bonis:" Corn.-a-lap., "verbum ergo emendi significat, quod multa debet homo facere, et multa conferre, ut idoneus sit a Deo accipere ista dona." Bede and Ribera, somewhat better, "derelictis omnibus," Bede: "etiam cum voluptatum dispendio," Rib. (which however is travelling out of the context, making the wealth to be earthly riches): Estius, better still, but curiously characteristic, "*Emere* significat aliquod studium præcedens, quo ambiat charitatem (his interpretation of χρυσίον πεπυρ.): quod tamen etiam ex Deo est. Unde statui potest meritum congruum, respectu justificationis." Far better again Ansbert, though missing the *point* of ἀγοράσαι: "Numquid is qui miser et miserabilis et pauper et cæcus et nudus redarguitur, aliquid boni habet, quod pro tanto bono largitori suo tribuat, nisi forte prius ab ipso accipiat quod pro accipiendis aliis illi tribuat? Sic certe invenit quod det, qui nisi desuper acceperit, non habet quod det." Augustine seems to be on the right track for the meaning of ἀγοράσαι when he says, "contende ut pro nomine Christi aliquid patiaris." The term continues the irony. "All this lofty self-sufficiency must be expended in the labour of getting from Me these absolute necessaries." So most of the later expositors. So even the R.-Cath. Stern, but disguising the truth under an appearance of a 'quid pro quo;' "Welches ist der Kaufpreis? Hat nicht der Herr selbst gesagt, daß sie arm seien und elend, nakt und jämmerlich? Ihr Herz sollen sie Christo hingeben, ihr Fuhlen, Denken, Wollen, und thatkräftiges Handeln; sich selbst ganz und gar dem Herrn zur Leibeigenschaft opfern, Matt. xiii. 45, 46") **from me** (who am the source of all true spiritual wealth, Eph. iii. 8) **gold** (fresh) **burnt from the fire** (the ἐκ gives the sense of being just fresh from the burning or smelting, and thus not only tried by the process, but bright and new from the furnace. This is better than, with many Commentators, to make the ἐκ almost = ὑπό, signifying the source from which the πύρωσις comes, as ch. viii. 11. In the interpretation, this gold represents all spiritual πλοῦτος, in its sterling reality, as contrasted with that merely imaginary sort on which the Laodiceans prided themselves. It is narrowing it too much to interpret it as *caritas* (cf. Estius above), or *fides*, as Aret., Vitringa, Hengstb., al., or indeed any one spiritual grace, as distinguished from the sum total of them all), **that thou mayest be** (aor., literally, mayest have become, viz., by the purchase) **rich: and white garments** (Düsterd. rightly remarks that the white garments are distinct from the gold only in constituting a different image in the form of expression, not really in the thing signified. On the meaning, see ver. 4, ch. vii. 14, xix. 8. The lack of *righteousness*, which can be only bought from Christ, and that at the price of all fancied righteousness of our own, is just as much a πτωχεία as the other), **that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy**

ἵνα [q] περιβάλῃ, καὶ μὴ [r] φανερωθῇ ἡ [s] αἰσχύνη τῆς [t] γυμνότητός σου, καὶ [u] κολλύριον [v] ἐγχρῖσαι τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου, ἵνα βλέπῃς. 19 ἐγὼ [w] ὅσους [w] ἐὰν φιλῶ [x] ἐλέγχω καὶ [y] παιδεύω· [z] ζήλευε οὖν καὶ μετανόησον. 20 ἰδοὺ ἕστηκα [a] ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ [b] κρούω· ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς

r = John iii. 21 al. (Jer. xi. [xxxiii.] 6 only.)
s = here (Luke xiv. 5. 2 Cor. iv. 2. Phil. iii. 19. Heb. xii. 2. Jude 13) only. Ezek. xxiii. 29.

t = here (Rom. viii. 35. 2 Cor. xi. 27) only. Deut. xxviii. 48. u here only. 3 Kings xiv. 3 Ald. (-ρις A, B def.) only. (-ρίς, -ρίζειν, 2 Kings xiii. 6.) v here only. Jer. iv. 30. Tobit vi. 8 xi. 8 (AB, not ℵ) only. double acc., Heb. i. 9. w ch. xiii. 15. Matt. xviii. 18. xxi. 22. xxii. 9. Mark iii. 28 al. x = Heb. xii. 5, from Prov. iii. 11, 12. y = Luke xxiii. 16, 22. 2 Chron. x. 11. Ps. cxvii. 18. Prov. xix. 18. z here only †. a Cant. v. 2. constr., ch. vii. 1. Luke iv. 9 ||. see John xx. 19, 26. b Luke xiii. 25. Acts xii. 13 al. Cant. as above.

περιβαλλη B f m n 37. [ασχημοσυνη P l] rec κολλουριον, with A[P] g k 1. 10-7. 30-6. 49 (a h 51 B[r] Bch's-4-mss, e sil) Andr-a: txt Cℵ B rel Andr Areth. (κολυρ. B e n.) rec εγχρισον, with [P] h 1. 10-7 (49 B[r], e sil): ινα εγχρισης 2. 4. 19. 26: ινα εγχριση B rel: εγχριση 37-8. 42: ινα εγχρισαι 36. 45: txt ACℵ(ενχρ.) l n 16-8 Andr-a. (d illeg.)

19. for εαν, αν ℵ 36. rec (for ζηλευε) ζηλωσον, with [P]ℵ l n 1. 10-7. 36 (d h 16. 37-8. 49, e sil) Andr: ζηλου c 6: ζητησον B[r]: txt AC B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

nakedness be not made manifest (the choice of the word φανερωθῇ seems as if some particular time were in view when such manifestation would take place. If we are to assign one, it will naturally be that of the Lord's coming, when τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. v. 10: when the Lord of the Church will come to see his guests, and all not clad in the wedding robe will be cast out, Matt. xxii. 11 ff.), **and collyrium** (the use of which is apparent from what follows. The κολλύριον was so called from its shape, being a stick or roll of ointment for the eyes, in the shape of a bread-cake, κόλλυρα or -ρις, 2 Kings vi. 19, LXX) **to anoint** (from reff. Tobit, ἐγχρίειν appears to have been the common technical word for anointing the eyes) **thine eyes, that thou mayest see** (in the spiritual interpretation, this collyrium will import the anointing of the Holy Spirit, which, like the gold of His unsearchable riches, and the white garment of His righteousness, is to be obtained from him, John xvi. 7 (πέμψω αὐτὸν . . .), 14 (ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται . . . .); Acts ii. 33 (ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο), and also at the price of the surrender of our own fancied wisdom. The analogy of 1 John ii. 20, 27 is not to be overlooked: see notes at those places). 19.] Importing that these rich proofs of Christ's love are only to be sought by such as the Laodiceans in the way of rebuke and chastisement: and reciprocally, as tending not to despair, but to encouragement, that rebuke and chastisement are no signs of rejection from Christ, but of His abiding and pleading love, even to the lukewarm and careless. **I** (emphatically prefixed: I, for my part: it is one of My ways, which are unlike men's ways)—**as many as** (ἐάν = ἄν, the common particle after the relative: see reff.) **I love** (not as Grot., "non absolute sed comparate, i. e. quos non plane ob diuturna peccata abjicere et objurare constitui:" but in its fullest and most blessed sense. Nor is the assertion addressed, as Vitr., only "ad meliorem ecclesiæ partem," but to all, as a gracious call to repentance; as is evident from the words next following), **I rebuke and chasten** (ἐλέγχειν, the convincing of sin, producing conviction, is a portion of παιδεύειν, the Lord's chastening: the latter may extend very much wider than the former, even to judgments and personal infliction, which, however they may subserve the purpose of ἐλέγχειν, are not, properly speaking, part of it. "Redargutio sane ad verba, castigatio vero pertinet ad flagella," Ansbert); **be zealous then** (ζήλευε, pres., of a habit of Christian life), **and repent** (begin that life of zeal by an act, decisive and effective (aor.), of change of purpose. There is not in the words any ὑστερονπρότερον, as De Wette, but the logical connexion is made plain by the tenses. Düsterd. (following Grot., Beng., Hengstb., Ebrard) is clearly wrong in saying that "the Lord requires of the church a burning zeal, kindled by the love shewn by Him (but where is this in the context?), and as the practical putting forth of this zeal, true change of purpose." This goes directly against both the grammatical propriety and the facts of the case, in which change of purpose must precede *zeal*, which is the effectual working in a man's life of that change of purpose). 20.] **Behold, I stand at the door** (the construction with the prep. of motion after ἕστηκα, is perhaps owing to the idea of motion conveyed in the verb,—"I have placed myself." See reff., especially ref. Luke) **and knock** (the re-

μου καὶ ἀνοίξῃ τὴν θύραν, [καὶ] [c] εἰσελεύσομαι πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ [d] δειπνήσω μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ. 21 ὁ νικῶν, [f] δώσω αὐτῷ [g] καθίσαι μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ [g] ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου, ὡς κἀγὼ ἐνίκησα καὶ [g] ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρός μου [g] ἐν

c see John xiv. 23.
d Luke xvii. 8. xxii. 20. 1 Cor. xi. 25 only. Prov. xxiii. 1. Tobit viii. 1 (not ℵ) only.
e constr., ch. ii. 26. ver. 12.
f = & constr., ch. ii. 7 reff.
g constr., here only. (Eph. i. 20 al.)

20. ανοιξω(sic) ℵ. ins και bef εισελευσομαι ℵ B rel Andr-coisl: om A[P] l n 1. 2. 30-6 (4. 13-6-8-9. 37-8, e sil) vss Orig Mac Epiph Andr Areth.

ference to Cant. v. 2 is too plain to be for a moment doubted: and if so, the interpretation must be grounded in that conjugal relation between Christ and the church,—Christ and the soul,—of which that mysterious book is expressive. This being granted, we may well say, that the vivid depiction of Christ *standing at the door* is introduced, to bring home to the lukewarm and careless church the truth of His constant presence, which she was so deeply forgetting. His *knocking* was taking place partly by the utterance of these very rebukes (ἐλέγχω), partly by every interference in judgment and in mercy. Whenever His hand is heard, He is knocking at the door. But it is not His hand only that may be heard: see below): **if any man hear my voice** (here we have more than the mere sound of his knock: He speaks. See Acts xii. 13 f. κρούσαντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου τὴν θύραν . . . ἐπιγνοῦσα τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Πέτρου. In that case we must conceive Rhoda to have asked "who is there?" and Peter to have answered. It may not be uninstructive to fill up this connexion in a similar manner. "It is I," is an answer the soul may often hear, if it will enquire the reason of an unexpected knock at the door of its slumbers; or we may compare Cant. v. 2, φωνὴ ἀδελφιδοῦ μου κρούει ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν, Ἄνοιξόν μοι), **and open the door** (ἀκούσῃ, ἀνοίξῃ, aorists, because prior in time to the futures which follow: "shall have heard," "shall have opened:" but it would be pedantry thus to render them in our language. On the sense, cf. Cant. v. 6.

Our verse is a striking and decisive testimony to the practical freedom of our will to receive or reject the heavenly Guest: without the recognition of which, the love and tenderness of the saying become a hideous mockery. We then open the door to Christ, when we admit Him, His voice, His commands, His example, to a share in our inner counsels and sources of action. To say that this can be done *without* His grace, is ignorance: to say it is done only by that grace irresistibly exerted, is far worse—it is, to deprive His gracious pleadings of all meaning), [**and**] (this καί is superfluous in the sense, merely expressing the sequence: and may on that account have been omitted) **I will enter in to him, and I will sup with him, and he with me** (the imagery is taken from the usages of intimate hospitality. But whereas in these it would be merely the guest who would sup with the host who lets him in, here the guest becomes himself the host, because He is the bread of life, and the Giver of the great feast of fat things and of the great marriage supper (Matt. viii. 11, xxv. 1 ff.; ch. xix. 7, 9). St. John is especially fond of reporting these sayings of reciprocity which our Lord uttered: cf. John vi. 56 (x. 38), xiv. 20, xv. 4, 5, xvii. 21, 26. This blessed admission of Christ into our hearts will lead to His becoming our guest, ever present with us, and sharing in all our blessings—and, which is even more, to our being ever in close union with Him, partaking ever of His fulness, until we sit down at His table in his Kingdom).

21.] **He that conquereth** (see above, ch. ii. 26, and ver. 12, for the constructional) **I will give to him to sit** (in the blessed life of glory hereafter: such promises cannot be regarded, as this by some, as partially fulfilled in this life: for thus the following analogy, ὡς κἀγὼ κ.τ.λ., would fail. The final and complete act is also pointed out by the aor. καθίσαι) **with me** (cf. John xvii. 24, πάτερ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὦσιν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ) **on my throne** (have a share in My kingly power, as ch. ii. 27, xx. 6), **as I also conquered and sat down with my Father on His throne** (the aorr. refer to the historical facts of the Resurrection and Ascension. By the latter, Christ sat down at the right hand of God, or of the throne of God, as Heb. xii. 2. No distinction must be made between the throne of the Father, on which Christ sits, and that of Christ, on which the victorious believer is to sit with Him: they are one and the same, cf. ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου, ch. xxii. 1; and the glory of the redeemed will be a participation in that of the Father and the Son, John xvii. 22). Doubtless the occurrence of this, the highest and most glorious of all the promises, in this place, is to be explained not entirely from

τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ. [22] ὁ [h] ἔχων [h] οὖς [h] ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

IV. [1] Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ θύρα ἠνεῳγμένη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ἣν ἤκουσα [i] ὡς [i] σάλπιγγος λαλούσης μετ' ἐμοῦ, [j] λέγων [k] Ἀνάβα ὧδε, καὶ

h ch. ii. 7 reff.
i ch. i. 10.
j constr., ch. xi. 15. xix. 14. Gen. xv. 1. Winer, edn. 6, § 59. 4.
k -βα, Mark xv. 30 rec. -βηθι, Matt. xxvii. 40. Luke xix. 5. John iv. 49.

CHAP. IV. 1. [μεταυτα(sic) P.] ανεωγμενη B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]ℵ 1. 33(-8?). 42 (c 6. 16. 26, e sil) Andr. ins ιδου bef η φωνη ℵ. λαλουσαν ℵ, λαλουσα k. rec (for λεγων) λεγουσα, with [P]ℵ[3a] h n 1. 17. 36-8 (13. 27. 37. 51 B[r], e sil): και λεγουσης l 16 Ambr: txt Aℵ[1] B rel Andr-coisl. for αναβα, αναβηθι A.

any especial aptness to the circumstances of the Laodicean church, though such has been attempted to be assigned (e. g. by Ebrard—because the victory over lukewarmness would be so much more difficult than that in any other case), but also from the fact of its occurring at the end of all the Epistles, and as it were gathering them all into one. It must not be forgotten too, that the ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ forms a link to the next part of the book where we so soon, ch. v. 6, read καὶ εἶδον ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου . . . . . . ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον. **22.**] See on ch. ii. 7.

From this point begins the Revelation proper, extending to the end of the book. And herein we have a first great portion, embracing chapp. iv.—xi., the opening of the seals and the sounding of the trumpets. But preparatory to both these series of revelations, we have described to us in chapp. iv. v., the heavenly scenery which furnishes the local ground for these visions. Of these, chap. iv. is properly the scene itself: chap. v. being a further unfolding of its details with a view to the vision of the seals which is to follow. So that we have,—

CH. IV. 1—11.] THE VISION OF GOD'S PRESENCE IN HEAVEN. "Decrees respecting the fortunes of the future rest with God, and from Him comes the revelation of them through Jesus Christ. Hence the Revelation begins with the imparting to the Apostle, through Christ, of the vision of God's presence." De Wette.

1.] **After these things** (μετὰ ταῦτα (or τοῦτο) is a formula frequently occurring in this book, and no where indicating a break in the ecstatic state of the Seer, but only the succession of separate visions. Those are mistaken, e. g. Bengel, Hengstb., who imagine an interval, here and in the other places, during which the Seer wrote down that which had been previously revealed to him. The whole is conceived as imparted in one continuous revelation consisting of many parts. See below on ver. 2) **I saw** (not with the bodily eye, but with the eye of ecstatic vision, as throughout the book. He is throughout ἐν πνεύματι. It is not *I looked*, as in E. V.: not the directing of the Seer's attention which discovers the door to him, but the simple reception of the vision which is recorded), **and behold, a door set open** (not, *was opened* (ἠνοίχθη) as E. V., which gives the idea that the Seer witnessed the act of opening. For the same reason the word "*opened*" is objectionable, as it may be mistaken for the aor. neuter) **in heaven** (notice the difference between this vision and that in Ezek. i. 1; Matt. iii. 16; Acts vii. 56, x. 11. In those, the heaven itself parts asunder, and discloses the vision to those below on earth: here the heaven, the house or palace of God (Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 6, xxix. 9), remains firmly shut to those on earth, but a door is opened, and the Seer is rapt in the Spirit through it. Henceforth usually he looks from the heaven down on the earth, seeing however both alike, and being present in either, as the localities of his various visions require), **and the former voice** (much confusion has been introduced here by rendering, as E. V., "*the first voice which*," &c., giving the idea that ἡ πρώτη means, *first after* the door was seen set open; whereas ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη is the voice which I heard at first, viz. in ch. i. 10) **which I heard** (aor. at the beginning) **as of a trumpet speaking with me** (viz. ch. i. 10. ὡς σάλπ. κ.τ.λ., is not predicative, "*was as* . . . ." as E. V. and Treg. The construction simply is—"behold, a door . . . . and the voice . . . ," both θύρα and φωνή dependent on ἰδού. The voice is not that of Christ (as Stier, Reden Jesu viii. 93, 207 ff.: Reden der Engel, p. 242,—and al.), but of some undefined heavenly being or angel. As Düsterd. observes, all we can say of it is that it is the *same voice* as that in ch. i. 10, which there, ver. 17, is followed by that of our Lord, not ὡς σάλπιγγος, but ὡς ὑδάτων πολλῶν, as stated

l = ch. i. 1 reff.
m ch. i. 10 reff.
n = John ii. 6. xix. 29. xxi. 9 only. Jer. xxiv. 1.
o w. acc., Luke v. 27 ||. xxi. 35. John xii. 15 al. (see note.)

δείξω σοι ἃ [l] δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα. [2] εὐθέως [m] ἐγενόμην [m] ἐν πνεύματι· καὶ ἰδοὺ θρόνος [n] ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ [o] ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον [o] καθήμενος· [3] καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ὅμοιος

APℵ B 1 to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 5. 10-3. 16 to 19. 25-7. 30. 32 to 35. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

for ἃ, οσα A.

2. rec ins και bef ευθεως, with [P] h l m n 1. 10-7-8. 34-5-6 (16. 37-8. 47 9. 51 Br, e sil) Andr Areth Bede: μετα ταυτα 19: om Aℵ[1] B rel am(with fuld harl lipss) syr-dd Primas Jer: ευθεως δε ℵ[3a]. aft 2nd και ins ο(but erased) ℵ. rec επι του θρονου, with [P] h n 1. 10-7-8. 36 (26-7. 37. 49 Br, e sil) Andr: txt Aℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

3. om και ο καθημενος (*homœotel?*) rel æth arm Andr Areth: ins A[P]ℵ B l 19. 26. 36 (13. 41-2, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Primas Jer. rec ins ην bef 1st ομοιος, with vulg

by anticipation in ver. 15), **saying** (Heb. לֵאמֹר. The gender is placed, regardless of the ordinary concord, with reference to the thing signified: so in reff., and even sometimes in the classics; cf. Xen. Cyr. i. 2. 12, αἱ πόλεις . . . ὡς παύσοντες. See more examples in Winer), **Come up hither** (viz. through the opened door), **and I will shew thee** (it is surprising how Stier can allege the δείξω as a proof that the Lord Himself only can be speaking: cf. ch. xxi. 9, 10, xxii. 8, 9, which latter place is decisive against him) **the things which must** (of prophetic necessity: see reff.) **take place after these things** (ταῦτα, the things now present: as in ch. i. 19, but the ταῦτα not being the same in the two cases. So that μετὰ ταῦτα has very much the general meaning given by the "*hereafter*" of the E. V.). **2.**] **Immediately I was** (became) **in the Spirit** (i. e. I experienced a new accession of the Spirit's powerful influence, which transported me thither: qu. d. "I was in a trance or ecstasy:" see on ch. i. 10. It is hardly credible that any scholar should have proposed to understand ἐκεῖ after ἐγενόμην, "immediately I *was there* in the Spirit:" but this was done by Züllig, and has found an advocate in England in Dr. Maitland: cf. Todd on the Apoc., Note B, p. 297): **and behold, a throne stood** (the E. V. "*was set,*" gives too much the idea that the *placing* of the throne formed part of the vision: "*lay*" would be our best word, but we do not use it of any thing so lofty as a throne. ἔκειτο is wrongly taken by Bengel as importing *breadth;* and by Hengstb. as representing the *resting* on the cherubim. But it is St. John's word for mere local position: see reff.) **in heaven, and upon the throne** (the accus. is perhaps not to be pressed; it may be loosely used as equivalent to the gen. or dat. The variations of the case in this expression throughout the book are remarkable, and hardly to be accounted for. Thus we have the gen. in ver. 10, ch. v. 1, 7 (13?), vii. 15, ix. 17, xiv. 15, 16, xvii. 1, 9, xix. 18, 19, 21: the dat. in ver. 9, ch. (v. 13?), vi. 16, vii. 10, xix. 4, xxi. 5: the accus. in ver. 4, ch. vi. 2, 4, 5, xi. 16, xiv. 14, xvii. 3, xix. 11, xx. 4, 11. The only rule that seems to be at all observed is, that always at the *first mention* of the fact of sitting, the accus. seems to be used, e. g. here, and ver. 4, ch. vi. 2, 4, 5, xiv. 14, xvii. 3, xix. 11, xx. 4 (11 seems hardly a case in point), thus bearing a trace of its proper import, that of *motion towards,* of which the *first mention* partakes. But the accus. is not confined to the first mention, witness ch. xi. 16, and no rule at all seems to prevail as regards the gen. and dat.) **one sitting** (called henceforward throughout the book, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τ. θρ.: and being the Eternal Father (not as Lyra, "Deus trinus et unus,"—so also Corn.-a-lap., Calov.; for He that sitteth on the throne is distinguished in ch. vi. 16, vii. 10 from the Son, and in ver. 5 from the Holy Spirit): see ch. vii. 10, xix. 4, where we read expressly, τῷ θεῷ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τ. θρ. So that it is not for the reasons sometimes suggested, that the Name is not expressed: e. g. that by Eich. and Ewald, on account of the Jewish unwillingness to express the sacred Name: that by Herder (see also De W. al.], that the mind has no figure and the tongue no word by which to express it: still less that of Heinr., "Nonnisi ex negligentia scribendi videtur omissum." The simple reason seems to be, as assigned by Hengstb. and Düsterd., that St. John would describe simply that which he saw, *as* he saw it. For the same reason he does not name Christ expressly in the first vision, ch. i. 13): **and he that sat** (no need to supply "*was,*" as ἦν in rec.: the nominatives are all correlative after ἰδού) **like in appearance** (lit., "*in vision,*" "*in sight,*" as E. V. in the next clause: dat. of form or manner, cf. Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 6, and see 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Phil. ii. 8, iii. 5) **to a jasper and sardine stone** (Epiphanius, in his treatise on the

[p] ὁράσει λίθῳ [q] ἰάσπιδι καὶ [r] σαρδίῳ, καὶ [s] ἶρις [t] κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου [u] ὅμοιος [p] ὁράσει [v] σμαραγδίνῳ· 4 καὶ [t] κυκλόθεν

p = here bis (ch. ix. 17. Acts ii. 17, from Joel ii. 28) only. Ezek. i. 5 al. q ch. xxi. 11, 18, 19 only. Ezek. xxviii. 13. r ch. xxi. 20 only. Ezek. xxviii. 13. s ch. x. 1 only‡. t here bis. ver. 8 only. 3 Kings xviii. 32. (-κλῳ, Isa. vi. 2. ch. v. 11.) u fem., so Luke ii. 13. 1 Tim. ii. 8. Winer, edn. 6, § 11. 1. v here only†. (-δος, ch. xxi. 19. -δίτης, Esth. i. 6 BN.)

copt: om A[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth. ins *σμαραγδω και* bef *σαρδιω* B 13. 26. 41-2-4. rec *σαρδινω*, with [P] 1. 36: txt Aℵ B rel Andr Areth. for *ιρις*, *ιρεις* ℵ-corr n æth arm: *ιερεις* Aℵ[1]. elz (for 2nd *ομοιος*) *ομοια*, with c h 10-6-7[2]. 34-5. 47 (l m 18. 37. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr: *ομοια ως* 47: *ομοιοι* n: txt AP 1. 6. 30-6; *ομοιως* ℵ[3a] B rel Areth; *ομοιως ως* 38.—om *ομοιος* to *θρονου*, v. 4, (*homœotel*) ℵ[1]. *ορασις σμαραγδινων* B rel: *ορασεις σμαραγδων* f, *ορασεις σμαραγδιων* 92: *ορασις σμαραγδω* 35: *ορασις σμαραγδου* 38. 47: *ορασει σμαραγδω* m 34: txt A[P]ℵ[3a] c h 1. 10-7-8. 36 (l n 6. 16. 49 B[r], e sil) vulg copt.

4. om 1st *και* B rel syr-dd: ins A[P]ℵ[3a] l m n 10-7-8. 34-5-6. 47-8-9 (c h 1. 6. 16 Bch's-5-

twelve stones in Aaron's breastplate says, *λίθος ἴασπις, οὗτός ἐστι τῷ εἴδει σμαραγδίζων* (see below). *παρὰ δὲ τὰ χείλη τοῦ Θερμώδοντος ποταμοῦ εὑρίσκεται . . . ἀλλ' ἔστι γένος πολὺ καλούμενον Ἀμαθούσιον, τὸ εἶδος δὲ τοιόνδε ἐστὶ τοῦ λίθου· κατὰ τὴν σμάραγδόν ἐστι χλωρίζουσα, ἀλλὰ ἀμβλυτέρα καὶ ἀμαυροτέρα. καὶ ἔνδοθεν χλωρὸν ἔχει τὸ σῶμα, ἐοικυῖα ἰῷ χαλκοῦ, ἔχουσα φλέβας τετραστίχους κ.τ.λ.* He then describes several other kinds, a purple, a yellow, &c. One kind appears to be that meant in our ch. xxi. 11, where we have the glory of God like *ὡς λίθῳ ἰάσπιδι κρυσταλλίζοντι*: for he describes it as *ἄλλη κρυστάλλου ὕδατι ὁμοία*. It is true that Epiphanius may have put in this species merely to satisfy ch. xxi. 11. From this latter passage, where it is described as *τιμιώτατος*,—which jasper, as commonly known, never was,—Ebrard argues that by *ἴασπις* the *diamond* is meant. **Ἴασπις**, Heb. יָשְׁפֵה, a beautiful stone of various wavy colours, semi-opaque, granulous in texture, used in ancient times for gems and ornaments, but in more modern ones on a larger scale for pavements and tables. Even Pliny wrote, xxxvii. (8.) 37, "viret, et sæpe translucet iaspis, etiamsi victa a multis, antiquitatis tamen gloriam retinens." The altar in Canterbury Cathedral stands on a platform of yellow Sicilian jasper pavement, 30 feet by 14 feet.

σάρδιος, Heb. אֹדֶם, is, as this name shews, a red stone, commonly supposed to answer to our cornelian. But Epiphanius, in his treatise on the twelve stones in Aaron's breastplate, says of it, *λίθος σάρδιος ὁ Βαβυλώνιος, οὕτω καλούμενος. ἔστι δὲ πυρωπὸς τῷ εἴδει καὶ αἱματοειδής, σαρδίῳ τῷ ἰχθύι τε ταριχευμένῳ ἐοικώς. διὸ καὶ σάρδιος λέγεται, ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴδους λαβὼν τὸ ἐπώνυμον. ἐν Βαβύλωνι δὲ τῇ πρὸς Ἀσσυρίαν γίνεται. ἔστι δὲ διαυγὴς ὁ λίθος.* Several of the Commentators, e. g. Victorin., Areth., Lyra, Ansbert, Joachim, &c., Bengel, Hengst., Düsterd., have said much on the symbolic significance of these stones as representing the glory of God. Thus much only seems, in the great uncertainty and variety of views, to stand firm for us: that if *ἴασπις* is to be taken as in ch. xxi. 11, as, by the reference there to *τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, it certainly seems it must, then it represents a watery crystalline brightness, whereas *σάρδιος* is on all hands acknowledged to be fiery red. Thus we shall have ample material for symbolic meaning: whether, as Victorinus, Tichon., Primas., Bede, al., of the one great judgment by water (or of baptism) and the other by fire,—as Andr., Areth., Lyra, al., of the goodness of God in nature (*ἴασπις* being green) and His severity in judgment,—as Ansbert, of the divinity and humanity ("quia nimirum humanitas ejus tempore passionis sanguine coloratur"), &c., or as the moderns mostly, e. g. Bengel, Stern, Hengstb., of the holiness of God and His justice. This last seems to me the more probable, especially as the same mixture of white light with fire seems to pervade the Old Testament and Apocalyptic visions of the divine majesty. Cf. Ezek. i. 4, viii. 2; Dan. vii. 9: and our ch. i. 14, x. 1. But nothing can be confidently asserted, in our ignorance of the precise import of *ἴασπις*), **and a rainbow** (cf. Gen. ix. 12—17; Ezek. i. 28) **round about the throne** (i. e. in all probability surrounding the throne vertically, as a nimbus; not, as Beng. and Hengstb., horizontally) **like to the appearance** (**ὅμοιος** is here an adj. with two terminations, as those in -*ιος* frequently in Attic Greek: see Winer (reff.): the construction of **ὁράσει** is not as above, but the dat. is here after *ὅμοιος*) **of an emerald** (on *σμάραγδος* (-*δινος* is the possess. adj. of two terminations) all seem agreed, that it represents the stone so well known among us as the *emerald*, of a lovely green co-

τοῦ θρόνου θρόνοι εἴκοσι τέσσαρες, καὶ ᵒ ἐπὶ τοὺς εἴκοσι τέσσαρας θρόνους πρεσβυτέρους ᵒ καθημένους, ʷ περιβεβλημένους ʷ ἐν ˣ ἱματίοις ˣ λευκοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν στεφάνους χρυσοῦς. ⁵ καὶ ʸ ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ʸ ἐκ-

w constr., ch. iii. 5 (reff.) only. (ch. vii. 9 reff.)
x ch. iii. 5, 18.
y ch. i. 16.

APℵ 1 to n 1. 2. 4. 6. 8. 10-3. 17 to 19. 26. 7. 30. 32 to 38. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Bʳ.

mss Bʳ, e sil) vulg. for θρονοι, θρονους ℵ(but τεσσαρες below) m 34-5 Andr-coisl: om 12. rec aft εικοσι ins και (twice), with (1 16. 32 Bch's-4-mss, e sil), and 33(-4-6, e sil)-8 1st time: om A[P](ℵ) B rel.—(κδ' B 1 and most of the others.)—om 2nd εικ. τεσσ. 38.—rec (for επι τ. εικ. τεσσ. θρ.) επι τους θρονους τους εικοσι τεσσαρας, with B rel: so, but omg 2nd τους, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 11. 36. 40-2 Andr-a-p: om επι τους εικοσι τεσσαρας θρονους ℵ: txt A[P] 17-8-9.—rec aft θρονους ins ειδον, with h 10 (a 37. 41-9 Bʳ, e sil): om A[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth.—[θρονους bef εικοσι τεσσαρας P:] om τ. θρον. g: om from τεσσ. to τεσσ. 32. om εν AP n Andr-a. om ιματιοις ℵ. rec ins εσχον bef επι τ. κεφ.: om A[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff. χρυσεους ℵ.

lour:—Pliny says of it, ut supra, "quin et ab intentione alia obscurata aspectu smaragdi recreatur acies, scalpentibusque gemmas non alia gratior oculorum refectio est; ita viridi lenitate lassitudinem mulcent." Almost all the Commentators think of the gracious and federal character of the bow of God, Gen. ix. 12—17. Nor is it any objection to this (as Ebrard) that the bow or glory here is green, instead of prismatic: the *form* is that of the covenant bow, the colour even more refreshing and more directly symbolizing grace and mercy. "Deus in judiciis semper fœderis sui meminit:" Grot. So far at least we may be sure of as to the symbolism of this appearance of Him that sitteth on the throne: that the brightness of His glory and fire of His judgment is ever girded by, and found within, the refreshment and surety of His mercy and goodness. So that, as Düsterd. says well, "This fundamental vision contains all that may serve for terror to the enemies, and consolation to the friends, of Him that sitteth on the throne . . ."). **4.**] *The assessors of the enthroned One.* The construction with ἰδού, partly in the nom., partly in the accus., still continues. **And round the throne twenty-four thrones** (i. e. evidently smaller thrones, and probably lower than ὁ θρόνος), **and upon the twenty-four thrones elders sitting** (the accus., either after εἶδον understood, or more likely loosely placed with the nominatives after ἰδού), **clothed in white garments, and on their heads golden crowns** (these 24 elders are not *angels*, as maintained by Rinck and Hofmann (Weiss. u. Erfüll. p. 325 f.), as is shewn (not by ch. v. 9, as generally argued,—even by Elliott, vol. i. p. 81 f.: see text there: but) by their white robes and crowns, the rewards of *endurance*, ch. iii. 5, ii. 10,—but *representatives of the Church*, as generally understood. But if so, what sort of representatives, and why 24 in number? This has been variously answered. The usual understanding has been that of our earliest Commentator, Victorinus; who says, "Sunt autem viginti quatuor, patres: duodecim Apostoli, totidem Patriarchæ." And this is in all probability right in the main: the key to the interpretation being the *analogy with* the sayings of our Lord to the Apostles, Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30. That those sayings do not regard the *same* session as this, is no argument against the inference from analogy. Joachim brings against this view that the twelve patriarchs were not personally holy men, and never are held up as distinguished in the Old Testament. But this obviously is no valid objection. It is not the personal characters, but the symbolical, that are here in question. It might be said with equal justice that the number of the actual Apostles is not definitely twelve. It is no small confirmation of the view, that in ch. xv. 3, we find the double idea of the church, as made up of Old Testament and New Testament saints, plainly revealed to St. John; for he heard the victorious saints sing *the song of Moses*, and *the song of the Lamb*. See also ch. xxi. 12, 14, where the twelve *gates* of the New Jerusalem are inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes, and its twelve *foundations* with those of the twelve Apostles. Various other interpretations have been: that of Lyra, "designantur universæ cathedrales ecclesiæ: quæ licet sint multæ, tamen sub tali numero designantur propter concordantiam novi Testamenti ad vetus, in quo legitur, 1 Paralip. xxv., quod sanctus David volens augmentare cultum divinum, statuit viginti quatuor sacerdotes templo per hebdomadas successive ministrantes, in sacra enim scriptura frequenter ponitur determinatus numerus pro indeterminato:" that of Alcas., Calov., Vitringa, Zeger, Ewald., al., who explain the

πορεύονται [za] ἀστραπαὶ καὶ [z] φωναὶ καὶ [zb] βρονταί. καὶ ἑπτὰ λαμπάδες πυρὸς [c] καιόμεναι [d] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [d] θρόνου [αὐτοῦ], αἵ εἰσιν [τὰ] [d] ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ. [6] καὶ [d] ἐνώπιον [d] τοῦ θρόνου ὡς θάλασσα [e] ὑαλίνη ὁμοία [f] κρυ-

z ch. viii. 5. xi. 19. xvi. 18. see Exod. xix. 16. Ps. lxxvi. 18. a as above (z). Matt. xxiv. 27 ‖ L. xxviii. 3. Luke x. 18. xi. 36 only. b [illegible] Rev. only (as above (z) & ch. x. 3, 4 al.), exc. Mark iii. 17. John xii. 29. c = Luke xii. 35. John v. 35. [illegible] viii. 10, Isa. lxii. 1. d ch. i. 4 (reff.). e ch. xv. 2 (bis) only †. (-λος, ch. xxi. 18, 21.) f ch. xxii. 1 only. Num. xi. 7. Ezek. i. 22. (-λίζειν, ch. xxi. 11.)

5. om και εκ 1. rec αστραπαι και βρονται και φωναι, with 1. 38: φω. κ. αστρ. κ. βρ. e: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Primas Jer Cassiod. om θρονου to 1st θρονου in ver 6 ℵ[1] (ins ℵ[3a]). rec om αυτου, with A[P]ℵ[3a] 18. 36-8 (1. 27. 40 B[r], e sil) vss Andr: ins B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth. (in B θρονου is written over αυτου.) for αἵ εισιν, ἅ εστιν A: και f: ἅ εισιν ℵ[3a] b 1. 36. om τα B rel Andr-coisl Areth: ins A[P]ℵ[3a] n 1. 33 (f 36-8, e sil) Andr.

6. rec om ως, with b 1 Andr Primas Tich: ins A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth.

number similarly by the 24 courses of priests and their heads,—the objection to which is, that these elders are not priests, their occupation in ch. v. 8 being simply connected with their representative character:—that of Grot., that the number is that of the presiding elders of the Jerusalem church (a pure assumption): that of Joachim, Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, that the number 12, that of the tribes of Israel, is doubled, to signify the accession of the Gentiles to the church: that of Primasius and Ansbert, that the doubling is "propter geminum Testamentum, quin et in veteri et in novo eadem formatur Ecclesia." Besides these, there have been many fanciful reasons, deduced from numerical considerations: as e. g. that of Arethas in Catena, that 21 is 3 × 7, the combination of the number of perfection with that of the Holy Trinity, and then 3 is added; &c. &c.). **5.] And out of the throne go forth** (the tense is changed, and the narrative assumes the direct form, which, however, is immediately dropped again, and the accumulation of details resumed) **lightnings and voices and thunders** (the imagery seems to be in analogy with that in the Old Testament, where God's presence to give His law was thus accompanied: cf. Exod. xix. 16; where ἀστραπαί and φωναί occur in juxtaposition as here. If this idea be correct, then we have here represented the sovereignty and almightiness of God. And nearly so Vitr., Hengstb., Düsterd., al. De Wette and Ebrard understand God's power over *nature*, De W. uniting it with what follows: see below. Grot. says, "Fulgura et tonitrua significant minas Dei contra impios: voces sunt in ipsis tonitrubus, infra x. 3, i. e. non generaliter tantum minatur, sed et speciales pœnas prædicit." But there seems no ground for this): **and seven lamps** (the former construction is resumed) **of fire burning before the throne [itself]** (or, **before his throne**, viz. the throne of the καθήμενος), **which are the seven spirits of God** (see notes on ch. i. 4, v. 6. These seem to represent the Holy Spirit in his sevenfold working: in his enlightening and cheering as well as his purifying and consuming agency. So most Commentators. De W. and Ebrard regard the representation as that of the Holy Spirit, the principle of physical and spiritual life, which appears only wrong by being too limited. Hengstenb. is quite beside the mark in confidently (as usual) *confining* the interpretation of the lamps of fire to the consuming power of the Spirit in judgment. The fact of the parallel ch. v. 6 speaking of ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοί, and such texts as ch. xxi. 23; Ps. cxix. 105, should have kept him from this mistake. The whole of this glorious vision is of a composite and twofold nature: comfort is mingled with terror, the fire of love with the fire of judgment): **and before the throne as it were a sea** (the ὡς belongs to θάλ. ὑαλ., not to ὑαλ. alone as Bengel: so also in the parallel place, ch. xv. 2) **of glass** (not, "*glassy*," as rendered by Elliott: ὑαλίνη describes not the appearance, but the material, of the sea: it appeared like a sea of glass—so clear, and so calm) **like to crystal** (and that not common glass, which among the ancients was as we see from its remains, cloudy and semi-opaque, but like rock crystal for transparency and beauty, as Victorinus, "aquam mundam, stabilem, non vento agitatam." Compare by way of contrast, ἡ καθημένη ἐπὶ [τῶν] ὑδάτων [τῶν] πολλῶν, the multitudinous and turbulent waters, ch. xvii. 1. In seeking the explanation of this, we must first track the image from its O. T. earlier usage. There, in Exod. xxiv. 10, we have καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἱστήκει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔργον πλίνθου σαπφείρου, καὶ ὥσπερ εἶδος στερεώμα-

στάλλῳ. καὶ [g] ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ [g] θρόνου καὶ [h] κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσαρα [i] ζῷα [k] γέμοντα [l] ὀφθαλμῶν [m] ἔμπροσθεν καὶ [m] ὄπισθεν. 7 [n] καὶ τὸ ζῷον τὸ πρῶτον ὅμοιον [o] λέοντι, καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ζῷον ὅμοιον [p] μόσχῳ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ζῷον [q] ἔχων τὸ

g ch. v. 6. h w. gen., ch. v. 11. vii. 11 only (Mark iii. 34 al.). Gen. xxxv. 5. (-λόθεν, ver. 3 reff.) i = Rev. passim. ch. v. 6 al. (elsewhere, Heb. xiii. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 12. Jude 10 only.) Ezek. i. 5. k ch. v. 8. xv. 7. xvii. 3, 4. xxi. 9. Matt. xxiii. 27 al. Amos ii. 13. l Ezek. x. 12. m Ezek. ii. 10. n Ezek. i. 10. o 2 Tim. iv. 17. Heb. xi. 33. 1 Pet. v. 8. ch. v. 5 al[4]. only. Ezek. x. 14. p Luke xv. 23, 27, 30. Heb. ix. 12, 19 only. Ezek. i. 10. q constr., ver. 1 reff.

30 ... ζῶα— APℵ 1 2 to n. 1 2. 4. 6 9. 10-3. ... to 1... 26-7 ... 32 to 42 47 to 5... 90 Br.

7. (d illeg.) rec εχον, with [P]ℵ rel: txt A B 1 n 30-2-3(-4-6 ?). om 5th το B rel Iren-gr Andr Areth: ins A[P]ℵ h n 10-7. 33-5 (1. 34-6-7-8. 48-9. 51 Br, e sil)

τος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῇ καθαριότητι. Compare with this Ezek. i. 22, *καὶ ὁμοίωμα ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν* [*αὐτοῖς* A] *τῶν ζῴων ὡσεὶ στερέωμα, ὡς ὅρασις κρυστάλλου, ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐπάνωθεν.* In Job xxxvii. 18 also, where the LXX appear to have gone quite astray, the sky is said to be "as a molten looking-glass." If we are to follow these indices, the primary reference will be to the clear ether in which the throne of God is upborne: and the intent of setting this space in front of the throne will be, to betoken its separation and insulation from the place where the Seer stood, and indeed from all else around it. The material and appearance of this pavement of the throne seem chosen to indicate majestic repose and ethereal purity. All kinds of symbolic interpretations, more or less fanciful, have been given. Such are those of Victorinus ("donum baptismi"), Tichonius, Primas., Bede, Lyra, Calov., al.,—of Joachim ("in mari vitreo sacrum designatur scripturarum volumen"),—of Alcas. (repentance), of Ribera ("ego mare vitreum dici arbitror multitudinem hominum in terra viventium"), Paræus, al.,—of Vitringa ("id, quo clare intelligimus regnum Dei in Christo Jesu niti et fundari: id vero est *a*) certa et constans Dei *voluntas*, qua constituit regnum gratiæ habere inter homines . . . . *β*) *jus* certum et liquidum ejusmodi regnum gratiæ inter homines erigendi . ."), Herder, al.,—of Bengel and Hengstb., that the sea of glass, on account of its being described as mixed with fire in ch. xv. 2, is "das Product der sieben Feuerlampen," and (Ps. xxxvi. 6, "Thy judgments are a great deep") betokens the great and wonderful works of God, His righteous and holy ways. But as Düsterd. remarks, the parallel place, ch. v. 6, where the seven lamps are seven *eyes*, precludes this:—of Aretius, Grot., and Ebrard, who, because the sea, in its stormy and agitated state, represents (ch. xvii. 15) the nations of the earth in their godless state, therefore the pure and calm sea represents (Ebr.) the creatures in their proper relation to their Creator, or (Aret.) "cœtum ecclesiæ triumphantis," or as Grot. strangely, and as De W. remarks, most unfelicitously, "summa puritas plebis Hierosolymitanæ ejus quæ Christo nomen dederat: quæ puritas describitur Act. ii. et iv." Düsterd. connects it, and in fact identifies it, with the river of the water of life, *λαμπρ. ὡς κρύσταλλον*, which, ch. xxii. 1, proceeded out of the throne of God and the Lamb. But the whole vision there is quite distinct from this, and each one has its own propriety in detail. To identify the two, is to confound them: nor does ch. xv. 2 at all justify this interpretation. There, as here, it is the purity, calmness, and majesty of God's rule which are signified by the figure). **And in the midst of the throne** (not, as Hengstb., *under* the throne: their movements are free, cf. ch. xv. 7. See below), **and round about the throne** (i. e. so that in the Apostle's view they partly hid the throne, partly overlapped the throne, being symmetrically arranged with regard to it, i. e. as the number necessitates, one in the midst of each side), **four living-beings** (the E. V., "*beasts*," is the most unfortunate word that could be imagined. A far better one is that now generally adopted, "*living creatures:*" the only objection to it being that when we come to vv. 9, 11, we give the idea, in conjoining "*living-creatures*" and "*created*" (*ἔκτισας*), of a close relation which is not found in the Greek. I have therefore preferred *living-beings*) **full of eyes before and behind** (this, from their respective positions, could be seen by St. John: their faces being naturally towards the throne. On the symbolism, see below). **And the first living-being like to a lion, and the second living-being like to a steer** (*μόσχος* is not necessarily to be pressed to its proper primary meaning, as indicating the young calf in distinction from the grown bullock: the LXX use it for an ox generally, in Exod. xxii. 1; Levit. xxii. 23: also Exod. xxix. 10, and Gen. xii. 16), **and the third living-being having its face as of a man**

πρόσωπον [ὡς] ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ζῶον ὅμοιον [r] ἀετῷ [s] πετομένῳ. [8] καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα [t] ἓν καθ' ἓν αὐτῶν [q] ἔχων [v] ἀνὰ [w] πτέρυγας ἕξ. [x] κυκλόθεν καὶ [y] ἔσωθεν [ky] γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ [za] ἀνάπαυσιν οὐκ [z] ἔχουσιν [zb] ἡμέρας καὶ [zb] νυκτὸς [q] λέγοντες [c] Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς

r Matt. xxiv. 28. Luke xvii. 37. ch. viii. 13. xii. 14 only. Ezek. ll. cc.
s so also (-ομεν-), ch. viii. 13. xiv. 6. xix. 17. Job ix. 26. πετ., as above & ch. xii. 14 only.
t Mark xiv. 19. [John viii. 9.] see Rom. xii. 5. 3 Macc. v. 34.
v = Matt. xx. 9. John ii. 6 al.
w Matt. xxiii. 37. Luke xiii. 34. ch. ix. 9. xii. 14 only. Isa. vi. 2, 3.
x vv. 3, 4 reff.
y Matt. xxiii. 25, 27.
z ch. xiv. 11 (but see note).
a as above (z). Matt. xi. 29. xii. 43. Luke xi. 24 only. Isa. xxv. 10.
b Mark v. 5. Luke xviii. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 9. iii. 10. ch. vii. 15. xii. 10. xiv. 11. xx. 10. Isa. xxxiv. 10.
c Isa. vi. 3.

Andr-a.—(om from 3rd ζωον up to ομοιον 9. 27.) rec ως ανθρωπος, with [P] h l n 1. 10-7. 38 (16. 37-9. 48-9 Br, e sil) Andr-a: ως ομοιον ανθρωπω ℵ: ανθρωπου B rel Iren-gr Andr Areth: ως ανθρωπου A 36 vulg Iren-int Primas Vict. om last ζωον B rel Andr-coisl Areth: ins A[P]ℵ h l n 36 (1. 2. 13-6-7-8. 37-8-9. 40-9 Br, e sil). rec πετωμενω, with rel Iren-gr: txt A[P]ℵ B a b e f h j k m 2. 4. 9. 10-3-7-8-9. 33(-4-5, e sil) (38?). 47-8-9. 50-1. 90 Andr Areth.

8. rec om τα, with B rel Andr Areth: ins A[P]ℵ a c e f g h l m n 6. 10-1-6-7-8. 30-4-6. 49. 51. 90 Andr-coisl. rec (for ἓν καθ' ἓν αυτων) ἓν καθ' εαυτο, with 1: εν εκαστον αυτων ℵ 38: εν (alone) 40-1-2. 92: εν καθ' εν (omg αυτων) B rel Areth: txt A[P] h l m n 2. 10-1-6-7. 34-5-6-7-9. 49. 51 Br vss Andr Tich (d illeg). rec (for εχων) ειχον, with ℵ (d?) 6(e sil): om c Br: εχει n: εχοντα [P] 38. 50: εσχον 9: εχον B rel Andr-a-p: txt A a k l m 1. 13-6. 30-2-6-9. 92. πτερυγων B. om και εσωθεν (homœotel) k n 38: for εσωθεν, εξωθεν 33 (35 Br, e sil): εξωθ. κ. εσ. f: και εξ. κ. εσ. B 12 Primas Victorin. rec (for γεμουσιν) γεμοντᾰ, with 1. 38(-9?): txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth. for εχουσιν, εξοσαν ℵ[1](txt ℵ[3a]). rec λεγοντα, with 10. 30(-8?) 49[2] (a d e h 37-9. 40-1 Br, e sil): txt A[P]ℵ B rel. αγιος is repeated nine times in B rel Andr-coisl: eight times in ℵ[1] e: six times in 38. 40 Br: twice in 51: txt A[P]ℵ[3a] 1. 16. 36 (b c d f g l n 13. 26. 37-9. 47. 90, e sil) vss Ephr Andr Areth Tert Vict Jer. om 1st ο ℵ[1].

(or, **the face of a man**), **and the fourth living-being like to a flying eagle. And the four living-beings, each** (reff.) **of them having** (ἔχων, the gender being conformed to that of the thing signified, see on φωνὴ . . λέγων, ver. 1) **six wings apiece** (for the distributive ἀνά, see reff.). **All round and within** (I prefer much putting a period at ἕξ, to carrying on the construction; as more in accord with the general style of this description. Understand, after both κυκλόθεν, and ἔσωθεν,—τῶν πτερύγων: the object of St. John being to shew, that the six wings in each case did not interfere with that which he had before declared, viz. that they were *full of eyes before and behind*. Round the outside of each wing, and up the inside of each (half-expanded) wing, and of the part of the body also which was in that inside recess) **they are full of eyes: and they have no rest by day and by night** (ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός may belong either to ἀνάπ. οὐκ ἔχ., or to λέγοντες. Partly on account of the καί, partly as a matter of the mere judgment of the ear, I prefer joining it with the latter) **saying** (the gender, see as above), **Holy Holy Holy Lord God Almighty** (so far is identical with the seraphim's ascription of praise in Isa. vi. 3: παντοκράτωρ answering usually in the LXX to צְבָאוֹת, though not in that place. See Bengel's remarks in note on Rom. ix. 29), **which was, and which is, and which is to come** (see on reff.). These four living-beings are in the main identical with the cherubim of the O. T. (compare Ezek. i. 5—10, x. 20), which are called by the same name of living creatures (חַיּוֹת), and are similarly described. We may trace however some differences. In Ezekiel's vision, each living-being has all four faces, Ez. i. 6, whereas here the four belong severally, one to each. Again in Ezekiel's vision, it is apparently the *wheels* which are full of eyes, Ez. i. 18; though in id. x. 12, it would appear as if the animals also were included. Again, the having *six* wings apiece is not found in the cherubim of Ezekiel, which have *four*, Ez. i. 6,—but belongs to the seraphim described in Isa. vi. 2, to whom also (see above) belongs the ascription of praise here given. So that these are forms compounded out of the most significant particulars of more than one O. T. vision.

In enquiring after their symbolic import, we are met by the most remarkable diversity of interpretation. 1) Our earliest Commentator, Victorinus, may serve as the type of those who have understood them to symbolize the Four Evan-

d ch. i. 8 (reff.). ὁ [d] παντοκράτωρ, [d] ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. [9] καὶ

APR I I to n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 7. 10–12. 16 to 19. 26–7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B'.

gelists, or rather, *Gospels*:—"Simile leoni animal, Evangelium secundum Marcum, in quo vox leonis in eremo rugientis auditur, vox clamantis in deserto, Parate viam Domini. Hominis autem figura Matthæus enititur enunciare nobis genus Mariæ unde carnem accepit Christus. Ergo dum enumerat ab Abraham usque ad David et usque ad Joseph, tanquam de homine locutus est. Ideo prædicatio ejus hominis effigiem ostendit. Lucas sacerdotium Zachariæ offerentis hostiam pro populo, et apparentem sibi angelum dum enarrat, propter sacerdotium, et hostiæ conscriptionem, vituli imaginationem tenet. Joannes Evangelista aquilæ similis, assumptis pennis ad altiora festinans, de verbo Dei disputat." I have cited this comment at length, to shew on what fanciful and untenable ground it rests. For with perhaps the one exception of the last of the four, not one of the Evangelists has any inner or substantial accordance with the character thus assigned. Consequently these characteristics are found varied, and that in the earliest writer in whom the view can be traced, viz. Irenæus, who (iii. 11. 8, p. 190) makes the lion to be the gospel of St. John, which *τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡγεμονικὴν αὐτοῦ . . . . καὶ ἔνδοξον γενεὰν διηγεῖται*: the steer that of St. Luke, as above: the man, that of St. Matthew: the eagle, that of St. Mark, who *ἀπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐξ ὕψους ἐπιόντος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο*. So also Andreas in Catena. But again Augustine, de cons. evv. i. 6, vol. iii. p. 1046, attributes the lion to St. Matthew, the man to St. Mark, the steer to St. Luke, and the eagle to St. John. These notices may again serve to shew with what uncertainty the whole view is beset. It has nevertheless been adopted by Jerome (Prolog. ad ev. Matth., vol. vii. p. 5, 6), Primas., Bede, and many others of old, and among the moderns by Williams (on the Study of the Gospels, pp. 1—92), Scott (Interpretation of the Apocalypse, p. 132, but making, as Aug. above, the lion = St. Matthew, the man = St. Mark, the ox = St. Luke, and the eagle = St. John), Wordsworth (Lectures on the Apoc. p. 116, see also his note here, who, as in his statements on the other details, so here, ascribes unanimity (but see below) to the ancients: "in them *the ancient church* beheld a figure of the four gospels"), &c. The principal of the other interpretations have been: 2) the 4 elements; so some mentioned in the Catena; 3) the 4 cardinal virtues: so Arethas, as cited by Corn.-a-lap., and generally: but not in the Catena: 4) the 4 faculties and powers of the human soul; "homo est vis rationalis, leo irascibilis, bos concupiscibilis, aquila est conscientia, sive spiritus;"—so Corn.-a-lap. refers to Sixtus Senensis as citing Greg. Naz. from Orig. Hom. 1 on Ezekiel, vol. iii. p. 361 f.: 5) Our Lord in the fourfold great events of Redemption: so a conjecture in the Catena (*Ἴσως δὲ καὶ διὰ τούτων ἡ οἰκονομία χριστοῦ δηλοῦται· διὰ τοῦ λέοντος, ὡς βασιλεύς· διὰ δὲ τοῦ μόσχου, ὡς ἱερεύς, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἱερεῖον· διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὡς δι' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρωπθείς· διὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ, ὡς χορηγὸς τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας καταπτάντος*), Aretius, Ansbert (inter alia: for he tries to combine all possible interpretations which can relate to Christ and the Church); 6) the 4 patriarchal-churches: so Lyra, explaining the *lion* = Jerusalem, "propter constantiam ibi existentium," citing Acts v. 29: the *ox* = Antioch, "quia fuit parata obedire mandatis Apostolorum in Judæa existentium, et quia (?) primo in ea vocati sunt discipuli Christiani:" the *man* = Alexandria, "nam in ea a principio fuerunt doctores docti non solum in literis divinis sed etiam humanis:" the eagle = Constantinople, "nam in ea fuerunt viri per contemplationem elevati, ut Gregorius Naz. et plures alii." This is referred to by Corn.-a-lap., who ends characteristically, "Hæ quatuor sunt in circuitu throni Dei, id est, Cathedræ Romanæ, in qua sedet vicarius Dei:" 7) the 4 great Apostles, Peter, "fervens animo et in hoc *leoni* similis:" James the Lord's brother, because "*bos* patientiam significat:" Matthew, "bonitate *homo* antecedit animantia cætera. Puto designari Matthæum qui diu dicitur mansisse in Judæa" (?): Paul, because the *eagle* "celeritatem ministerii significat, quod certe Paulo proprium qui sæpius Hierosolymis fuit. Et bene *πετομένῳ*, quia semper erat in cursu:" so Grotius: 8) all the doctors of the church: so Vitringa, al.: 9) "in quatuor animalibus istis quatuor speciales ordines designati sunt, quorum primus pastorum est, secundus diaconorum, tertius doctorum, quartus contemplantium," Joachim: 10) the 4 representatives of the N. T. church, as the four standards of the tribes Reuben, Judah, Ephraim, and Dan, which are traditionally thus reported (see also Num. ii.), were of the O. T. church. So Mede and many others: 11) the 4 virtues of the Apostles, "magnanimitas, beneficentia, æquitas sapientia,"—Alcasar (in De W.):

ὅταν δώσουσιν τὰ ζῶα [e] δόξαν καὶ [f] τιμὴν καὶ [g] εὐχαριστίαν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ τῷ [h] ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν

e = Jude 25 reff. f = 1 Tim. i. 17. vi. 16. ch. v. 12, 13. vii. 12. Ps. xxviii 1. Theod. vi. 26. see ch. i. 18. g 1 Thess. iii. 9. ch. vii. 12 al.† Wisd. xvi. 28. h Dan. iv. 31 (34)

9. δωσωσιν ℵ B f l 12-6. 32-corr 39: δωσι rel, δωσει 13. 27. 40: txt A[P] 1. 18. 32[1]-3(-4, e sil)-6-8 Andr. om δοξαν ℵ[1]. ευχαριστειας A: txt [P]ℵ B rel. rec του θρονου, with B rel: txt A[P]ℵ.

12) the 4 principal angels, Corn.-a-lap., Laun., al.: 13) the angelic, or is-angelic, state of the glorified church: so Elliott, vol. i. p. 87. But thus we have no account given of the peculiar symbolism of these living-beings, nor of the part which they perform in the act of praise below. There are many other interpretations and ramifications of interpretation, hardly worth recounting. But the one which above all these seems to me to require our notice is that which is indicated in the rabbinical sentence cited by Schöttgen here: "Quatuor sunt qui principatum in hoc mundo tenent. Inter creaturas homo, inter aves aquila, inter pecora bos, inter bestias leo." The four cherubic forms are the representatives of animated nature—of God's sentient creation. In Ezekiel, each form is compounded of the four. Here, the four forms are distinct. There (xxviii. 12), where the prince of Tyrus is compared to one of them, it is called the impression of similitude, and the crown of beauty: in Isaiah vi., where the seraphim, which enter into the composition of these living beings, ascribe holiness to Jehovah, they cry, "His glory is the fulness of the whole earth." With this view, every thing that follows is in accordance. For when these, and the 24 elders, in vv. 9—11, fall down before the throne, the part which these living-beings bear in the great chorus of praise is sufficiently indicated by the reason which is given for their ἄξιος εἶ, viz. ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν. The objection brought against this view by Ebrard, viz. that Behemoth, the king of the waters, is not here represented, is mere trifling. He forgets that in the record of creation, the noblest of the creatures sprung from the waters are not fishes, but birds; and that the eagle represents both. It is in strict accordance also with this view, that these living-beings are full of eyes, ever wakeful, ever declaring the glory of God: that they have each six wings, which doubtless are to be taken as in Isa. vi. from which the figure comes—"with twain he covered his face (*reverence*, in not venturing to look on the divine majesty), and with twain he covered his feet (*humility*, hiding his own created form from the glory of the Creator), and with twain he did fly (*obedience*, readiness to perform the divine commands). This view is taken by the best of the modern Commentators: by Herder, De Wette, Rinck, Hengstb., Düsterd. Ebrard differs only in this, that he regards them as symbolic not of creation itself, but of the creative power of God. Stern, whose commentary on this whole passage is very able and beautiful, inclines rather to take them as representing the power of divine grace within the church of God: but in his usual interpretation (see in p. 209, on ὅταν δώσουσιν, κ.τ.λ.) treats them as "alles creaturliche Leben der Natur." See also my Hulsean Lectures for 1841, vol. i. Lecture ii. We have thus the throne of God surrounded by His Church and His animated world: the former represented by the 24 elders, the latter by the four living-beings. 9—11.] *The everlasting song of praise of creation, in which the church joins.* It is well observed by Düsterd., that the ground of this ascription of praise is not *redemption*, which first comes in ch. v. 9 ff.,—but the power and glory of God as manifested in Creation; so that the words of the elders are in beautiful harmony with the praise of the four living-beings, and with the signification of the whole vision. **And whensoever the living-beings shall give** (the future δώσουσι must not be pressed quite so strongly as is done by De Wette (so also Stern), "from henceforth for all the time to come: see ch. vii. 15 ff.: beforetime it was not so, seeing that the 24 elders have only assumed their place since Christ's work of Redemption has been proceeding and His victory developing." Still, it is more than a mere frequentative put for the regular subjunctive, as Düsterd., after Vitr., Beng., Hengstb., and Ebr. It has a distinct pointing onward towards the future, implying eternal repetition of the act, which the subjunctive would not carry) **glory and honour** (i. e., recognition of His glory and honour) **and thanksgiving** (i. e. actual giving of thanks: the 3 accusatives are not strictly co-ordinate in meaning) **to Him that**

αἰώνων, 10 [i] πεσοῦνται οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι [i] ἐνώπιον τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ [h] ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ βαλοῦσιν τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν [k] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [k] θρόνου λέγοντες 11 [l] Ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, λαβεῖν τὴν [e] δόξαν καὶ τὴν [f] τιμὴν καὶ τὴν [m] δύναμιν, ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας [n] τὰ πάντα, καὶ [o] διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου [p] ἦσαν καὶ [p] ἐκτίσθησαν.

i ch. v. 8. vii. 11 only. 1 Kings xxv. 23. (see ch. xix. 10. xxii. 8.)
k ch. i. 4 reff.
l ch. v. 12. constr. ch. v. 2, 4 reff.
m = Rev. only. ch. v. 12. vii. 12. (xii. 10.) xix. 1. (exc. Matt. vi. 13 rec.) 1 Chron. xxix. 11.
n — Rom xi. 36. Col. i. 16 al. Job viii 3.
o = John vi 57.
p plur., ch. i. 19 reff.

APℵ B1 to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 34-7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

(homœotel αιωνων this ver and next a 32.) at end add αμην g 32: αμην. και ℵ.

10. rec aft εικοσι ins και, with 33 (4. 9. 16-7-8-9. 30-4-6 Bch's-5-mss 90, e sil): om A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth.—(κδ' B g h k l n 1. 10. 49. 50. 92.) Steph προσκυνουσι: txt A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. aft αιωνων ins αμην ℵ. Steph βαλλουσι, with ℵ[1] B m n 1. 17. 30-2-6. 49[1] Andr-a: txt A[P]ℵ-corr rel vss Andr Areth. for λεγοντες, εντες (sic) ℵ[1].

11. rec (for ο κς κ. ο θς ημ.) κυριε, with 1: κυριε ο θεος ημων [P] l n 16. 36-8-9. 47: κε ο κς και θς ημων ℵ c: txt A B rel am syr-dd Andr-p-coisl Areth Thdor-stud. (om και vss.) aft ημων ins ο αγιος B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Thdor-stud: αγιος (only) 13. 92: ουρανιος k: om A[P]ℵ l n (1, e sil) 16. 36-8-9. 47 vulg copt. om 2nd την ℵ: om και την 50. om 3rd την A: om και την k[2]. om τα B rel Andr Areth: ins A[P]ℵ n 10-7. 30[2]-6-8 (h 2. 37-9. 40-1-2-9 Br, e sil). δια θεληματι σου A. rec (for ησαν) εισι, with [P] l m 1. 10-3-7(*sic?*) 34-5 (h 37-9. 47-9 Br, e sil): ουκ ησαν B(Tischdf not Mai) f 38. 51: om ησαν και 36: txt Aℵ rel (and 92) vulg syr-dd copt Areth Tich Primas. om και εκτισθησαν (*homœotel?*) A: ins [P]ℵ B rel.

sitteth upon the throne, to Him that liveth to the ages of the ages, the twenty-four elders shall fall down before Him that sitteth upon the throne, and shall worship Him that liveth to the ages of the ages (cf. ch. v. 8, xix. 4), **and shall cast down their crowns** (to disclaim all honour and dignity of their own, and acknowledge that all belongs to Him. See instances of casting down crowns cited in Wetstein. Cf. especially Tacit. Ann. xv. 29: "ad quam (effigiem Neronis) progressus Tiridates . . sublatum capiti diadema imagini subjecit") **before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord and our** (Düsterd. remarks that the ἡμῶν has a force here peculiarly belonging to the 24 elders, as representing the redeemed, and thus standing in a covenant relation to God nearer than that of the 4 living-beings. But we must not forget, that Creation is only a part of Redemption, Col. i. 20) **God, to receive the glory** (τὴν δ. &c., as alluding to the δόξα &c., ver. 9, ascribed by the living-beings. The articles are improperly omitted in E. V.) **and the honour and the might** (observe that τὴν δύναμιν in the mouth of the 24 elders represents εὐχαριστίαν in that of the 4 living-beings. The elders, though themselves belonging to creation, in this ascription of praise look on creation from without, and that thanksgiving, which creation renders for its being, becomes in their view a tribute to Him who *called them into being*, and thus a testimony to His creative power. And thus the reason follows): **because Thou didst create all things** (τὰ πάντα, "this universal whole," the universe), **and on account of Thy will** (i. e. because Thou didst will it: "propter voluntatem tuam," as Vulg.: not durch Deinen Willen, as Luther, which represents διά with a gen. "*For thy pleasure*," of the E. V., introduces an element entirely strange to the context, and however true in fact, most inappropriate here, where the ὅτι renders a reason for the ἀξιότης of ἡ δόξα, ἡ τιμή, and ἡ δύναμις) **they were** (ἦσαν, not = *ἐγενήθησαν, came into being*, as De W., al.: for this it cannot signify: nor again, though thus the requirement of ἦσαν would be satisfied, as Lyra, "in dispositione tua ab æterno, antequam crearentur:" nor, as Grot., "*erant* jam homines quia tu volueras, et conditi sunt, id est, *iterum conditi*, per Christum:" nor again as Bengel, "all things *were, from* the creation down to the time of this ascription of praise and henceforward." The best explanation is that of Düsterd., *they existed*, as in contrast to their previous non-existence: whereby not their

V. [1] Καὶ εἶδον [q] ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσωθεν καὶ [r] ὄπισθεν [s] κατ-

q = ch. xx. 1. 2 Cor. iii. 15. see ch. iii. 20 reff. & note.
r see note. Ezek. ii. 9, 10.
s here only. Job ix. 7. xxxvii. 7. Wisd. ii. 5 only. = σφραγίζω, Deut. xxxii. 34. Isa. xxix. 11. (viii. 16.)

Chap. V. 1. om βιβλιον γεγραμμενον ℵ[1] (ins ℵ[3a]). for οπισθεν, εξωθεν [P] B rel Orig-ed Andr Areth Œc: *foris* vulg lat-ff: txt A f 51 Orig-ms Epiph, *retro* Cypr.—εξ. κ. εσ. 18: εμπροσθεν και οπισθεν ℵ Orig$_2$. ins και bef κατεσφρ. ℵ[3a]: και εσφραγ. 82.

coming into being, but the simple fact of their being, is asserted. The remarkable reading οὐκ ἦσαν is worth notice: "by reason of Thy will they were not, and were created:" i.e. "they were created out of nothing." But besides the preponderance of authority the other way, there is the double chance, that οὐκ may have arisen from the preceding ου, and that it may have been an escape from the difficulty of ἦσαν) and were created (they both had their being,—ἦσαν; and received it from Thee by a definite act of Thine,—ἐκτίσθησαν).

Ch. V. 1—14.] *The book with seven seals,* containing ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα, which the Seer was to be shewn, ch. iv. 1. *None found worthy to open it but the Lamb, who takes it for this purpose, amidst the praises of the heavenly host, of the church, and of the creation of God.*

1.] *The sealed book.* **And I saw** (notice, that from the general vision, in the last chapter, of the heavenly Presence of God, the scene is so far only changed that, all that remaining as described, a particular incident is now seen for the first time, and is introduced by καὶ εἶδον) (lying) **on the right hand** (i.e. the right hand was open, and the book lay on the open hand. So in ch. xx. 1, where see note. The common rendering, *in* the right hand, misses the ἐπί with the accus. Beza's and Ebrard's rendering, "on the right side of Him on the throne," is shewn to be wrong by what follows ver. 7, where the Lamb takes the book ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τ. θρ.: see there. The lying on the open hand imports, that *on God's part* there was no withholding of His future purposes as contained in this book. The only obstacle to unsealing it was as follows, ver. 3) **of Him that sat upon the throne a book** (i. e. "a roll of a book," as in Ezek. ii. 9 f. This explanation alone will suit the meaning of the word as applied to the contemporary practice regarding sacred writings. See also Jer. xxxvi. 2, 23; Zech. v. 2: and below) **written within and behind** (such scrolls, written not only, as commonly, on the inner side, but also on the outer, which, to one reading the inner, was *behind* (see below), are mentioned by Pliny, Epist. iii. 5, who says of his uncle Pliny the elder, "tot ista volumina peregit, electorumque commentarios CLX mihi reliquit, *opistographos* quidem et minutissime scriptos, qua ratione multiplicatur hic numerus:" by Lucian, Vitarum auctio, i. p. 549, ἡ πήρα δέ σοι θερμῶν ἔσται μεστή, καὶ ὀπισθογράφων βιβλίων: by Juvenal, Sat. i. 6, "summi plena jam margine libri Scriptus et *in tergo nondum finitus* Orestes:" by Martial, viii. 22, "Scribit in *aversa* Picens epigrammata *charta*." This writing within and without, so that the whole roll was full, betokens the *completeness* of the contents as containing the divine counsels: there was no room for addition to that which was therein written. This would be of itself a sufficient reason for the *fulness* of the scroll. To see, as Elliott, i. p. 99; iii. p. 4, two *divisions of written matter* indicated, by the writing within, and by that on the back, correspondent to one another, seems hardly warranted by the text), **fast-sealed with seven seals** (not, consisting of seven writings, each sealed with one seal, as Grot. (who joins καὶ ὀπισθ. with κατεσφραγισμ.), Vitringa, Wetst., Storr, Ewald, al.: but one book, fastened with seven seals, which were visible to the Apostle. Various ingenious methods have been imagined, by which the opening of each of these seals may have loosened a corresponding portion of the roll: see e.g. the apocalyptic chart in Elliott, vol. i. p. 111, and its explanation, ib. note 2, p. 98. But they all proceed on the assumption that the roll in the vision was *unfolded*, which is no where to be gathered from the text. Nor have we any right to say that the separate visions which follow the opening of each seal are identical with *separate portions* of writing on the roll. These visions are merely symbolic representations of the progress of God's manifestation of the purpose of His will; but no portion of the roll is actually unfolded, nor is any thing read out of the book. Not its contents, but the gradual steps of access to it, are represented by these visions. What is *in* that book, shall not be known, until, in full completion, γνωρισθῇ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυ-

εσφραγισμένον [t] σφραγῖσιν ἑπτά. [2] καὶ εἶδον [u] ἄγγελον

t Rev. (v.—ix. passim) only, exc. Rom. iv. 11. 1 Cor. ix. 2. 2 Tim. ii. 19. Hagg. ii. 24. u so ch. x. 1. xviii. 21.

A P[illegible] B 1 to n. 1. 2 4. 6 5. 10-3 16 to 19. 3- 7. 30 12 to 42 47 to 51. 90 Br.

ποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, Eph. iii. 10: till those material events, which marked the gradual opening of the sum of God's purposes, are all past, and the roll is contemplated in its completeness by the spirits of the glorified hereafter. This *completeness* is here set forth to us again by the mystic number *seven*. See some excellent remarks on the entire distinctness of the *opening of the seals*, and the *reading of the book*, in Corn.-a-lap., p. 77 c:—"nihil enim in libro legi poterat, nisi post resignationem omnium septem sigillorum: omnibus enim reseratis, tunc demum aperiri et legi potuit liber, non ante." So also Ribera, p. 197: "calamitates illæ quæ sigillis continebantur, prius omnes pene venturæ erant, quam ea quæ in libro scripta erant, apparerent et cognoscerentur." Mr. Elliott, in his work "Apocalypsis Alfordiana," specially directed against my commentary on this book, treats this view with all the scorn which is unfortunately so characteristic of him, calling it absurd, unscriptural, &c. He has not produced a word of proof, or even illustrative corroboration, of his own view, that the opening of each seal corresponds to the unrolling of a certain portion of the scroll: but has contented himself with re-asserting it in the strongest language, and pouring contempt on those who hold the other view. I grieve to say, that this is so often the case throughout his above-mentioned work, as to render it generally impossible for me to meet his objections in argument. One who distrusts his own as well as all other explanations, and believes that much of this mysterious book is as yet unfathomed, is no match for one who hesitates not on every occasion to shew his confidence that he is in the right, and all who differ from him are wrong. An enquiry here arises, *What is represented by this Book?* Opinions have been very various. 1) Some of our earliest Commentators understood by it the Old Testament: or the Old and New conjoined. So, apparently, Orig. (in Ezech., Hom. xiv., vol. iii. p. 405: where after quoting our vv. 2—5, he says, "quamdiu non venit Deus meus, clausa erat lex, clausus sermo propheticus, velata lectio veteris testamenti." But again, he says, ἡ γὰρ πᾶσα γραφή ἐστιν ἡ δηλουμένη διὰ τῆς βίβλου: so that he can hardly be safely quoted for this view), Euseb. (Demonstr. Ev. viii. 2, vol. iv. p. 386,—ποίας δὲ σφραγῖδας, ἢ τῶν προφητῶν τὰς ἀσαφείας:), Epiphanius (Hær. li. 32, vol. i. p. 454. ὅσα γὰρ ἦν νόμῳ καὶ ἐν προφήταις σκοτεινὰ καὶ αἰνιγματώδη, ταῦτα ὁ κύριος ᾠκονόμησε διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰς ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἀποκαλύψαι), Hippolytus (in Dan. frag. xix., Migne, Patrol. vol. x. p. 653 f., ὅτι δὲ τὰ παλαιὰ διὰ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν λελαλημένα πάντα ἦν ἐσφραγισμένα κ. ἄγνωστα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑπάρχοντα Ἡσαΐας λέγει (xxix. 11) .... τὰ μὲν οὖν πάλαι ἐσφραγισμένα νῦν διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου πάντα τοῖς ἁγίοις ἠνέῳγεν. αὐτὸς γάρ ἦν ἡ τελεία σφραγὶς καὶ κλεῖς ἡ ἐκκλησία, ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείει, κ.τ.λ., ὡς Ἰωάννης λέγει. καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτός φησι καὶ εἶδον, κ.τ.λ. our vv. 1, 2 and 6, 9), Andreas (βίβλος δὲ καὶ ἡ προφητεία νοεῖται);—Victorinus ("in dextera autem sedentis super tribunal liber scriptus intus et foris, signatus sigillis septem, vetus testamentum significat, quod est datum in manibus Dei nostri"), Primasius, Bede ("hæc visio mysteria nobis Sanctæ Scripturæ per incarnationem Domini patefacta demonstrat. Cujus unitas concors vetus testamentum quasi exterius, et novum continet interius:" and so Augustine), Tichonius (similarly to Bede), Hilary (Prol. to Comm. on Psalms, vol. i. p. 6, "Liber iste, et præterita et futura in his quæ intus et foris scripta erant continens, a nemine dignus est aperiri, &c. .... Sed vicit leo ex tribu Judæ, &c.: quia solus septem illa .... signacula quibus liber clausus est, per sacramentum corporationis suæ et divinitatis absolvit. Id ipsum autem Dominus post resurrectionem testatus est, dicens Quoniam oportet omnia impleri quæ scripta sunt in lege Moysis et in prophetis, et in psalmis de me." But see more on Hilary under 2), below), Ambrose (Comm. in Psal. cxviii. 64, § viii. 64, vol. i. (ii. Migne), p. 1078, "legisti in Apocalypsi quod Agnus librum signatum aperuit, quem nullus ante aperire poterat. Quia solus Dominus Jesus in evangelio suo prophetarum ænigmata et legis mysteria revelavit: solus scientiæ clavem detulit, et dedit aperire nobis"), Jerome (Comm. on Is. xxix. 9—12, vol. iv. p. 393: "Leo autem de tribu Juda Dominus Jesus Christus est, qui solvit signacula libri, non proprie unius, ut multi putant, Psalmorum David, sed omnium Scripturarum, quæ uno scriptæ sunt Spiritu sancto, et propterea unus liber appellantur"), al.: and so Joachim, Gregory the Great, Haymo, Ansbert (as Bede above), the glossa ordinaria (the same), Aquinas, al. I have given several of the above testimonies at length, as helping us to estimate this view. For it

[v] ἰσχυρὸν κηρύσσοντα [v] ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Τίς [w] ἄξιος ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ [x] λῦσαι τὰς σφραγῖδας αὐτοῦ; [3] καὶ οὐδεὶς

v so ch. xiv. 7, 9, 15.
w = ver. 9. John i. 27. constr., Luke xv. 21. Acts xiii. 25. ch. iv. 11.
x John i. 27. Acts xxvii. 41. Gen. xlii. 27.

2. κηρυσσοντα bef ισχυρον ℵ. rec om εν, with [P] h m n 1. 17. 36-8 (27. 37. 49 Br, e sil) Orig-ed Epiph Andr-a: ins Aℵ B rel Orig-mss Andr Areth. rec ins εστιν bef αξιος, with 1 (19, e sil) vulg Primas; aft αξιος B rel Andr Areth: om A[P]ℵ h frag-n_2 4. 10-2-7. 36-7-8. 49 Br, Orig Epiph. (frag-n_2 = a few verses written a 2nd time on p. 18 of cod. n.)

will appear from them, that the opening of the seals was very generally by these fathers and interpreters taken to mean, the fulfilment, and consequent bringing to light, of O. T. prophecy by the events of Redemption as accomplished in the Person of our Lord. But, if so, then this view cannot consist with what follows in the Apocalypse. For manifestly the opening of the seals, as notified by the symbolic visions belonging to each, does not relate to things past, but to things which were yet future when this book was written. Nor can this apparent consensus of the early expositors be cited, as it has been e. g. by Dr. Adams ("Sealed Book, &c." pp. 82 ff.), in support of any *other* view than theirs, in which this Book shall still represent the O. T. Such for example is that of Dr. Adams himself, who regards the opening of the sealed book as symbolizing a future republication of the genuine text of the O. T., by which the Jewish people is to be converted. The untenableness of this view appears at once, if only from (so to speak) its touching the apocalyptic course of visions at this point only, and finding no justification or expansion in any of the symbolic visions accompanying the opening of the seals. 2) Some have held the Book to be *Christ Himself:* so Hilary ((?) as cited by Corn.-a-lap. from the Prologue to the Psalms, "Liber, ait, hic est Christus, quia Christus est hujus libri materia et argumentum:" and, "sigilla septem, ait Hilarius, sunt septem præcipua Christi mysteria, &c." But the words are not found in that prologue), Heterius (Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. xcvi. pp. 963 ff.), Paschasius (Præfatio in Matth. p. 11). But for the same reasons as above, neither can this be held. 3) Wetstein takes it to be "libellus repudii a Deo scriptus nationi Judaicæ:" which for the same reason falls to the ground. 4) Schöttgen, "sententiam a Judice et patribus ejus conscriptis in hostes ecclesiæ conceptam:" and similarly in the main, Hengstenberg: but this view, though strongly defended by Hengstb., is not borne out by the contents of these chapters. 5) Alcasar holds it to be that part of the Apocalypse which treats of the opening of the seven seals (ch. vi.—xi.): and nearly so Hengstb. also, except that he allows only from vi. 1 to viii. 1 for this portion. But both are obviously wrong, seeing that the opening of the seventh seal evolves a series of symbolic actions which only ends with the book itself. So that this comes to 6) the Book being = the Apocalypse itself: so Corn.-a-lap., seeing in the seven seals that part relating to their opening, and after that regarding the subsequent visions concerning Antichrist and the end of the world, as the *contents of the book itself.* But he seems, in concluding his paragraph, to resolve this view into the wider one 7) that the Book represents "divinæ providentiæ concilium et præfinitio, qua apud Se statuit et decrevit facere vel permittere, &c." This is very nearly that of Areth. (in Catena, τί δὲ τὸ βιβλίον; ἡ πάνσοφος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνεπίληπτος μνήμη, ἣν καὶ ὁ προφήτης Δαβὶδ καὶ Μωυσῆς παρεδήλου, ὁ μὲν διὰ τοῦ Ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον σου πάντες γραφήσονται· ὁ δὲ διὰ τοῦ Κἀμὲ ἐξάλειψον ἐκ τῆς βίβλου ἧς ἔγραψας), Lyra ("liber iste est divina scientia, in qua omnia sunt scripta"), Vitringa, Mede ("codex fatidicus seu consiliorum Dei"), Ewald, De Wette, Stern, Düsterd., al. And this is, in the main, my own view. We may observe, that it is in fact but a limitation of this meaning, when many understand the Book to contain the prophetic fortunes of the Church of Christ: but also that it is a limitation which has arisen from the mistake, noticed above, of confounding the opening of the seals with the reading of the contents of the book. Those successive openings, or if we will, the fortunes and periods of the Church and world, are but so many preparations for that final state of perfection in which the Lamb shall reveal to the Church the contents of the Book itself). **2.] And I saw a strong angel** (the epithet ἰσχυρόν is by no means superfluous, but corresponds to the φωνῇ μεγάλῃ below, which, as appears by what followed, penetrated heaven and earth and Hades. Compare ch. x. 1, 3 and notes) **proclaiming in** (reff.; the voice is the vehicle, or investiture, of the thing proclaimed) **a loud voice, Who is worthy** (see

y Exod. xx. 4. z = here bis only. a John only (ch. ii. 7 al. fr.), exc. Luke xi. 22. Rom. iii. 4 (from Ps. l. 4). xii. 21 bis. constr., see note. b Gen. xlix. 9. c ch. xxii. 16. see Rom. xv. 12, from Isa. xi. 1, 10.

ἠδύνατο ʸ ἐν τῷ ʸ οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐδὲ ʸ ὑποκάτω τῆς ʸ γῆς ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὐδὲ ᶻ βλέπειν αὐτό. ⁴ καὶ ἐγὼ ἔκλαιον πολὺ ὅτι οὐδεὶς ʷ ἄξιος εὑρέθη ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε ᶻ βλέπειν αὐτό. ⁵ καὶ εἷς ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγει μοι Μὴ κλαῖε· ἰδοὺ ᵃ ἐνίκησεν ὁ ᵇ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ᶜ ῥίζα Δαυείδ, ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ

APℵ B [illegible] to n, 1. 2. 4 6. 9. 10-3. 1[illegible] to 1[illegible] 7. 30. 3[illegible] to 42. 47 to [illegible] 90 [illegible]

3. aft ουρ. ins ανω B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl: om A[P]ℵ m n 10. 33. 51 (h 1. 2. 4. 17-8-9. 37. 47-9 Br, e sil) vulg Orig Epiph Andr Areth Cypr Hil Primas. ουτε (thrice) B a c d e f g j k m 4. 6. 13-8-9. 26-7. 30-2-4-5-6. 42-8. 50. 90, (twice) ℵ b frag-n₂ 51, 1st time 33, 2nd time 38, and (3rd time) l 16. 33-8. om ουδε υπ. τ. γ. ℵ: ins aft αυτο 1. om from ουδε βλεπ. up to ουτε βλεπ. in next ver A k.

4. om εγω [P]ℵ frag-n₂ 1. 36 copt Orig Epiph. εκλααν ℵ¹: εκλεον ℵ³ᵃ 36. rec (for πολυ) πολλα: πολλοι 1 copt: txt [P]ℵ (B) rel Andr Areth, *multum* vulg lat-ff.—πολυν B 92. ευρεθησεται ℵ¹. rec aft ανοιξαι ins και αναγνωναι, with h 1. 10-7. 36. 49 (37-9 Br, e sil) Andr: aft βιβλιον, arm: om [P]ℵ B rel vss Orig Epiph Andr-coisl Areth.

5. [om μοι P Orig-ms Areth.] om 2nd ο ℵ f frag-n₂. rec ins ων bef 2nd εκ, with 1 Andr-p: om A[P]ℵ B rel Orig Eus Epiph Andr Areth. for ανοιξαι, ανοιξας 90: ανοιγων 33: ο ανοιγων B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]ℵ 1. 10-7. 36-8. 49. 51 (h l n 16. 37-9 Br, e sil) vulg copt Orig Epiph Andr lat-ff.

reff. ἄξιος here = ἱκανός Matt. viii. 8) **to open the book and to loose the seals of it? and no one was able, in heaven, nor yet upon the earth, nor yet under the earth** (in Hades, the place of departed spirits: not, as Grot., *in mari*), **to open the book, nor yet to look on it** (if we were reading an ordinary Greek sentence, this οὐδέ would introduce a climax, which would rule the meaning to be, "*nor even so much as to look upon the book*," lying there closed as it did. But the somewhat indiscriminate use of οὐδέ in the former clause, in which no such climax can be intended, removes this necessity, and enables us to take βλέπειν of an act subsequent to the ἀνοῖξαι,—the looking on the book, with a view to read it. For the claim to open the book must be founded on a claim of worthiness to see that which was contained in it). **4.] And I** (ἐγώ emphatic, 'I, for my part') **wept much, because no one was found worthy to open the book nor to look upon it** ("per hunc fletum designatur Johannis desiderium de sciendo ecclesiæ futurum processum." Lyra. It had been promised to him, ch. iv. 1, that he should be shewn future events: and now it seemed as if this promise were about to be frustrated by the lack of one worthy to open the book. There was no weakness of faith, as Hengstb. fancies: indeed such a supposition is entirely out of place here: St. John is in this book the simple *recipient* of the Apocalypse: for *that* he is summoned to the heavenly scene, for *that* he is waiting in humility: but that now seems to be precluded, and his tears burst forth in the earnestness of disappointed desire after the fulfilment of the promise. Christ, as the opener of the book, is not yet revealed to him: and to have him anticipating that revelation by the power of his individual faith, would be to put him out of his place and violate consistency). **5.] And one from among the elders** ("dicunt aliqui," says Lyra, "quod fuit Matthæus evangelista, qui dixit in persona Christi, Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo et in terra:" he himself preferring *Peter*, who had before this suffered martyrdom, and who was "unus, id est, primus, inter Apostolos." But see the interpretation of the elders above, ch. iv. 4. The elders, in their triumphant place round God's throne, know better than the Evangelist, yet clothed with the infirmities of this earthly state, the nature and extent of the victory and glory of Christ. It is the practice of the book to introduce the heavenly beings thus talking with the Seer: cf. ch. vii. 13 f.; x. 4, 8 ff.; xvii. 1; xix. 9; xxi. 9, &c.; xxii. 8, &c.) **saith to me, Weep not: behold** (the ἰδού serves to present before him the scene of which he says in the next verse καὶ εἶδον . . . . .) **the Lion which is from the tribe of Judah** (from ref. Gen.: the *lion*, as victorious: *from the tribe of Judah*, as the Messiah of promise, sprung from among the brethren of the Seer, and so carrying more comfort to him), **the root of David** (from ref. Isa.: i.e. the branch or sucker come up from the ancient root,

τὰς ἑπτὰ σφραγῖδας αὐτοῦ. [6] καὶ εἶδον [d] ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ [d] θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων [e] ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς [f] ὡς [g] ἐσφαγμένον ἔχων [h] κέρατα ἑπτὰ καὶ [i] ὀφθαλμοὺς [i] ἑπτά, οἵ εἰσιν τὰ [k] ἑπτὰ [k] πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ [l] ἀπεσταλμένα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. [7] καὶ ἦλθεν

d ch. iv. 6. see ch. vii. 17.
e Rev. passim. elsw., John xxi. 15 only. Ps. cxiii. 4, 6. Jer. xi. 19.
f see ch. xiii. 3. (xiv. 3.)
g vv. 9, 12. ch. vi. 4, 9. xiii. 3, 8. xviii. 24. 1 John iii. 12 (bis) only. J. Exod. xii. 6.
h Rev. (ch. ix. 13 al[8].) only, exc. Luke i. 69. Dan. vii. 7.
i Zech. iv. 10.
k ch. i. 4 reff.
l Heb. i. 14. Isa. vi. 6. see Zech. iv. 9.

rec ins λυσαι bef τας επτα, with ℵ (41, e sil) ulg-ed(with demid lipss, agst am fuld &c) Andr-p Cypr Jer: om A[P] B rel vss Orig Epiph Andr Hil.

6. rec aft και ειδον (ιδον B f 33 &c: simly elsw) ins και ιδου, with m 34-5 vulg(not lips-5): και ιδου και, omg ειδον, A: txt [P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Iren-int Cypr Primas. εστηκως ℵ l m n 1. 32. rec εχον, with [P] 1. 10 &c: txt Aℵ B l n 33-6. om και οφθαλμους επτα 1. for οἵ, ἅ B rel Andr Areth: ατινα j 47: txt Aℵ 1. (30?) 51 (m 38, e sil) Andr-p. [P def.] om 3rd επτα A 1. 12 am[1](with fuld harl[1]) æth Tich: ins ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Iren-int Cypr Firm. [P def: but there is not room for επτα.] rec του θεου bef πνευματα, with 1 (40, e sil): txt A[P]ℵ B rel. rec ins τα bef απ., with (l n?) 1. 6. 13-6. 37. 41-2 (B[r], e sil): om Aℵ B rel. [P def.] αποστελλομενα B rel Andr Areth: απεσταλμενοι A: om n: txt ℵ 1. 38. 49. [P def.]

and so representing it: not, as Calov., al., the Divine root which brought forth David, —to which Vitringa also approaches very near:—for the evident design here is to set forth Christ as *sprung from* the tribe of Judah and lineage of David, and His victory as His exaltation through suffering, ver. 6), **conquered** (as De W. well remarks, this word needs no comparison with any Hebrew usage to explain it (so Vitringa: "vox Hebræa זכה circa recentiora tempora reip. Hebr. receptissima fuit hoc usu ut significaverit mereri, dignum esse, haberi vel censeri: imo etiam simpliciter obtinere, nancisci provinciam v. munus administrandum." And so the majority of Commentators, as E. V., "hath prevailed to open:" most of all Ewald, "Messiam a Deo veniam hanc petiisse et impetrasse"), but is simply to be taken as standing in its proper sense in a pregnant construction. The usual rendering loses sight of the victory of Christ, and of the uniform sense in which the verb νικᾶν is constantly used in this book. The aor. must not be resolved into a perfect, but points to the past event of that great victory, by virtue of which the opening is in His power), **(so as) to open** (construction, see above) **the book and** (in order to that) **its seven seals.** 6.] *The vision of the Lamb.* **And I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living-beings, and in the midst of the elders** (the words seem to indicate the middle point before the throne; whether on the glassy sea (De W.) or not, does not appear; but certainly not *on* the throne, from what follows in the next verse. ἐν μέσῳ is repeated, as ἀναμέσον in Levit. xxvii. 12, 14) **a lamb** (the use of ἀρνίον, the *diminutive*, as applied to our Lord, is peculiar to the Apocalypse. It is difficult to say what precise idea is meant to be conveyed by this form. Elsewhere, it is ἀμνός, John i. 29, 36; 1 Pet. i. 19; Acts viii. 32: and as ἀμνός is found in Isa. liii. 7, from which the figure here is taken, the alteration of the word appears to be purposely made. Possibly, as De W., it may be to put forward more prominently the idea of meekness and innocence) **standing** (i. e. in its natural living position: the word is probably chosen on account of what immediately follows. Though ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, it was not lying, but standing), **as if slain** (i. e. retaining the appearance of death-wounds on its body: looking as if it had been slain: cf. ch. i. 18. So the majority of Commentators: cf. especially Vitringa;—"vivens equidem, verumtamen insignitum nota majoris alicujus in jugulo vulneris, et conspersum sanguine." Ebrard is quite wrong in supposing that the ὡς has any emphasis on it: it merely serves to solve the apparent paradox lying in the juxtaposition of ἑστηκός and ἐσφαγμένον), **having** (the gender again is that not of the thing expressed, but of the thing signified. See above, ch. iv. 1) **seven horns** (the horn is the well-known emblem of might: cf. 1 Sam. ii. 10; 1 Kings xxii. 11; Ps. cxii. 9, cxlviii. 14; Dan. vii. 7, 20 ff., viii. 3 ff.; ch. xvii. 3 ff. The perfect number *seven* represents that "all power is given unto Him in heaven and earth," Matt. xxviii. 18) **and seven eyes, which** (eyes) **are the seven spirits of God, sent forth** (as they have been) **into the whole earth** (i. e. which eyes repre-

m perf. as aor., ch. vii. 14. viii. 5. xix. 3. Winer, edn. 6, § 40. 4.
n ch. iv. 10 reff.
o 1 Cor. xiv. 7. ch. xiv. 2. xv. 2 only. Gen. iv. 21 al.
p Rev. (ch. xv. 7. xvi. 1, 2, &c. xvii 1. xxi. 9) only. Zech. xiv. 20.
q ch. iv. 6 reff.
r Rev. (ch. viii. 3, 4. xviii. 13) only, exc. Luke i. 10, 11. Exod. xxx. 1.
s Ps. cxl. 2. (see Luke i. 10. Tobit xii. 12.)
t = ch. i. 19, 20 reff.
u = Acts ix. 13. Rom. i. 7, and passim in Epp. ch. viii. 3, 4 al. (Ps. xv. 3)

καὶ [m] εἴληφεν ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου. [8] καὶ ὅτε ἔλαβεν τὸ βιβλίον, τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα καὶ οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι [n] ἔπεσαν [n] ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου, ἔχοντες ἕκαστος [o] κιθάραν καὶ [p] φιάλας χρυσᾶς [q] γεμούσας [r] θυμιαμάτων, αἵ [t] εἰσιν αἱ [s] προσευχαὶ τῶν [u] ἁγίων. [9] καὶ

APℵ B 1 to n. 1. 2. 4 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

7. rec aft ειληφεν ins το βιβλιον, with l 1²-marg. 16. 36(-9, e sil) am²(with lips-6 tol) copt Cypr Primas: ins aft θρονου 38 vulg-ed Andr Areth; την (= την βιβλον?) B: om A[P]ℵ rel am¹(with demid fuld harl¹ lips) æth arm Andr-coisl¹. for 1st του, της ℵ¹.

8. (επεσαν, so Aℵ l 1. 9. 26-7. 42-9: om 36. [P def.]) εκαστος bef εχοντες ℵ. rec κιθαρας, with k l 1. 10-7-8. 30-6. 49. 51 (e h 16. 37-9 Br, e sil) vulg Andr Areth₁ Cypr Primas: txt A[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd copt æth arm Andr-a²-coisl Areth₁ Hil. χρυσεας ℵ. for 1st αι, α ℵ. om 2nd αι ℵ¹ b c f g j k m 30-2-3-4-5. 40-8. 50.

sent the watchful active operation of God's Spirit poured forth through the Death and by the victory of the Lamb, upon all flesh and all creation. The weight of the whole sentence lies on the predicative anarthrous participle **ἀπεσταλμένα**. As the seven burning lamps before the throne represented the Spirit of God immanent in the Godhead, so the seven eyes of the Lamb represent the same Spirit in his sevenfold perfection, profluent, so to speak, from the incarnate Redeemer: busied in His world-wide energy: the very word ἀπεσταλμένα reminding us of the *apostolic* work and church.

Observe, οἵ εἰσιν does not as Bede ("Spiritus in Christo septiformis propter eminentiam potestatis cornibus, propter illuminationem gratiæ comparatur oculis"), Bengel, De W., al., refer to both κέρατα and ὀφθαλμοί: this would be of course grammatically possible, but it seems otherwise decided here both by the context, and by Zech. iv. 10: ἑπτὰ οὗτοι ὀφθαλμοί εἰσιν [add κυρίου A; pref. ℵ], οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες (E. V. which run to and fro; Heb. מְשׁוֹטְטִים, from שׁוּט, remigare, cursitare) ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν). 7.] *The Lamb takes the Book.* **And he** (or, *it*) **came and took** (not, '*received*,' as Ebrard. The book lay on the open hand of Him that sat on the throne, for any to take who was found worthy. That "das Buch überreichen" which Ebrard insists on, is found not here, but in the previous description: and to introduce it here, confuses the distinctness of the symbolism.

The perfect εἴληφεν apparently cannot be pressed: see reff.) it (i.e. the Book; cf. next verse) **out of the right hand of Him that sat upon the throne** (Vitringa's enquiry, whether we are to imagine the Lamb to have had partly a human form and hands, is rightly dismissed by Düsterd. as "unnöthig und geschmacklos"). 8—10.] *Song of praise following thereupon.* **And when he took** (the aor. **ἔλαβεν** is not an imperfect, "*when he was taking*," "als es nahm," Luth.: nor again is it a pluperf. "*when he had taken*," as E. V. (our idiom perhaps so requiring it), and many Commentators (even De W. and Düsterd.);—but a pure past: the context, and not the word itself, indicating that the act to be described was subsequent to that thus expressed. And so in all places commonly cited for aorists "*put for*" pluperfects) **the book, the four living-beings and the twenty-four elders fell down before the Lamb** (who shares the divine throne, and honour, and worship, cf. ver. 13; ch. xxii. 1; and ch. iii. 21), **having each (of them)** (**ἔχοντες ἕκαστος** apparently applies only to the elders: not for any grammatical reason, but on account of the symbolism: for 1) it is unnatural to suppose figures described as the four living-beings are, having harps or vials; and even if this is not to be pressed (see above on ver. 7), yet 2) it is inconsistent with the right view of the four living-beings, as representing creation, that they should present the prayers of the Saints) **a harp** (κιθάρα, properly a zithern or kind of guitar: the harp of David, which the LXX call κινύρα in 1 Kings xvi. 16, 23, al., but always κιθάρα in the Psalms, is described by Josephus, Antt. vii. 12. 3, ἡ μὲν κινύρα, δέκα χορδαῖς ἐξημμένη, τύπτεται πλήκτρῳ: and then he adds, ἡ δὲ νάβλα, δώδεκα φθόγγους ἔχουσα, τοῖς δακτύλοις κρούεται. But David, in the passages above cited, appears to have played with his hand: so that perhaps the κινύρα or κιθάρα was played in both ways), **and golden vials** (cups, or bowls. or, by the context, censers) **full of incense**

vw *ᾄδουσιν* vw *ᾠδὴν* v *καινὴν λέγοντες* x v Ἄξιος εἶ λαβεῖν τὸ *βιβλίον καὶ ἀνοῖξαι τὰς σφραγῖδας αὐτοῦ, ὅτι* y *ἐσφάγης καὶ* z *ἠγόρασας τῷ θεῷ* a *ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου* b *ἐκ πάσης* c *φυλῆς καὶ* c *γλώσσης καὶ* c *λαοῦ καὶ* c *ἔθνους,* 10 *καὶ* d *ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς* d *βασιλείαν καὶ* d *ἱερεῖς, καὶ* e *βασιλεύουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς*

v ch. xiv 3. Ps. cxliii. 10. see Ps. xxxii. 3. xcv. 1 al.
w as above (x).
ch. xv. 3. Eph. v. 19. Col. iii. 16 only. Ps. cxxxvi. 4.
x ver. 2.
y ver. 6 reff.
z = 1 Cor. vi. 20. vii. 23. 2 Pet. ii. 1. ch. xiv. 3, 4.
a ch. i. 5. Eph. ii. 13 al.
b = 2 John 4.
c ch. vii. 9. xi. 9. xiii. 7. xiv. 6. Dan. iii. 4 Theod-A.
d ch. i. 6.
e ch. xx. 4, 6 reff.

9. *αδωσιν* A. *λαβων* 1. rec aft *τω θεω* add *ημας*, with [P(appy)] ℵ B rel (1 copt Cypr); pref, c l m 16. 34-5-9 vulg arm; add *ημων* 44: om A æth.—(1 harl[1] copt Cypr Fulg om *τω θεω*.)

10. rec (for *αυτους*) *ημας*, with (41, e sil) vulg-ed(with fuld &c.) Andr-coisl Areth: txt Aℵ B rel am syr-dd copt æth Andr. [P def.] rec adds *τω θεω ημων*, with [P (*At this point P has only the beginnings of lines, but the letters μων clearly testify to the insn*)] ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth: om A. rec (for *βασιλειαν*) *βασιλεις*, with B rel Andr Areth: txt Aℵ vulg copt Cypr Primas Fulg Idac. [P def.] *ιερατειαν* ℵ. rec (for *βασιλευουσιν*) *βασιλευσομεν*, with (26-7. 41, e sil) vulg-ed(with demid lips) Areth Primas Firm: *βασιλευσουσιν* ℵ rel am(with harl tol lips-5) copt Andr Areth lat-ff: txt A[P] B a b e f g l n 12. 37-8. 48. 51. 90.

(*θυμίαμα* is generally used in the plural, e. g. Herod. ii. 86, *διηθέουσι θυμιήμασι τετριμμένοισι*: viii. 99, *ἐθυμίων θυμιήματα*), **which** (*αἵ* might well have *θυμιαμάτων* for its antecedent, being fem. to suit *προσευχαί* below: but it is perhaps more likely that *φιάλας* is its antecedent—each vial being full of incense) **are** (represent: see reff.) **the prayers of the saints** (see reff.: especially ch. viii. 3: Ps. cxl. 2, *κατευθυνθήτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου.* The twenty-four elders, representing as they do the whole church of God, offer the praises and the prayers of the whole church: the harps symbolizing the former, the censers the latter. Of any thing approaching intercession on the part of the glorified saints for the church below, or indeed of the glorified saints at all, there is not the least mention, nor does this passage at all touch the question of the fact of such intercession. In the division of the two employments, the most of prayer falls to the lot of the church in trial, and the most of praise to the church in glory: and this is perhaps the reason why, while they have harps on which they themselves play, they only offer or present the vials of incense. De W. remarks, that the Writer of the Apocalypse seems not to know any thing of the intercessory office of Christ. But that office is prominent through this whole scene. What is the lamb as it had been slain—what the *ἠγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου*, but recognitions of it? It underlies the whole book): **and they sing** (why *present?* Is it because the sound still lingered in his ears? Or more probably, as describing their special and glorious office generally, rather than the mere one particular case of its exercise?) **a new song** (new, because the *occasion* was new; the manifestation of the worthiness of the Lamb calls forth fresh words springing from fresh and living thoughts. These words which follow could not be spoken except by those who had seen Christ's redemption complete; therefore they must needs be new), **saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals of it: for Thou wert slain, and didst redeem** (the object is not expressed, nor need it be: see similar constructions with *ἐκ*, Matt. xxv. 8; 1 John iv. 13. The *ἡμᾶς*, which is in the MSS. added or prefixed to the verb, has considerable authority, but on the whole seems more likely to have been inserted, considering the prevalent early interpretation of the elders as Apostles and Prophets, than omitted because they were imagined to be angels) **to God through** (*ἐν*, as the vehicle, and conditioning element of redemption) **thy blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation** (the only thing to be noticed is the quadruple *number* of these specifications, as indicating universality: see again below, ver. 13. To identify *φυλῆς* as Bengel, or *λαοῦ* as Züllig, with the *Jewish people*, seems forbidden by the *πάσης*), **and madest them a kingdom and priests, and they reign upon the earth** ("this clause differs from that in ch. i. 6, both by the *καί* before *ἱερεῖς*, and by the important addition *καὶ βασιλ. κ.τ.λ.* This last would be superfluous, if we were with Hengstb., al., to adhere to the rec. *βασιλεῖς*, or if *βασιλείαν* could have the sense given to it by Hengstb. in ch. i. 6, 'a people invested

f ch. iv. 6 reff. Isa. vi. 2.
g Heb. xii. 22 reff.
h Dan. vii. 10.
i constr., ch. iv. 1 reff.
k ch. iv. 11.
l ver. 6.
m = ch. iv. 11 reff.
n Rom. ix. 23. Eph. i. 7, 8. ii. 7. iii. 8, 16. Phil. iv. 19 al.
o Rom. xi. 33.
p ch. vii. 12. 1 Cor. i. 21.

γῆς. [11] καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἤκουσα [ὡς] φωνὴν ἀγγέλων πολλῶν [f] κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν ζώων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν [gh] μυριάδες [g] μυριάδων καὶ [h] χιλιάδες χιλιάδων, [12] [i] λέγοντες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ [k] Ἄξιόν ἐστιν τὸ [l] ἀρνίον τὸ [l] ἐσφαγμένον λαβεῖν τὴν [m] δύναμιν καὶ [no] πλοῦτον καὶ [op] σοφίαν καὶ [q] ἰσχὺν καὶ [r] τιμὴν καὶ [r] δόξαν καὶ [s] εὐλογίαν. [13] καὶ πᾶν [t] κτίσμα ὃ [u] ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ

APℵ B 1 to n, 1. 2. 4. 6 [illegible] 10-3. 1[illegible] to 19. 2[illegible]-7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 5[illegible]. 90 Br.

q = ch. vii. 12. 1 Chron. xxix. 11. r ch. iv. 9, 11. s = ch. vii. 12 reff. t 1 Tim. iv. 4. James i. 18. ch. viii. 9 only †. Wisd. ix. 2. u ver. 3.

11. ins ως bef φωνην ℵ B² rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Fulg Cassiod: om A[P] B¹ n 17 (f 1. 2. 16. 49, e sil) vulg Primas. rec (for κυκλω) κυκλοθεν, with 1. 18 (30. 41, e sil]: txt A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. om from ζωων to πρεσβυτερων 1.—Steph om further from και to μυριαδων, with 1: om μυριαδες μυριαδων vulg Primas Fulg Cassiod: ins A[P]ℵ B rel vss.

12. αξιος A: txt ℵ B rel. [P def.] ins τον bef πλουτον B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om A[P]ℵ n 17-9. 36 (h 1. 37. 41-9 Br, e sil).—(om και πλουτον g.)—om και 38.

13. rec aft ὁ ins εστιν, with [P] h m n 1. 10-7. 34-5-6 (37. 41-7-9 Br, e sil) vulg Andr lat-ff: om (ℵ) B rel tol copt Areth.—for ὁ, το ℵ: om 39.

with kingly power.' Here we have three particulars: 1) that those who are bought to be God's own are made into a kingdom, viz. God's,—2) (καί) that they are made into priests,—3) (καί) that they are invested with kingly power. So rightly Ebrard." Düsterd. The present βασιλεύουσιν is not to be rendered as a future, but keeps its own meaning (the whole aspect and reference of this heavenly vision being *not future*, but *present*: the world and church as now existing, cf. Eph. ii. 6). The Church even now, in Christ her Head, reigns on the earth: all things are being put under her feet, as under His: and even if this meaning be questioned, we have her kingly rank and office asserted in the present, even in the midst of persecution and contempt). **11, 12.**] *The assenting chorus of the host of angels.* **And I saw** (εἶδον, not in a general vague sense, introducing a fresh particular merely; but in its proper sense: John saw the host of angels whose voice he heard: cf. ch. vi. 1 f. The gloss. ord. refers εἶδον to what has preceded: but this is contrary to St. John's usage), **and I heard** [**as it were**] **a** (or, *the*: φωνή, like many other substantives in regimen with their possessive genitives, being definite though anarthrous) **voice of many angels around the throne and the living-beings and the elders** (i. e. surrounding on all sides, in the more distant space, the smaller circle hitherto described. The Church, as the vehicle of the work of Redemption, of which Creation is but a part, is the central and crowning manifestation of God's power and love and wisdom. Round it, and Him who is its Head, the heavenly hosts are ranged in humble admiration; and into its wonders they desire to look. Cf. Eph. iii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12); **and the number of them was myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands** (i. e. innumerable in its vastness. See Ps. lxviii. 18, and ref. Dan., where χίλιαι χιλιάδες comes before μύριαι μυριάδες: but it is of very little import whether the specification is by way of climax or of anti-climax, the same idea being conveyed), **saying** (the appositional nom. instead of the gen.: as in ch. iv. 1) **with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb which hath been slain to receive** (by way of *ascribed praise*: cf. ch. iv. 11 and note) **the power and riches and wisdom and might and honour and glory and blessing** (here, as in ch. vii. 12, but in differing order, we have *seven* particulars of ascription. But here there is a difference both from ch. vii. 12 and iv. 11. In each of those places the art. is repeated before each particular: here, one article includes them all. Bengel well remarks, that we must regard them all as if they formed but one word. And when they are thus regarded, the article seems to point out the fact of all these, as one, belonging to God, whose power and glory the Lamb is declared worthy to share. Of the particulars themselves, πλοῦτος is better kept in its generality, all riches and fulness, than limited, as by De W., to *spiritual* riches; see 1 Chron. xxix. 11: εὐλογία is *blessing*, in the sense so frequent when the word and its cognate verb are used of an act passing from man to God: viz. that of ascribed praise; the *will* on the part of the creature, though unaccompanied by the *power*, to return blessing for blessing con-

[u] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ [u] ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς καὶ [v] ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστίν, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα ἤκουσα [w] λέγοντας Τῷ [x] καθημένῳ [x] ἐπὶ * τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ [y] ἀρνίῳ ἡ [a] εὐλογία καὶ ἡ [x] τιμὴ καὶ ἡ [x] δόξα καὶ τὸ [z] κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. 14 καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῷα ἔλεγον [a] ἀμήν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι [b] ἔπεσαν καὶ [bc] προσεκύνησαν.

v see Matt. xiv. 25. Job ix. 8.
w acc., Acts ix. 4.
x w. dat. (but see v. r.), ch. iv. 9. vi. 16. vii. 10. xix. 4. xxi. 5 only. see ch. iv. 2 reff. & note.
y ver. 6 reff.
z ch. i. 6.

a = 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Neh. v. 13. xx. 20. John iv. 20. b absol., Dan. iii. 6 (not Theod-A). c absol., Matt.

C κυνη-σαν... ACPℵ B a to n, 1 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 42 47 to 51. 90 Br.

rec (for επι της γης) εν τη γη, with 1 syr-dd Andr-a lat-ff: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg copt Andr Areth, επι γης n 16. om και υποκατω της γης (*homœotel*) ℵ 33. for επι της θαλασσης, τα εν τη θαλασση ℵ·: επι την θαλασσαν 38. rec aft θαλασσης ins ἅ, with [P] B 10-7. 30[2] (h 1. 37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg Andr-p Fulg: οσα m 34 Andr-coisl: om Aℵ rel Areth. (om εστιν as well as ἅ ℵ n 38. 47 syr-dd Andr-a Primas Cassiod.) for παντα, παντας A rel: παντα και παντας B: παντας, insg παντα bef τα, 40: txt [P]ℵ c f k m 1. 30-3 (6. 9. 17. 32-4-5-6 Br, e sil) vulg Andr-a Areth Primas.—pref και f n 13. 47: add και ℵ k m 30-4-5-6 Andr-coisl. for λεγοντας, λεγοντα A 1. 12 some-vss Andr-p(omg ηκ.): txt [P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr-a Areth Primas. * rec τοῦ θρόνου, with [P]ℵ b n 1. 2. 10-7-8. 33 (g h 13-6. 36-7-8-9. 42-7-9 Br, e sil) Andr Thdor-stud Areth: τω θρονω A B rel Andr-coisl.—(om τω k 40.) om και (bef. τω αρνιω) ℵ[3a]. [om 1st η P.] for και το κρατος, παντοκρατορος ℵ[1]. aft αιωνων ins αμην B rel æth Andr Thdor-stud Areth: om A[P]ℵ l m 35 (b 41, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Primas Fulg.

14. for ελεγον, λεγοντα B rel copt Areth: ελεγεν m 34 Andr-coisl: λεγουσα 42: txt A[P]ℵ l n 16. 35-6. 49[2] (1. 18. 38-9, e sil) vulg syr-dd æth Andr lat-ff.—(om from αμην in last ver to αμην in this g 19.) ins το bef αμην B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om A[P]ℵ f k n 1. 36 (37-8. 42, e sil) Andr. rec ins εικοσι τεσσαρες bef πρεσβυτεροι, with vulg-ed(with demid) Primas: om A[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Cassiod[1]. επεσον B rel Andr-a Areth: txt A[P]ℵ d l m 9[1](appy). 19. 33 (1. 2. 16. 26-7. 30-4-5-6-9. 41-2-9, e sil) Andr. rec at end ins ζωντι εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, with vulg-ed Primas: om ACℵ B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff$_m$.

ferred. The idea of Bengel, that the septenary number has to do with the seven seals, is hardly probable: the number, as indicating completeness, running through the whole book). 13, 14.] *The chorus of assenting praise from Creation itself.* **And every creature** (i. e. by the very terms, animated creature: for heaven and earth and sea themselves are mentioned as the *abodes* of these κτίσματα) **which is in the heaven** (the chorus being *universal*, this will include the angels, previously mentioned, and the glorified saints) **and on the earth and under the earth** (i. e. not the devils, as even Vitringa: but as in Phil. ii. 10, the departed spirits in Hades: see note there), **and upon the sea** (i. e. most probably, on the surface of the sea; meaning not those on ships, but those sea-animals which are regarded as being on the surface), **and all the things in them** (so in Exod. xx. 11. The clause added seems to serve the purpose of *complete* enumeration, applying here to γῆ and θάλασσα only, as ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ has occurred already. The ἐπί and ὑποκάτω being both superficial, ἐν completes the list—in the depths of the earth and the sea: cf. ch. viii. 9) **I heard saying** (the gender again is that of the things signified, not that of κτίσμα: see ch. iv. 8), **To Him that sitteth upon the throne** (for the various cases after καθημ. ἐπί, see note, ch. iv. 2) **and to the Lamb** (the Church, including Creation, gives praise to the Lamb for Redemption, vv. 9, 10: the angels praise the infinite condescension of the Son of God: the entire universe celebrates the glory of the universal Father and of the Redeemer, thence accruing) (**be** (or, *is, belongs*)) **the blessing and the honour and the glory and the might** (notice the fourfold arrangement where *universality* is set forth: and the repeated article, exhaustive of each predicate separately. It is fanciful, with Bengel, to allot the four ascriptions among the four classes of creatures above mentioned. In each case the number has the same signification: but they need not separately correspond) **to the ages of the ages.** 14.] *The solemn assent of the celestial representatives of Creation and of the Church.* **And the four living-beings said Amen** (as above, in ch. iv. 11, the four living-beings assert the worthiness of

d ch. v. 1. e so ver. 12. ch. x. 7. f ch. xiv. 2. xix. 6. Ps. lxxvi. 18. nom., ch. iv. 1 reff. g ch. iv. 5 reff.

ACP℞ B a to n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 25-7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

VI. 1 Καὶ εἶδον ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὸ y ἀρνίον μίαν ἐκ τῶν d ἑπτὰ σφραγίδων, e καὶ ἤκουσα ἑνὸς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων λέγοντος ὡς f φωνὴ fg βροντῆς Ἔρχου. 2 Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ

Ch. VI. 1. *οτι* B(Mai) rel vulg(with am &c, agst demid &c) Andr Areth Bede: txt AC[P]℞ 1 n 16-8-9. 33(in Alter's errata) 38 (1. 36-7-9. 41, e sil) vss Andr-a Primas. om *μιαν* 1. rec om *επτα*, with [P] c n 1. 33 (6. 9. 27. 36, e sil) copt Bede: ins AC℞ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas. om *σφραγιδων* ℞[1]. *εκ* (2nd) is written above the line by ℞[1]. *λεγοντων* ℞. rec *φωνης*, with [P] c 1. (30-2?) (k 6. 18, e sil): *φωνην* ℞ 26 Br: txt AC B rel Andr Areth. aft *βροντης* ins another *λεγοντος* A, arm has *λεγ.* in this place but om above. rec aft *ερχου* ins *και βλεπε*; *και ιδε* ℞ B rel; *ιδε* 6. 9. 11: om AC[P] h n 1. 2. 10-7-8. 36-7-8. 41-2-7-9 Br am.
2. om *και ειδον* B rel demid(with harl[1] tol lips-6) Areth Primas: ins AC[P]℞ h l n

God to receive the glory and the honour and the power *on account of His having created all things*, so here they say their Amen to *creation's* chorus of praise: being themselves the representatives of the animated Creation). **And the elders fell down and worshipped** (in silent adoration of God and of the Lamb. The inference of Ewald from the rec. text (which is itself here wholly untenable), "presbyteri adoratione repetita Deum prosequuntur, ut a quo auctore omnia progressa sunt et Messias creatus est, ad eum omnis redeat honor, omnis reverentia," would be unwarranted even were that text retained: *ζῶντι*, anarthrous, would apply to the whole object of praise in ver. 13).

Ch. VI. 1—VIII. 1.] The opening of the seven seals. As preliminary to the exegesis of this section, I may observe that it is of the first importance to bear in mind, that the openings of these seals correspond to the various arrangements of God's Providence by which the way is prepared for the final opening of the closed book of His purposes to His glorified Church. That opening shall not fully and freely be made, till His people will know even as they are known. And that will not be, till they are fully gathered in to His heavenly garner. This book the Lamb opens, containing as it does matters which *οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ ἄγγελος ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός*, first by the acts and procedures of His establishment of His reign over the earth, and then finally by His great second coming, the necessary condition of His elect being gathered out of the four winds into His glory. When these preparations for His coming have taken place, and that coming itself has passed, and the elect are gathered into glory, then will be the time when the last hindrance to our perfect knowledge will be removed, and the book of God's eternal purposes will lie open—the theme of eternity's praise.

I may add that for the sake of perspicuity, I shall mainly follow, in these notes, the track of that interpretation which seems to me to be required; noticing only differences in those of other Commentators where grammar and philology are concerned.

1—8.] The opening of the first four seals, marked by the ministration of the four living-beings. 1, 2.] **And I saw when the Lamb opened one from among the seven seals, and I heard one from among the four living-beings saying, as the voice** (a pendent nominative; the regular construction would be dative) **of thunder** (which is to be taken not as peculiarly belonging to this first as resembling a lion, but as belonging to all alike, and accounted for by their mysterious and exalted nature: cf. ch. i. 10, x. 3), **Come** (to whom, and with what meaning is this *ἔρχου* spoken? The great majority of Commentators have taken the rec. reading, which fixes it by adding *καὶ βλέπε*, as an address to the Seer, to approach nearer and look at the coming vision. And even those who have rejected this addition have yet regarded it as a true gloss, and the "Come" as addressed to the Seer. But whither was he to come? Separated as he was by the glassy sea from the throne, was he to cross it? And where shall we find the simple verb *ἔρχεσθαι* used absolutely in such a sense, "Draw near," without *ὧδε* or some such particle? Compare also the place where the Seer is to go and take the little book (ch. x. 8), and see how different is the whole form of expression. In interpreting so unusual a term of address, surely we should rather begin by enquiring whether we have not the key to it in the book itself. And in this enquiry, are we justified in leaving out of consideration such a verse as ch. xxii. 17, *τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν Ἔρχου· καὶ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω Ἔρχου*, and the following *ἀμὴν ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ*, ib. ver. 20? This seems to

ἰδοὺ [hi] ἵππος [ik] λευκός, καὶ ὁ [l] καθήμενος [l] ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἔχων [m] τόξον, καὶ [n] ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [n] στέφανος, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν [o] νικῶν καὶ ἵνα [o] νικήσῃ.

h Rev. only (vv. 4, &c. ch. ix. 7, &c. xiv. 20. xviii. 13. xix. 11, &c.), exc. James iii. 3.
i Zech. vi. 2, 3. k ch. xix. 11, 14. l ch. iv. 2 reff. & note. m here only. Ps. vii. 12. n ch. ii. 10. o ch. v. 5 reff.

16-7-8. 36. (1. 13. 37-9. 42-7-9 Br, e sil) vss Andr. rec (for *αυτον*) *αυτω*, with 1 Andr-a[1]: *αυτων* 39: *αυτου* 18: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. ins *ο* bef *νικων* A. for *ινα νικηση*, *ενικησεν* ℵ: *και ινα νικηση και ενικησεν* 32-6.

shew, in my mind, beyond a doubt, what, in the mind of the Seer, the remarkable and insulated exclamation *ἔρχου* imported. It was a cry addressed, not to himself, but to the Lord Jesus: and as each of these four first seals is accompanied by a similar cry from one of the four living-beings, I see represented in this fourfold *ἔρχου* the groaning and travailing together of creation for the manifestation of the sons of God, expressed in each case in a prayer for Christ's coming: and in the things revealed when the seals are opened, His fourfold preparation for His coming on earth. Then at the opening of the fifth seal the longing of the martyred saints for the same great consummation is expressed, and at that of the sixth it actually arrives). **And I saw, and behold a white horse, and he that sat on him having a bow, and a crown was given to him, and he went forth conquering, and in order that he may conquer** (in the first place, the figure of the horses and their riders at once brings to mind the similar vision in Zechariah, i. 7—11, vi. 1—8, where the men on the horses are they whom the Lord hath sent to walk to and fro through the whole earth. In Zech. i., as here, that part of the vision is followed, ver. 12, by the cry of the *ἕως τίνος*. Here the horses and their riders are the various aspects of the divine dispensations which should come upon the earth preparatory to the great day of the Lord's coming. As regards this first, the whole imagery speaks of *victory*. The horses of the Roman commanders in their triumphs were white. Wetst. quotes Virg. Æn. iii. 537, where Æneas says, "Quatuor hic primum omen equos in gramine vidi, Tondentes campum late, candore nivali;" where Servius's comment is "Hoc ad victoriæ omen pertinet." The *bow* serves to identify the imagery here with that in Habakkuk iii. 9, where God goes forth for the salvation of His people: see also Isa. xli. 2; Zech. ix. 13: and even more strikingly with that in Ps. xlv. 4, 5, "In thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth and meekness and righteousness: and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies; whereby the people fall under thee." It is hardly possible that one whose mind was full of such imagery, should have had any other meaning in his thoughts, than that to which these prophecies point. The *crown* finds its parallel in the vision of Zech. vi., where, ver. 11, it is said, "take silver and gold, and make crowns (*στεφάνους*, LXX), and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedech, the high-priest." The *going forth conquering and in order to conquer* can only, it seems to me, point to one interpretation. The *νικῶν* might be said of any victorious earthly power whose victories should endure for the time then present, and afterwards pass away: but the *ἵνα νικήσῃ* can only be said of a power whose victories should last for ever. Final and permanent victory then is here imported. Victory, we may safely say, on the part of that kingdom against which the gates of hell shall not prevail: whose fortunes and whose trials are the great subject of this revelation. Such is the first vision, the opening of the first seal in the mystery of the divine purposes: *victory for God's church and people:* the great key-note, so to speak, of all the apocalyptic harmonies. And notice, that in this interpretation, there is no lack of correspondence with the three visions which follow. All four are *judgments* upon the earth: the beating down of earthly power, the breaking up of earthly peace, the exhausting of earthly wealth, the destruction of earthly life. Nor is this analogy disturbed, when we come to enquire, *who is the rider* on this white horse. We must not, in reply, on the one hand, too hastily introduce the Person of our Lord Himself, or on the other, be startled at the objection that we shall be paralleling Him, or one closely resembling Him, with the far different forms which follow. Doubtless, the resemblance to the rider in ch. xix. 11 ff. is very close, and is intended to be very close. The difference however is considerable. There, He is set forth as *present* in his triumph, followed by the hosts of heaven: here, He is working, in bodily absence, and the rider is not Himself, but only a symbol of His vic-

p ch. xii. 3 only. Gen. xxv. 30.
q = ch. ii. 7 reff.
r red., ch. ii. 7, 17. Matt. iv. 16 al.
s constr., ch. iii. 9 reff.
t ch. v. 6 reff.

[3] Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν δευτέραν, ἤκουσα τοῦ δευτέρου ζώου λέγοντος Ἔρχου. [4] καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄλλος [l] ἵππος [lp] πυῤῥός, καὶ τῷ [l] καθημένῳ [l] ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν [q] ἐδόθη [r] αὐτῷ λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ [s] ἵνα ἀλλήλους [st] σφάξουσιν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ μάχαιρα μεγάλη.

ACPℵ B a to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9 10 3. 1. to 19. 26-7. 3… 33 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B[r].

3. rec (for τ. σφρ. τ. δ.) την δευτεραν σφραγιδα, with B rel æth Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ m 1. 6. 12. 34-5. 49 vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Primas. rec aft ερχου ins και βλεπε, with Areth; και ιδε ℵ b m 30-2-4-5. 40-1-2 copt Vict Primas: om AC[P] B rel am(with fuld al, agst many mss) syr-dd.

4. aft 1st και ins ιδον και ιδου ℵ m 34-5. for πυρρος, πυρος A[P] B rel copt Andr-coisl: æth-rom joins the two: txt Cℵ b[2] h j k 4. 13[1]. 33 (a 9. 17-9. 30-7-9. 40-1-2-7-8, e sil) vulg syr-dd æth-pl Andr Areth Primas. ins εν bef τω καθημενω A. rec (for αυτον) αυτω, with k m 1. 30 (16. 90, e sil) Andr-a: αυτου e 18: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. om αυτω (bef λαβειν) Aℵ[3a]. rec (for εκ) απο, with 1. 36: om A l 16. 39. 46: txt C[P]ℵ[1] B rel vulg(*de*) copt Andr Areth Primas.—om εκ της γης ℵ[3a]. om και (bef ινα) B rel copt arm Andr Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ m 1(e sil) 17. 38. rec σφαξωσι, with [P]ℵ B 1 &c.: txt AC 36. μεγαλη bef μαχαιρα A copt æth.

torious power, the embodiment of His advancing kingdom as regards that side of its progress where it breaks down earthly power, and makes the kingdom of the world to be the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. Further it would not be wise, nor indeed according to the analogy of these visions, to specify. In all cases but the last, these riders are left in the vagueness of their symbolic offices. If we attempt in this case to specify further, e. g. as Victorinus, "Equus albus verbum est prædicationis cum Spiritu sancto missum in orbem. Ait enim Dominus, Prædicabitur hoc Evangelium per totum orbem terrarum in testimonium coram gentibus, et tunc veniet finis,"—while we are sure that we are thus far right, we are but partially right: we do not cover the extent of the symbol, seeing that there are other aspects and instruments of victory of the kingdom of Christ, besides the preaching of the Word. The same might be said of any other of the partial interpretations which have been given by those who have taken this view. And it was taken, with divergences of separate detail, by all expositors from the earliest times down to the year 1500).

3, 4.] And when he opened the second seal, I heard the second living-being saying, Come (see above on ver. 1). **And there came forth another horse, red** (the colour of blood: so 4 Kings iii. 22, ὕδατα πυῤῥὰ ὡς αἷμα. The colour of the horse in each case has reference to the employment of the rider. Tertullian, de Spectaculis, 9, vol. i. p. 641, says: "russeum .. Marti .. consecraverunt"), **and to him that sat upon him it was given (to him) to take away peace** (τὴν εἰρ. not, as Elliott, "the peace left by the former seal," for 1) the former seal neither implies nor leaves such peace, and 2) these four seals are strictly correlative, not consecutive on one another: but, peace *is its entirety*, the τὴν *distributing*, as the logicians say, the substantive. See for εἰρήνη *without* the art., Matt. x. 34 (peace, at all: *any* peace): Luke ii. 14 (peace, in each particular case, under every circumstance), &c.: *with* the art., Rom. xiv. 19, τὰ τῆς εἰρ. διώκωμεν: xv. 33, al., ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης: Eph. ii. 14, αὐτὸς ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, &c.) **out of the earth** (generally, as ever: not, Judæa, nor the Roman "orbis terrarum," nor any special portion merely) **and that they** (men: the inhabitants of the earth) **shall kill** (the pregnant future after ἵνα not only imports the result of purpose, but includes also matter of fact, "that they may . . . which they also shall;" see Winer (edn. 6, § 41 *b*. 1. b), who however intepretes it as expressing duration (?), whereas the aor. denotes rapid transition) **one another: and there was given to him a great sword** (the key to the interpretation of this seal is to be found in Matt. x. 34, μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν: see also Luke xii. 51. It represents to us the taking away of peace from the earth, the slaying one another, the reign of the sword, as one of the destined concomitants of the growing and conquering power of Christ, and one of the world-long and world-wide preparations for His coming. Observe, all *limitations* of this meaning are wrong: whether to the persecutions of the Christians, or to any period of time, ancient or modern. The above was the most ancient interpretation; e. g. we have in Victorinus, "Equus roseus et qui sedebat super eum habens gladium. bella sunt significata fu-

[5] Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν τρίτην, ἤκουσα τοῦ τρίτου ζώου λέγοντος [u]Ἔρχου. καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ [t]ἵππος [tu]μέλας, καὶ ὁ [t]καθήμενος [t]ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔχων [v]ζυγὸν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. [6] καὶ ἤκουσα ὡς φωνὴν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων λέγουσαν [w]Χοῖνιξ σίτου [x]δηναρίου, καὶ τρεῖς [w]χοίνικες [y]κριθῶν [x]δηναρίου, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὸν οἶνον μὴ [z]ἀδικήσῃς.

u ver. 12 reff.
v = (see note) here (Matt. xi. 29, 30. Acts xv. 10. Gal. v. 1. 1 Tim. vi. 1) only. Levit. xix. 35, 36. Prov. xvi. 11. Isa. xl. 12. Ezek. xlv. 10.
w here bis only. Ezek. xlv. 10, 11 only.
x Matt. xx. 2 al. gen. as Matt. x. 29. Acts v. 8. 4 Kings vii. 1.
y here only. Exod. ix. 31. 4 Kings vii. 1. (-θινος, John vi. 9, 13.)
z = Rev. (ch. ii. 11. vii. 2, 3. ix. 4, 10, 19. xi. 5) only, exc. Luke x. 19. Exod. v. 16. Isa. lxv. 25.

5. rec (for τ. σφρ. τ. τ.) την τριτην σφραγιδα, with 1. 33-5-8. 51 (4. 41, e sil): txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Primas.—και ηκουσα ανεωγμενης της τριτης σφραγιδος n 79. 80 Andr-a. rec aft ερχου ins και βλεπε (with 26-7, e sil); και ιδε ℵ B rel Andr Areth: om AC[P] h l n 1. 10 6-7. 36-7-8-9. 47-9 Br am arm Andr-a. om και ειδον B a b c e f g j k m 2. 6. 9. 11-2-9. 26-7. 30 2-8. 40-1-2-8. 50-1. 90 Andr(not -a) Areth. rec (for αυτον) αυτω, with 1. 18 (16. 26-7, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

6. rec om ως, with B rel gr-lat-ff: ins AC[P]ℵ 6. 12-7 vulg. rec κριθης, with B rel: txt AC[P]ℵ 1. 12 syr-dd Andr-p-txt. ins του bef 2nd δηναριου A. [αδικησεις P(appy) k l n(?).]

tura, ut legimus in Evangelio, Surget enim gens contra gentem," &c., Matt. xxiv. 7).

5, 6.] **And when he opened the third seal, I heard the third living-being saying, Come** (see above on ver. 1). **And I saw, and behold a black horse** (the colour is indicative of the mournful nature of the employment of the rider: see below), **and he that sat on him having a balance** (the symbol of scarcity, during which the bread is doled out by weight: see Ezek. iv. 16, *φάγονται ἄρτον ἐν σταθμῷ καὶ ἐν ἐνδείᾳ*: and Levit. xxvi. 26, *ἀποδώσουσι τοὺς ἄρτους ὑμῶν ἐν σταθμῷ, καὶ φάγεσθε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐμπλησθῆτε.* Some, as e. g. Woodhouse, have defended the meaning "*yoke*" for *ζυγόν*. But surely the question is here decided for us by ref. Ezek., *ζυγὸς δίκαιος, καὶ μέτρον δίκαιον, καὶ χοῖνιξ δικαία ἔσται ὑμῖν τοῦ μέτρου*: where the same words occur in juxtaposition. The assertion of Mr. Barker, in his strictures on Elliott's Horæ Ap., that *ζυγός* in the sense of *balance* absolutely is very rare, is sufficiently answered by the proverb *ἀκριβέστερος ζυγοῦ*: by Diog. Laert. viii. 18, where he records of Pythagoras the maxim *ζυγὸν μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν, τουτέστι, τὸ ἴσον καὶ δίκαιον μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν.* When a word can be thus used figuratively in common sayings, its literal sense cannot be so very rare. Cf. also the Etymologicon in Wetstein, *ζυγὸς εἴρηται καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν τάλαντον ἤγουν ἡ τρυτάνη*: and his citations from Sextus Empir. and Demosthenes) **in his hand. And I heard as it were** (*ὡς* must apparently be taken with the whole clause—"something like (a voice in the midst of the four living-beings)," the uncertainty applying to the *situation*, not to its being a voice, which it *was*) **a voice in the midst of the four living-beings** (it is not specified, *whose* voice: but the point from which the voice comes is appropriate to its intent, which is to mitigate the woes of creation, represented by the four living-beings: see below), **saying** (Let there be) **A chœnix of wheat for a denarius** (gen. of price, see Winer, edn. 6, § 30. 10 end), **and three chœnixes of barley for a denarius** (the sense seems to be, Take care that there be thus much food for thus much price. The denarius was the ordinary soldier's pay for a day in the time of Tiberius (see note on Matt. xx. 2), and has been usually and not unfairly assumed to be twice mentioned here as representing a day's wages. The chœnix appears in like manner to be taken for a day's provision: for so it is used in several of the numerous places cited by Wetst.: e. g. Herod. vii. 187, who, in estimating the amount of food consumed by the army of Xerxes, assumes this: *εὑρίσκω γὰρ συμβαλλεόμενος, εἰ χοίνικα πυρῶν ἕκαστος τῆς ἡμέρας ἐλάμβανε καὶ μηδὲν πλέον*: Thuc. iv. 16, speaking of the allowance made to the Lacedæmonians in Sphacteria while negotiations were going on,—*σῖτον . . . δύο χοίνικας ἑκάστῳ Ἀττικὰς ἀλφίτων, καὶ δύο κοτύλας*: Athen. x. 452 E, *μὴ καθῆσθαι ἐπὶ χοίνικα, ἀντὶ τοῦ μὴ σκοπεῖν τὰ ἐφ' ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἀεὶ προσδέχεσθαι*: Diog. Laert. Pythag. viii. 18, and Suidas under Pythagoras, *ἐπὶ χοίνικος μὴ καθίζειν, ἐν ἴσῳ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος φροντίδα ποιεῖσθαι καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος· ἡ γὰρ χοῖνιξ ἡμερήσιος τροφή.* Nothing can be more decisive than such proverbial

[7] Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν τετάρτην, ἤκουσα φωνὴν τοῦ τετάρτου ζώου λέγοντος Ἔρχου. [8] καὶ εἶδον,

ACPℵ B a *l* n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

7. *την τεταρτην σφραγιδα* 38. om *φωνην* (C)[P] B rel syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas: ins Aℵ h n 1. 10-7. 33. 91 (2. 13. 34-6-7. 49 Br, e sil) vulg Andr-a, *φωνης* Andr-p.—*το τεταρτον ζωον* C. rec (for *λεγοντος*) *λεγουσαν*, with 1. 33 (26. 51, e sil): txt AC[P]ℵ B rel. rec aft *ερχου* ins *και βλεπε*; *και ιδε* ℵ B rel Andr Areth: om AC[P] h l n 1. 2. 10-2-6-8. 36-7-8-9. 47-9 Br am Andr-a.

8. om *και ειδον* B rel vulg Andr-coisl Vict Primas: ins AC[P]ℵ b h l n 10-7-8. 36.

usage. The tendency of the voice is then to check or limit the agency of the rider on the black horse, and to provide that notwithstanding his errand sustenance shall not utterly fail. With regard to the three chœnixes of barley, the cheaper and less profitable grain, it seems to have been rightly interpreted as taking in the other case, of the workman who, out of his denarius a day, has to maintain not himself only, but his family also, and cannot consequently afford the dearer wheaten bread); **and the oil and the wine do not thou injure** (not, as Heinr. and recently Elliott, "do thou not commit injustice in the matter of the oil and the wine." The usage of this book should have prevented such an interpretation: for ἀδικεῖν with the accus. of the material object hurt or injured is the constant habit of our Writer, see reff.: and in no case do we find the other construction used by him, or indeed by any other writer to my knowledge, except with such general adverbial accusatives as τι and οὐδέν, e. g. Gal. iv. 12; Philem. 18. This statement of the usage of ἀδικέω in this Book and in Greek literature, Mr. Elliott, *more suo*, calls a "vain dictum:" and adds, "In the three Apocalyptic examples of the *thing injured*, occurring in connexion with the verb ἀδικέω in the active sense of *injury*, the accusative follows the verb: vii. 2, 3, ix. 4." It did not suit his purpose to cite xi. 5, αὐτοὺς ἀδικῆσαι, and he therefore appears to introduce a distinction (of course untenable) between the *person* and *thing* injured. But this whole matter of the position of the accusative has to do with the emphasis only, and not with the construction at all. Not one of the examples which he cites in his note is to the point: in that from Xenophon, Cyrop. iv. 5. 42, τὴν δ' ἀγορὰν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ κηρυξάτω μὲν ἤδη, ἔφη, μὴ ἀδικεῖν μηδένα, πωλεῖν δὲ τοὺς καπήλους ὅ τι ἔχει ἕκαστος πράσιμον..., the pendent accusative being evidently prefixed to the whole subsequent enactment, not connected with the first verb in it only. Rinck gives another meaning, equally untenable, "*waste* not the oil and the wine," seeing they are so costly.

As regards the meaning, the spirit of the saying is as explained above: the rider on the black horse symbolizing Famine, is limited in his desolating action by the command given, that enough is to be reserved for sustenance. Wheat, barley, oil, and wine, formed the ordinary sources of nourishment: cf. Ps. civ. 14, 15. So that as regards its *intent*, the command is parallel with that saying of our Lord in Matt. xxiv. 22: καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι. It is the mercy of God, tempering His judgments. And in its general interpretation, as the opening of the first seal revealed the certain proceeding on to victory of Christ and His church, and the second, that His coming should be prepared in the world not by peace but by the sword, so now by this third we learn that Famine, the pressure of want on men, not sweeping them away by utter failure of the means of subsistence, but keeping them far below the ordinary standard of comfort, and especially those who depend on their daily labour, will be one of the four judgments by which the way of the Lord's coming will be opened. This seems to point, not so much to *death* by famine, which belongs to the next vision, as to agrarian distress with all its dreadful consequences: ripening in some cases (see below) into the hunger-death, properly the consequence of Famine. The above interpretation of the third seal is given in the main by Victorinus—"Equus niger autem famem significat; ait enim Dominus: Erunt fames per loca:" but he allegorizes the latter part of the vision: "vinum et oleum ne læseris, id est, hominem spiritualem ne plagis percusseris").

7, 8.] **And when he opened the fourth seal, I heard the voice of the fourth living-being saying, Come** (see above on ver. 1). **And I saw, and behold a livid horse** (χλωρός, originally and properly grass-green, when used of flesh implies that greenish pallor which we know as *livid:* the colour of the corpse in incipient decay, or of the complexion extremely pale through disease. Thus Thucyd. in describing the symptoms of the plague at Athens, says that the body was οὐκ ἄγαν θερμόν, οὔτε χλωρόν, ἀλλ' ὑπέρυθρον.

καὶ ἰδοὺ [a] ἵππος [b] χλωρός, καὶ ὁ [c] καθήμενος [cd] ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, [e] ὄνομα [e] αὐτῷ [ὁ] θάνατος, καὶ ὁ [f] ᾅδης [g] ἠκολούθει [g] μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ [h] ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς [hi] ἐξουσία [i] ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς [k] ἀποκτεῖναι [lm] ἐν [l] ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ [m] ἐν λιμῷ καὶ [m] ἐν [k] θανάτῳ καὶ [n] ὑπὸ τῶν [o] θηρίων τῆς [o] γῆς.

a vv. 2, &c. b Mark vi. 39. ch. viii. 7. ix. 4 only. Gen. i. 30 al. see note. c Matt. xxiii. 22. xxviii. 2. d Rev., ch. xx. 3 only. Matt. ii. 9 al. Gen. vii. 18.
e ch. ix. 11. John i. 6. iii. 1. (xviii. 10.) 1 Kings i. 1. f ch. i. 18 reff. g Luke ix. 49. ch. xiv. 13. h ch. ii. 26 reff. i constr., ch. xiii. 7. xvi. 9. xxii. 14. Luke ix. 1. k = ch. ii. 23. l so ch. ii. 16 (reff.). xix. 21. Num. xxxi. 8. m = ch. ii. 27. ix. 19, 20. xi. 6. xii. 5 al. fr. n constr., here only. so προαγορεύειν ὑπὸ κήρυκος, Herod. ix. 98. o here (Acts xi. 6) only. Gen. i. 24.

47-9 (16. 37-9, e sil) syr-dd copt Andr. om 1st ο C. om 1st αυτου C[P] 1 (and 12: but 12 has ονομα αυτου) demid(with harl tol lips-5, agst am lipes al) Ansb Bede Ruf. om 2nd ο Cℵ g h 16[1]. 37. 49 B[r]. for θανατος, αθανατος A. rec ακολουθει, with h n 1. 10-7. 30 (37. 49. 51 B[r], e sil) syr-dd copt Orig, Andr-a Vict: txt C[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas Bede. (A illeg.) for μετ' αυτου, αυτω ℵ B rel Andr Areth: μετ' αυτω 33(-5, e sil): txt AC[P] h j[1] l n 10-6-7 (1. 37-9. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr-a. for αυτοις, αυτω B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ n 17. 49 (1. 40, e sil) Andr. rec αποκτειναι bef επι το τεταρτον της γης, with 1(-κτηναι): txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—(om αποκτ. 51?) om 2nd and 3rd εν ℵ, 2nd k, 3rd j 9. 26. 42. om last και 1. for υπο, το τεταρτον A.

Callistratus, as quoted in Wetst. says, ἡ μὲν γὰρ χεὶρ ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου χλωρόν τε καὶ τεθνηκὸς ὁρῶσα. Hippocrates, ibid. says of the colour, μελάντερόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐρυθροῦ, καὶ οἷον ἀρχή τις τοῦ μελαίνεσθαι καὶ πελιδνοῦσθαι. And again, in describing the symptoms of approaching death,—ῥὶς ὀξεῖα, ὀφθαλμοὶ κοιλοί, ... καὶ τὸ χρῶμα τοῦ ξύμπαντος προσώπου χλωρόν τε καὶ μέλαν ἐὸν . . . . σημαίνει θανατῶδες. See also Wetst.'s other quotations), **and he that sat upon him** (ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, lit. *on the top of him*: in the three other cases, ἐπ' αὐτόν. The nominative is pendent, see ch. iii. 12, 21) **his name was Death** (i. e. he was death personified. In this case only of the four is the explanation given. It is wrong to understand Pestilence by *this* θάνατος: see below), **and Hades** (the impersonation of the place of the departed: see ch. i. 18, xx. 14, where as here θανάτου καὶ ᾅδου go together. Eichhorn and Ebrard understand it of the whole multitude of the departed: but this clearly is beside the purpose: personification being the prevailing character of these four riders) **was following with him** (in his train: ready to engulf and detain his victims), **and there was given to them** (Death and Hades, considered as joint partners in the baleful work) **power over the fourth part of the earth** (ἐπί with accus., as *extending over, spreading over*, τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς, perhaps owing to the fourfold division of these former seals: not implying thereby that this last rider divided the earth with the three former, but thus specifying his portion as being one of four. At all events this suggests itself here as a possible reference of the number four: whereas in ch. viii. the continually recurring τὸ τρίτον has no such assignable solution. The expositors for the most part pass it over, merely as signifying a considerable portion. Elliott, with whose historical interpretation it will not square, takes refuge in the reading of the vulg., "super quatuor partes terræ"), **to kill with** (the ἐν of *investiture*, expressing the element or vehicle in which the action transpires) **sword and with famine and with death** (i. e. here, *pestilence*: see below), **and by** (ὑπο, seeing that the other three were rather general indications of the manner in which, but this last of the actual agent by whose administration. Wetst. gives examples of ἀποθανεῖν, τελευτᾷν, ὑπο, but the construction with an active verb is not common. See Matthiæ, § 592, who gives, besides ref., Eurip. Alcest. 753, εἰ δὲ ἀπειπεῖν χρῆν με κηρύκων ὕπο τὴν σὴν πατρῴαν ἑστίαν,—Plato, Phileb. p. 320, ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων φράζειν,—and Thuc. vi. 32, ὑπὸ κήρυκος εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι. It is singular that these examples should all belong to the same description of employment of agents) **the wild beasts of the earth** (the enumeration comprehends the "*four sore judgments*" enumerated in Ezek. xiv. 21, and in the same terms: τὰς τέσσαρας ἐκδικήσεις μου τὰς πονηράς, ῥομφαίαν καὶ λιμὸν καὶ θηρία πονηρὰ καὶ θάνατον. This fixes the meaning of this second and subordinate θανάτῳ as above. This seal also is interpreted as above by the earliest Commentators: e. g. Victorinus: "Hæc eadem quoque inter cæteras clades præmiserat Dominus, venturas pestes magnas et mortalitates." But as on the third seal, so here also, he goes off into vague allegory about the latter part of the vision).

p ch. v. 3, 13. xii. 1. Mark vii. 28 al. Ezek. xxiv. 5.

[9] Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν πέμπτην σφραγῖδα, εἶδον [p] ὑπο-

ACPℵ a *to* n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3 16 to 19 26-7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

9. for την πεμπτην σφραγιδα, την σφραγιδα την ε ℵ[1] f. aft ειδον ins και C; pref f.

We have now passed the four first seals, after which the character of the vision changes. One feature common to these four is, Personification: the representation of processions of events by the impersonation of their leading features. Another is, the share which the four living-creatures bear in the representation, which after this point ceases, as far as the seals are concerned. No interpretation can be right, which does not take both these common features into account. And in my view this may best be done by viewing, as above, these four visions as the four solemn preparations for the coming of the Lord as regards the visible Creation, which these four living-beings symbolize. The whole Creation demands His coming. Ἔρχου, is the cry of all its tribes. This cry is answered, first by the vision of the great Conqueror, whose arrows are in the heart of his enemies, and whose career is the world's history. The breaking of this first seal is the great opening of the mystery of God. This in some sense includes and brings in the others. Those others then, as we might expect, hold a place subordinate to this. They are, in fact, but exponents of the mysteries enwrapt within this conquering career: visions of the method of its being carried out to the end in its operation on the outward world. That the world-wide declaration of the everlasting Gospel should be accompanied by war, by famine, by pestilence, and other forms of death, had been announced by our Lord Himself (Matt. xxiv. 7), and is now repeated in this series of visions. The fulfilment of each of these judgments is, as it were, the removing a seal from the book of God's mysterious purposes: the bringing nearer of the time when that book shall be open for all the redeemed to read.

With regard to the question whether these four visions are to be regarded as consecutive or contemporaneous, I have already expressed an opinion. In their *fulness*, I believe them to be contemporaneous, and each of them to extend through the whole lifetime of the church. The analogy of the whole four symbols seems to require this. We read nothing implying that there are "days" of the opening of any particular seal, as there are, ch. x. 7, of the sounding of the several trumpets. The ἵνα νικήσῃ of the first seal speaks of a purpose which will not be accomplished till the earth be all subjugated: and if I am right in supposing the other visions subordinate to this, their agency is necessarily included in its process. At the same time I would by no means deny that they may receive continually recurring, or even ultimate fulfilments, as the ages of the world go on, in distinct periods of time, and by distinctly assignable events. So far we may derive benefit from the Commentaries of those who imagine that they have discovered their fulfilment in successive periods of history, that, from the very variety and discrepancy of the periods assigned by them, we may verify the fact of the prevalence of these announced judgments, hitherto, throughout the whole lifetime of the Church.

As regards *ultimate* fulfilment, there can be no doubt, that all these judgments on the world without, as well as the manifestation (of which they form a part) of the conquering career of the Kingdom of Christ, will reach their culminating point before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord. I may add, that no account whatever is taken, in the common *historic* interpretation, of the *distinctive* character of the four first seals, as introduced by the cry of the four living-beings: nor indeed is any interpretation commonly given of that cry itself.

9—11.] OPENING OF THE FIFTH SEAL. We may at once observe, that the whole character of the vision is altered. The four living-beings have uttered each his cry of ἔρχου, and are now silent. No more horses and riders go forth upon the earth. The scene is changed to the heavenly altar, and the cry is from thence. Any interpretation which makes this vision of the same kind with and consecutive to the four preceding, must so far be wrong. In one point only is the character of the former vision sustained. It is the κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς who are objects of the judgment invoked: as it was the earth, and its inhabitants, and its produce, which were the objects of the former judgments. See again below on the sixth seal.

9.] **And when he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar** (it is an altar of *sacrifice* which is here meant; ἐσφαγμένων, which follows, seems plainly to imply this: see below) **the souls** (i. e. departed spirits. It is manifestly idle to enquire, seeing that the Apostle was in a state of spiritual and supernatural vision, *how* these disembodied spirits became visible to him. That they were not, as

κάτω τοῦ [q] θυσιαστηρίου τὰς [r] ψυχὰς τῶν [s] ἐσφαγμένων [t] διὰ τὸν [t] λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [διὰ] τὴν [tu] μαρτυρίαν ἣν [uv] εἶχον, 10 καὶ ἔκραξαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγοντες [w] Ἕως [w] πότε, [x] ὁ [y] δεσπότης [z] ὁ [z] ἅγιος καὶ [a] ἀληθινός, οὐ [b] κρίνεις καὶ [cd] ἐκδικεῖς τὸ [ce] αἷμα ἡμῶν [be] ἐκ τῶν [f] κατοικούντων [f] ἐπὶ

q = ch. viii. 3, 5 reff. r = Acts ii. 27 (from Ps. xv. 10), 31. ch. xx. 4 only. Wisd. iii. 1. Jos. Antt. vi. 14. 2. s ch. v. 6 reff. t = ch. i. 2. u ch. xii. 17. xix. 10. v = John xiv. 21. w Matt. xvii. 17 ∥. John x. 24. Ps. xii. 1, 2. lxi. 3. x voc., Luke xii. 32. xviii. 11. John xx. 28 al. Ps. v. 2. y = Luke ii. 29. Acts iv. 24. Jude 4 only. Isa. i. 24. iii. 1. see 2 Pet. ii. 1. z ch. iii. 7. [iv. 11.] a of God, John xvii. 3. 1 Thess. i. 9. see ch. iii. 7 reff. b ch. xviii. 20. Ps. xliii. 1. c ch. xix. 2. 4 Kings ix. 7. d as above (c). Luke xviii. 3, 5. Rom. xii. 19. 2 Cor. x. 6 only. 1 Kings xxiv. 13. e Matt. xiii. 30. Gen. iv. 10 al. fr. f ch. iii. 10 reff.

aft *ψυχας* ins *των ανθρωπων* [P]ℵ h 1. 10-2. 36-7. 46 copt æth arm. om 2nd *δια* A tol copt Cypr Primas. *και δια την μαρτυριαν* is repeated by ℵ[1]. aft *μαρτυριαν* ins *του αρνιου* B rel syr-dd Andr-p Areth; *αυτου αρνιου* 46; *ιησου χριστου* m 34-5 Andr-coisl: om AC[P]ℵ n (1, e sil) 36. (38.) 47 vulg Andr-a Primas.—for *μαρτ.*, *εκκλησιαν* 38. *εσχον* ℵ[1].

10. rec (for *εκραξαν*) *εκραζον*, with [P] c 1. 38 (n, e sil) Andr, *clamabant* vulg: *εκεκραξαν* 19: txt ACℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth, *clamaverunt* Cypr Primas. *φωνην μεγαλην* B a b c d f g m 2. 6. 9. 11-3-6-9. 26-7. 30 2-3. 40-1-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-coisl. rec ins *ο* bef *αληθινος*, with m 1. 16. 30[2]-5. 51 (d f h 13. 39. 90, e sil) Andr: om AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. *εκδικησεις* ℵ. rec (for *εκ*) *απο*, with [P] 1 (17[1]?) 33 (l 35-6-9. 40, e sil) Andr: *επι* n: *και* 38: txt ACℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth, *de* vulg lat-ff.

Eichhorn, clothed with bodies, is manifest) **of those that have been slain on account of the word of God and on account of the testimony which they had** (i. e. which was committed to them to bear, and which they bore: see reff., especially ch. xii. 17. The testimony is one *borne by them*, as most Commentators: not one *borne to them* by the faithful Witness, as Düsterd. and Ebrard, most unnaturally: for how could the testimony borne to them before the Father by Christ (so Ebr.) be the cause of their being put to death on earth? Much has been said about the souls of the martyrs not being their departed spirits, which must be conceived of as being in bliss with Christ (cf. Hengstb.), and in consequence it has been imagined that these were only their animal lives, resident in the blood and shed forth with it. But no such difficulty really exists. We know, whatever be the bliss of the departed martyrs and confessors, that they are waiting for the coming of the Lord, without which they are not perfect: and in the holy fire of their purified zeal, they look forward to that day as one of righteous judgment on the ungodly world. The representation here, in which they are seen *under the altar*, is simply symbolical, carrying out the likening of them to victims slain on an altar. Even as the blood of these victims was poured under the altar and the life was in the blood, so their souls are represented as under the symbolical altar in heaven, crying for vengeance, as blood is often said to do. After this, it hardly need be said that no inference can be drawn from this vision respecting the intermediate state between the death of the saints and the coming of the Lord): **and they cried with a great voice, saying** (viz. *αἱ ψυχαί*, which are identified in the sentence with the persons themselves: not, as Ebr. and Düsterd. the *ἐσφαγμένοι* as distinguished from the *ψυχαί*) **Until when** (i. e. how long: see reff.), **thou Master** (**δεσπότης** is the correlative of *δοῦλος*, cf. *σύνδουλοι* below, ver. 11, and see ch. i. 1; Luke ii. 29; 1 Tim. vi. 1. It is God who is here addressed; with Him rests the time when to avenge His elect, cf. Luke xviii. 7, 8) **holy and true** (see on ch. iii. 7, for the sense of *ἀληθινός* in such connexion: here it is too evidently intended of subjective truthfulness for the other meaning even to be brought into question: and it is wonderful that Düsterd. should have insisted on it, "der Herr, welcher in Wahrheit diesen Namen verdient." For the voc. expressed by the nom. with the art., see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 29. 2), **dost thou not judge** (give decision in the matter of; with *ἐκ*, see reff.) **and exact vengeance for our blood from** (reff.: *ἀπό* is found in Luke xviii. 3) **them that dwell upon the earth** (i. e. the ungodly world, as distinguished from the church of God)?

As hitherto, so here again, the analogy and order of our Lord's great prophecy in Matt. xxiv. 11 is closely followed. "The signs of His coming, and of the end of the world" were there announced by Himself as war, famine, and pestilence, vv. 6, 7. And when He had declared that these were but the beginning of sorrows (*ὠδίνων*), He next, vv. 9 f., announces the persecution and martyrdom of His

τῆς γῆς; [11] καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς [ἑκάστῳ] [g] στολὴ [gh] λευκή, καὶ [i] ἐῤῥέθη αὐτοῖς [i] ἵνα [j] ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι [k] χρόνον μικρόν, ἕως * [l] πληρώσωσιν καὶ οἱ [m] σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν οἱ μέλλοντες [n] ἀποκτέννεσθαι ὡς καὶ αὐτοί.

ACP℞ B a to n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

g ch. vii. 9 reff. h ch. iii. 4, 5 reff. i ch. ix. 4 only. j ch. xiv. 13. Mark vi. 31. Dan. xii. 13. (-σις, ch. iv. 8.) k Luke xx. 9. John vii. 33. xii. 35. xiv. 9. Acts xix. 22 al. Isa. liv. 7. l = (see note) here only m Matt. xviii. 28, 29, 31, 33. xxiv. 49. Col. i. 7. iv. 7. ch. xix. 10. xxii. 9 only. Ezra iv. 7, 9. n (-κτενν-) Matt. x. 28. Mark xii. 5. Luke xii. 4. 2 Cor. iii. 6.

11. rec εδοθησαν . . . στολαι λευκαι, with 39 (e sil) vulg copt Primas: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel (1) syr-dd Clem Andr Areth Cypr.—εδοθη αυτοις ινα (omg αυτοις to αυτοις) 1. rec εκαστοις: εκαστω 2. 4. 19 Clem: εκαστω αυτων n syr-dd æth: αυτοις B rel arm Areth: αυτοις εκαστω AC[P]ℵ f h l m 10-1-2-3-6-7-8. 34-6-8-9. 47-9. 51. 90 Br Andr. αναπαυσονται A[P] B d k l n 1. 13. for ετι, επι ℵ 6: om 9: χρονον bef ετι A am(with fuld al). om μικρον B rel æth-rom Andr-coisl Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ n 1. 38. 51 vss Andr Primas, and bef χρονον 36. 47. rec aft εως ins ου, with h n 1. 10-7. 33-6. 49. 51 (4. 37 Br, e sil) Andr: om AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec πληρωσονται, with Areth (?): * πληρωθῶσιν AC e 51: πληρωσουσιν c g n 36: πληρωσωσιν [P]ℵ B rel Andr.—πληρωσω (with σ superscribed) 1. om 3rd και B vulg arm Cypr. ins και bef οι μελλοντες B a b c d e f g j 2. 6. 9. 13. 26-7. 30-2-3(-5, e sil)-9. 40-1-2-7-8. 50 Andr-a Areth Cypr, Primas. rec αποκτεινεσθαι, with [P] f j 1 (6. 16. 27. 30 and Bch's mss, e sil) Andr Areth: αποκτενεσθαι B rel: txt ACℵ a 2. 9. 17-8-9. 34-5. 47. 50-1 Andr-coisl. add υπ αυτων ℵ[1] (ℵ[3a] disapproving).

people. Similarly here, after the judgments already announced, we have the prayer for vengeance on the part of the martyrs, and the announcement of more such martyrdoms to come. And as our Lord's prophecies received a partial fulfilment in the events preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, and may have done so again and again since, but await their great and final fulfilment when the day of His coming approaches, so it is with these. The cry of the martyrs' blood has been ever going up before God since Stephen fell: ever and anon, at some great time of persecution, it has waxed louder: and so on through the ages it shall accumulate and gather strength, till the great issue of the parable Luke xviii. 1 ff. is accomplished. **And there was given to them [each] a white robe** (there will be no real difficulty in understanding this, if we are careful to mark its real place and interpret it accordingly. The white robe, in this book, is the vestment of acknowledged and glorified righteousness in which the saints walk and reign with Christ: cf. ch. iii. 4; vii. 13 ff., al. This was given to the martyrs: but their prayer for vengeance was not yet granted. The Seer saw in vision that this was so. The white robe was not actually bestowed as some additional boon, but seemed in vision to be thus bestowed, because in that vision one side only of the martyrs' intermediate state had been presented, viz. the fact of their slaughter and their collective cry for vengeance. Now, as over against that, the other more glorious side is presented, viz. that though the collective cry for vengeance is not yet answered, yet individually they are blessed in glory with Christ, and waiting for their fellows to be fully complete), **and it was said to them that they should rest** (not merely, *abstain from their cry for vengeance, be quiet* (so De W., al.):—but *rest in blessedness*, see ch. xiv. 13, and ref. Daniel) **yet a little while until** (construction, see reff.) **their fellow-servants** (see above on δεσπότης) **also and their brethren** (the καὶ . . . . καί may be taken as "*both* . . . *and*," in which case two different sets of persons are indicated by the σύνδουλοι and the ἀδελφοί, which distinction it would not be easy to give an account of. So that I prefer regarding the first καί as "also," "as well as themselves," and the two substantives as describing (notwithstanding the repetition of the οἱ before ἀδελφοί) the same persons; those who are οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν and οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν: the former term reminding them of the necessity of completeness as far as the service of their one Master is concerned: the latter, as far as they belong to one and the same great family) **shall have accomplished** (scil. "*their course*." Considering that this absolute use of πληροῦν without an object following is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, it is strange that Ebr. and Düsterd. should designate πληρώσωσιν as an explanatory reading for πληρωθῶσιν. If this latter be read, then we must render, ***shall have been completed*** (in number); a meaning found Luke xxi. 24; Acts vii. 23, 30, ix. 23, xxiv. 27: cf. also Col. ii. 10, which suggests another reason for altering to -θῶσιν), **who are about to be slain as also they were.**

[12] Καὶ εἶδον ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν ἕκτην, [o] καὶ [p] σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο [q] μέλας ὡς [r] σάκκος [s] τρίχινος, καὶ ἡ [t] σελήνη ὅλη ἐγένετο ὡς [t] αἷμα, [13] καὶ οἱ [u] ἀστέρες τοῦ [u] οὐρανοῦ [u] ἔπεσαν εἰς τὴν γῆν ὡς [v] συκῆ βάλλει τοὺς [w] ὀλύνθους αὐτῆς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου μεγάλου [x] σειομένη, [14] καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς [y] ἀπεχωρίσθη ὡς [z] βιβλίον [za] ἑλισσόμενον, καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ νῆσος [b] ἐκ τῶν [c] τόπων

... ειλισσομενος και d.

o so ver. 1. ch. x. 7. p Matt. viii. 24. xxiv. 7 ||. xxvii. 54. xxviii. 2. Acts xvi. 26. ch. viii. 5 al[5]. Amos i. 1. q Matt. v. 36. ver. 5 only. (2 John 12 reff.) r Matt. xi. 21. Luke x. 13. ch. xi. 3 only. Isa. l. 3. s here only. Exod. xxvi. 7. Zech. xiii. 4 only. t Acts ii. 20, from Joel ii. 31. see Matt. xxiv. 29. u Matt. xxiv. 29. (Isa. xiii. 10.) v Matt. xxiv. 32. Hab. iii. 17. w here only. Cant. ii. 13 only. x Matt. xxi. 10. xxvii. 51. xxviii. 4. Heb. xii. 26 (from Hag. ii. 7) only. y Acts xv. 39 only. Ezek. xliii. 21 only. z Isa. xxxiv. 4. a Heb. i. 12 only, from Ps. ci. 26. Job xviii. 8 only. b w. ἐκ, ch. ii. 5 (Matt. xxiii. 4. xxvii. 39 || Mk. Acts xvii. 28. xxi. 30. xxiv. 5) only. Prov. xvii. 13. c = Matt. xxvi. 52. John xi. 48. ch. ii. 5. xii. 14.

12. aft ειδον ins και 1. rec (aft 2nd και) ins ιδου, with A vulg-ed(with some mss and lat-ff): om C[P]א B rel vss gr-lat-ff. εγενετο bef μεγας A c am(with demid fuld lips tol) Vict: txt C[P]א B rel Andr Areth Primas. μελας bef εγενετο א B rel copt Andr-coisl: μεγας εγ. m: εγ. μεγας 19: txt AC[P] n 17. 33 (1. 36-8-9. 41-2, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Areth. rec om ολη, with [P] h m 1. 10-7. 35 (37. 40-9 B[r], e sil) Andr Promiss: ins ACא B rel vss Andr-p Areth.

13. for ουρανου, θεου A. επεσον B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]א 1 9[1]. 17. 33-8. 51 (1. 18. 30. 39. 40-1-2, e sil). (d illeg.) for εις, επι א 47. for βαλλει, βαλουσα rel syr-dd æth Andr-comm: βαλλουσα א j m 13-6. 30-4-5-9. 51. 90: αποβαλλει n 37: αποβαλουσα 38: βαλει 1: txt AC[P] B 10-7. 36 (f h 49 B[r], e sil) vulg Andr-a Areth. for υπο, απο א c[2]-marg f. rec μεγαλου bef ανεμου, with [P] h n 17. 36 (1. 37-9. 40-1-9 B[r], e sil) copt Andr: txt ACא B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas.—א[1] has μεα between με and γαλου, but marked for erasure. for σειομενη, σαλευομενη A 12.

14. rec om ὁ, with 1 (2. 13, e sil): ins AC[P]א B rel Andr Areth.—om ο ουρανος k. rec ειλισ., with [P] d(appy) n 1. 18. 27. 33(-6, e sil). 47-9[2]. 51: txt ACא B rel. — -σομενος א a b c d e g j k n 2. 4. 6. 9. 16-8-9. 27. 30-2-8-9. 40-7-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-p Areth. for νησος, βουνος א (*see Isa* xl. 4): νησσος C B.

12—VII. 17.] Opening of the sixth seal, and its attendant visions. And herein (12—17) *Immediate approach of the great day of the Lord*, Matt. xxiv. 29 ||: (vii. 1—8) *gathering of the elect out of the four winds*, Matt. xxiv. 31: (vii. 9—17) *vision of the whole glorified church*, Matt. xxv.

The interpretation of this sixth seal is a crucial point in Apocalyptic exegesis. We may unhesitatingly set down all interpretations as wrong, which view as the fulfilment of this passage any period except that of the coming of the Lord. See the grounds of this below. **And I saw when he opened the sixth seal, and a great earthquake took place** (we have no word but "*earthquake*" for σεισμός, but it does not by any means cover the meaning. For here the heavens are shaken (against Düsterd.), and the sea, and the dry land. See Hag. ii. 6, 7, and the comment in Heb. xii. 26 f. Compare also Zech. xiv. 4, 5), **and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair** (see ref. Isa. The cloth meant is the cilicium: see note on Acts xviii. 3. This answers to Matt. xxiv. 29,—εὐθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται . . . . , and to ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος, in Joel ii. 31), **and the whole moon** (i. e. not the moon in her crescent or her incomplete form, but entire; as we say, the full moon) **became as blood** (so Matt. l. c., καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς; and Joel ii. 31, καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ), **and the stars of the heaven fell to the earth** (so Matt. l. c., καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), **as a fig-tree casteth her unripe figs** (ὄλυνθος, τὸ μὴ πεπαμμένον σῦκον, Hesych. De W. explains it to mean, the winter figs, which almost always fall off unripe) **when shaken by a great wind** (so Matt. again, l. c., καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. It is remarkable, that in Matt., when the description has finished, the next words are ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν. The similitude from the fig-tree, though a different one, rises to the mind of the Apostle as he sees in vision the fulfilment of his Master's words which were so shortly followed by a similar illustration. The imagery itself, as that in the beginning of the next verse, is from Isa. xxxiv. 4). **And the heaven parted asunder as a scroll when rolled up** (the stars having fallen from it, the firmament itself was removed away, as an open scroll which is rolled up and put by. So also almost verbatim,

d Mark vi. 21. ch. xviii. 23 only. Isa. xxxiv. 12 al.
e ch. xix. 18. Mark vi. 21. John xviii. 12 only, exc. Acts xxi.—xxv. passim. 1 Chron. xiii. 1.
f ch. v. 2 al. Prov. xvi. 32. Lam. i. 15 al.
g ch. xiii. 16 reff.
h Matt. xxi. 13 ‖ (from Jer. vii. 11). John xi. 38. Heb. xi. 38 only. Isa. ii. (10) 19.
i Hosea x. 8. Luke xxiii. 30.
k see Nah. i. 6.
l = (John vii. 37. xix. 31.) Acts ii. 20 (from Joel ii. 31). Jude 6.
m see Luke xxi. 36. Ps. xxxv. 12.

ACP℞ B a b c e *to* n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 28. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

αὐτῶν ^b ἐκινήθησαν. ^15 καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ^d μεγιστᾶνες καὶ οἱ ^e χιλίαρχοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ ^f ἰσχυροὶ καὶ πᾶς ^g δοῦλος καὶ ^g ἐλεύθερος ἔκρυψαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὰ ^h σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς πέτρας τῶν ὀρέων, ^16 καὶ λέγουσιν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ταῖς πέτραις ^i Πέσατε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ κρύψατε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ^k προσώπου τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ^k ὀργῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου, ^17 ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ^l ἡμέρα ἡ ^l μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τίς ^m δύναται ^m σταθῆναι;

om αυτων ℵ c 26. απεκεινησαν A : εκινησαν ℵ[1].

15. rec transp χιλιαρχοι and πλουσιοι, with 1. 36-8: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. —om και bef οι χιλ. A. rec (for και οι ισχυροι) και οι δυνατοι: om 1. 12. 36: txt AC[P](ℵ) B rel Andr Areth.—om οι ℵ g. rec ins πας bef ελευθερος, with [P]ℵ[3a] h n 1. 10 7. 38 (37. 49 Br, e sil) copt Andr: om AC B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth.—om και ελευθερος ℵ[1].

16. (πεσατε, so A[P] l n.) κρυψεται(sic) ℵ e. rec του θρονου, with [P] B e f[1] h l n 1. 10-7-8-9. 36 (38-9. 40-2-7-9 Br, e sil) Andr-coisl Areth: txt ACℵ rel Andr. for 2nd απο, επι ℵ.

17. for αυτου, αυτων Cℵ 38 vulg syr-dd Fulg Promiss: txt A[P] B rel copt Andr Areth Primas.

Isa. xxxiv. 4), **and every mountain and island were moved out of their places** (cf. again Matt. xxiv. 35, ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται: the whole earth is broken up by a change as total as any of those previous ones which have prepared it for its present inhabitants. Cf. ch. xvi. 20; and Nahum i. 5, τὰ ὄρη ἐσείσθησαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ ἐσαλεύθησαν, καὶ ἀνεστάλη ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἡ σύμπασα καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ). **And the kings of the earth and the great men** (the word μεγιστᾶνες belongs to later Greek. It serves here to designate the great civil officers, statesmen and courtiers, as distinguished from the next following) **and the chief captains** (see reff., especially those in Acts, where the officer in command of the garrison at Jerusalem is so called) **and the rich men and the strong men** (hitherto the enumeration has comprised all those who from their circumstances would have most ground for trust in the permanence of the existing state of the earth: these last, the ἰσχυροί, being perhaps the physically strong, cf. Ps. xxxii. 16: or perhaps all those who on account of any ἰσχύς, physical or intellectual, are of the number of the sturdy or stout-hearted. The word is commonly used by the LXX as an epithet or even as a name (ὁ ἰσχυρός) of Jehovah: but also as here: see reff. Now, the catalogue becomes more general) **and every man, bond and free, hid themselves in** (εἰς, pregn.; ran for shelter *into*) **the caves and in the rocks of the mountains** (see reff. Isa., from which the imagery comes), **and say to the mountains and to the rocks, Fall upon us and hide us from the countenance** (see ref., and cf. Ps. xxxiii. 16, πρόσωπον κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά) **of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb** (the imagery is from Hosea x. 8, further impressed by our Lord's solemn saying on the way to Calvary, Luke xxiii. 30:—the meaning, that all these shall seek death or annihilation in terror of the coming day, when they shall have to stand before God): **because the great day** (we have no way in English of expressing the ἡ μεγάλη without an awkward periphrasis. The art. lifts the adjective out of its mere epithetal office, and makes it almost a *title*—the day, that great day: cf. Acts viii. 10, where the people say of Simon Magus, οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη. This name, ἡ ἡμ. ἡ μεγάλη, if properly considered, should have kept expositors firm here to the great verity of this part of the Apocalyptic visions, and prevented them from going in omnia alia as they have done) **of His wrath is come** (the virtually *perfect* sense of the aor. ἦλθεν here can hardly be questioned. Yet even here an account may be given of the aoristic use: see note on ch. xi. 15), **and who is able to stand** (reff., and Mal. iii. 2)? We are thus brought to the very threshold itself of the great day of the Lord's coming. It has not yet happened: but the tribes of the earth are troubled at its immediate

...39. ACPℵ b a b c e l o n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Bʳ.

VII. 1 [Καὶ] μετὰ τοῦτο εἶδον τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους ἑστῶτας ἐπὶ τὰς [n] τέσσαρας [n] γωνίας τῆς γῆς [o] κρατοῦντας τοὺς [p] τέσσαρας [p] ἀνέμους τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μὴ [q] πνέῃ ἄνεμος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μήτε ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης μήτε ἐπί [τι] δένδρον. 2 Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα ἀπὸ [r] ἀνατολῆς [r] ἡλίου, ἔχοντα [s] σφραγῖδα [st] θεοῦ [t] ζῶντος, καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις [u] οἷς [v] ἐδόθη [u] αὐτοῖς [w] ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, 3 λέγων Μὴ [w] ἀδι-

n ch. xx. 8. Ezek. xliii. 20. (vii. 2.) o ch. ii. 1. p Matt. xxiv. 31 || Mk. Jer. xxv. (xlix.) 36. Dan. vii. 2. Zech. ii. 6. q Matt. vii. 25, 27. Luke xii. 55. John iii. 8. vi. 18. Acts xxvii. 40 only. Isa. xl. 24. r so ch. xvi. 12. Job i. 3. Isa. xi. 14. s ch. ix. 4. see Rom. iv. 11. t Acts xiv. 15. Rom. ix. 26 (from Hos. i. 10). 2 Cor. iii. 3. vi. 16. 1 Tim. iii. 15. iv. 10. Heb. iii. 12. ix. 14. xii. 22. ch. xv. 7. u constr., ch. iii. 8 reff. v ch. ii. 7 reff. w = ch. vi. 6 reff.

Chap. VII. 1. om και AC vulg copt Primas: ins [P]ℵ B rel syr-dd æth Andr Areth. rec (for τουτο) ταυτα, with g n 1. 33 (27. 30. 47, e sil) vss Andr Primas: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel copt Andr-coisl Areth. [τεσσαρες (2nd) P.] for ανεμους, αγγελους 1. πνευση ℵ m 34. 40. ins ο bef ανεμος C a f g k 26. 30. om επι της γης A. om της (bef θαλασσης) A. for last μητε, μη C. rec (for τι) παν, with [P]ℵ h n 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 Bʳ, e sil) Andr: om A syr-dd æth: τινι 19: txt C B rel vulg copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas. δενδρου A: δενδρων syr-dd æth.
2. rec (for αναβαινοντα) αναβαντα, with 1: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Orig Andr Areth. ανατολων A 90. σφαργιδα(sic) ℵ[1]. εκραζεν A[P] Andr-a-p. τεσσαρες(sic) ℵ[1].
[3. λεγον(sic) P.]

approach, and those terrible signs with which all Scripture ushers it in, have taken place. We are now then arrived at the time described in Matt. xxiv. 30: the coming itself of the Son of man being for a while kept in the background, as hereafter to be resumed. He is seen as it were coming: but before the vengeance is fully accomplished, the elect of God then living on the earth must be gathered, as Matt. xxiv. 31, out of the four winds of heaven, from among the inhabitants of the earth. To this ingathering the sealing in our text is the necessary preliminary. The correspondence between the series of prophecies holds even in the minutest particulars, and where they do not correspond, their very differences are full of instruction. See these pointed out as we proceed.

Ch. VII. 1—8.] *The sealing of the Elect.* **[And] after this** (these words, **μετὰ τοῦτο**, shew that the opening of the sixth seal is complete, and that what is now to follow,—viz. the two visions each introduced with similar words, μετὰ τοῦτο (ταῦτα) εἶδον,—comes in by way of episode. They represent two great events, the sealing of the elect on earth, and the great final assemblage of the saints in heaven. The great day of the Lord's judgment is not described; it is all but brought before us under the sixth seal, and is actually going on in the first of these episodes (see below): but only that part of it which regards the saints appears to us, and that only by its result – their gathering in to heaven) **I saw four angels** (not, as many interpreters, *bad* angels; nor does it necessarily follow that we are to adopt the analogy of ch. xvi. 5 and to regard them as "angels of the winds:" but simply angels, to whom this office is committed. This is all that is declared to us in the text, and it is idle to enquire beyond it. All allegorizing and all individualizing interpretations are out of the question) **standing upon the four corners** (**ἐπί** with accus. at the first appearance, as indicating the *coming into* that position, "sensu prægnanti;" see on ch. iv. 2) **of the earth** (i. e. North, South, East, and West, the cardinal points from which the winds blow) **holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind may not blow on the earth nor on the sea, nor against any** (or **a**, i. e. *any*) **tree** (the three disjunctives, μήτε, merely couple, without any climax), **and I saw another angel** (as before, simply an angel; not as has been fancied, our Lord, nor the Holy Spirit; cf. τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν below) **coming up from the rising of the sun** (**ἀναβαίνοντα**, because the rising of the sun is low on the earth's horizon, whereas the Apostle was in heaven, looking down on the earth: and **ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου**, as naturally agreeing with the glorious and salutary nature of his employment. Cf. Ezek. xliii. 2; Mal. iv. 2. The allegorical interpretations which have been given are entirely uncountenanced in the text), **having the seal** (**σφραγῖδα**, though anarthrous, is defined by the possessive gen. following) **of the living God** (**ζῶντος**, as giving to the seal solemnity and vital import): **and he cried with a great voice to the four angels to whom it was**

κησητε τὴν γῆν μήτε τὴν θάλασσαν μήτε τὰ δένδρα, [x] ἄχρι [y] σφραγίσωμεν τοὺς [z] δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν [a] μετώπων αὐτῶν. [4] καὶ ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν [y] ἐσφραγισμένων, ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες [y] ἐσφραγισμένοι ἐκ [b] πάσης φυλῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ· [5] ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα

x ch. xv. 8. xvii. 17. xx. 3, 5. y = here, &c. only. (John vi. 27. Eph. i. 13. iv. 30. ch. x. 4 reff.) z = Matt. xxv. 14. Ezra v. 11. a Rev. only; ch. ix. 4. xiii. 16. xiv. 1, 9. xvii. 5. xx. 4. xxii. 4. Ezek. ix. 4. b = ver. 9. Eph. iii. 15. Col. iv. 12. 1 Pet. i. 15 al.

ACPℵB a b c e *l* o n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 B[r].

αδικησεται(sic) ℵ: *αδικισειτε* l. for 1st *μητε*, *και* A 37-8. 41-2 vulg(with am, agst demid fuld lips-4 tol): *μητε* n, *μηδε* (twice) ℵ. rec (for *αχρι*) *αχρις ου*, with B rel Andr Areth: *αχρις αν* n 18 Andr-a: txt AC[P]ℵ(*αχρις*) 1. 12 Orig$_2$.

4. om *και* . . . . *εσφραγισμενων* A. *ηκουσαν*(sic) ℵ. om *τεσσαρες* ℵ c. *χιλιαδας* 1.

given (reff.) **to injure** (viz. by letting loose the winds, which they as yet held in) **the earth and the sea, saying, Do not ye injure the earth nor the sea nor the trees, until we** (not *I:* see Matt. xxiv. 31, cited below) **shall have sealed the servants of our God** (the God alike of the speaker and of those addressed) **upon their foreheads** (the noblest, as well as the most conspicuous part of the human frame).

This vision stands in the closest analogy with Matt. xxiv. 31, where immediately after the appearing of the sign of the Son of man and the mourning of the tribes of the earth, we read *καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος φωνῆς μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ἀπ' ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως ἄκρων αὐτῶν.* The judgment of the great day is in fact going on in the background; but in this first and general summary of the divine judgments and dealings, in which the sighs of Creation and of the Church for Christ's coming are set before us, only that portion of its proceedings is described which has reference to these two. When the strain is again taken up, the case and reference are different.

The questions now arise, 1) who are these that are sealed? and 2) what is the intent of their being sealed? 1) Those who have followed the preceding course of interpretation will have no difficulty in anticipating the reply. They are, primarily, those elect of God who shall be living upon earth at the time here indicated, viz. that of the coming of the Lord: those indicated in Matt. xxiv. 31, above cited. (On the import and reason of the use of *Israel* and its tribes, I shall speak below.) As such, they are not *identical with*, but are *included in*, the great multitude which no man can number of ver. 9 ff. But they are also symbolical of the first-fruits of the Church: see notes on ch. xiv. 1 ff.

4.] **And I heard the number of the sealed, an hundred and forty-four thousand sealed** (the number is symbolical of fixedness and full completion, 12 × 12, taken a thousand fold. No one that I am aware of has taken it literally, and supposed that just this particular number and no more is imported. The import for us is that the Lord knoweth and sealeth His own: that the fulness of their number shall be accomplished and not one shall fail: and, from what follows, that the least as well as the greatest of the portions of his Church, shall furnish its quota to this blessed company: see more below) **from every tribe** (i.e. from the sum of the tribes; from every tribe, all being taken together. This is evident from what follows. For this accumulative sense of *πᾶς* with an anarthrous substantive, see reff. and Winer, edn. 6, § 18. 4) **of the sons of Israel** (this has been variously understood. By many, and even by the most recent Commentator, Düsterdieck, these sealed ones are taken to represent Jewish believers: the chosen out of the actual children of Israel. I need hardly say that such an interpretation seems to me to be quite inconsistent with the usage of this book. Our rule in such cases must be, to interpret a term, where it may possibly be ambiguous, by the use of the same term, if we can discover any, in a place or places where it is clear and unmistakeable. Now in the description of the heavenly Jerusalem, ch. xxi. 9 ff., we have the names *τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ* inscribed on its 12 gates. Can there be any doubt as to the import of those names in that place? Is it not that the city thus inscribed is the dwelling-place of the Israel of God? Or are the upholders of the literal sense here prepared to carry it out there, and to regard these inscribed names as importing that none but the literal descendants of Israel dwelt within? (For observe that such an inference could not be escaped by the fact of the names of the 12 Apostles being inscribed on its foundations: those being individual names, the others collective.) It seems certain, by this expression

δώδεκα χιλιάδες [y] ἐσφραγισμένοι, ἐκ φυλῆς Ῥουβὴν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Γὰδ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, [6] ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσὴρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Νεφθαλὶμ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Μανασσῆ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, [7] ἐκ φυλῆς Συμεὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Λευὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰσσαχὰρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, [8] ἐκ φυλῆς Ζαβουλὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰωσὴφ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμὶν δώδεκα χιλιάδες ἐσφραγισμένοι.

5—8. rec aft *χιλιαδες* ins *εσφραγισμενοι* (ten times), with c (6 Br ?) vulg Areth: twice (in ver. 5) l (-*νων*) 1: once, n: om AC[P]ℵ B rel harl[1] syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Primas.
5. om *εκ φ. γαδ δωδ. χιλ.* ℵ: for *γαδ*, *δᾶδ* 1. **6.** *νεφθαλι* ℵ.
7. om *εκ φ. συμ. δωδ. χιλ.* ℵ m 35. *λευει* ℵ. (*ισσαχαρ*, so A[P]ℵ 1.)
8. transp *ιωσηφ* and *βενιαμιν* ℵ. *βενναμειν* [A]P. *εσφραγισμεναι* B rel: om 36: txt ACℵ f h m n 10. 35 Br (1. 16-7. 30-7-8. 40-7-9, e sil). [P def., having only the beginning of the word.]

being again used there "totidem verbis," that the Apostle must here, as there, have intended Israel to be taken ⌜not as the Jewish nation, but as the Israel of God.⌟ Again, we have a striking indication furnished in ch. iii. 12, who these children of Israel are, and to what city they belong:—ὁ νικῶν . . . γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν. These words serve to bind together the sealing here, and the vision of the new Jerusalem in ch. xxi. Nor is it any valid objection to this view that the persons calling themselves Jews in ch. ii. 9, iii. 9, have been taken to be actual Jews. There is a wide difference in the circumstances there, as there is also in the appellation itself): **out of the tribe of Judah, twelve thousand sealed, &c. &c.** The points to be noticed in this enumeration are, 1) ⌜that with the exception of Judah being placed first, the order of the tribes does not seem to follow any assignable principle.⌟ It may indeed be not without reason, that Reuben, the eldest, next follows Judah, and Benjamin the youngest is placed last, with Joseph his own brother: but beyond this all is uncertainty: as any one will find, who attempts to apply to the order any imaginable rule of arrangement. So far has been generally confessed. "Nullus servatur ordo, quia omnes in Christo pares," says Grotius. 2) That the tribe of Dan is omitted. This is accounted for by the fathers and ancient interpreters, from the idea (founded on Gen. xlix. 17) that antichrist was to arise from this tribe. So Areth. in Catena,—ἡ τοῦ Δὰν φυλὴ τῆς σωτηρίας ἐκβέβληται, ἅτε μαινόυσα τὸν Ἀντίχριστον, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συγκροτουμένη, καὶ τούτῳ προσανέχουσα, καὶ καύχημα τοῦτον προβαλλομένη καὶ κλέος ἀκλέες καὶ ὀλέθριον: by most Commentators, from the fact, that this tribe was the first to fall into idolatry, see Judg. xviii.: by others (Grot., Ewald, De W., Ebrard, Düsterd., al.), from the fact that this tribe had been long ago as good as extinct. Grot. quotes for this a Jewish tradition,—"jam olim ea tribus ad unam familiam Hussim reciderat, ut aiunt Hebræi, quæ ipsa familia bellis interiisse videtur ante Esdræ tempora." Accordingly we find in 1 Chron. iv. ff. where all Israel are reckoned by genealogies, that this tribe is omitted altogether. This latter seems the more probable account here, seeing that in order to the number 12 being kept, some one of the smaller tribes must be omitted. In Deut. xxxiii., Simeon is omitted. 3) That instead of Ephraim, *Joseph* is mentioned. We have a somewhat similar instance in Num. xiii. 11, with this difference, that there it is "of the tribe of Joseph, namely of the tribe of Manasseh." The substitution here has been accounted for by the "untheocratic" recollections connected with the name Ephraim (so e. g. Düsterd.). But this may well be questioned. In the prophecy of Hosea, where the name so frequently occurs, it designates Israel repentant, as well as Israel backsliding; cf. especially Hos. xiv. 4—8, the recollection of which would admirably fit the spirit of this present passage. I should rather suppose that some practice had arisen which the Apostle adopts, of calling the tribe of Ephraim by this name. 4) That the tribe of Levi is included among the rest, hardly appears to depend on the reason assigned by Bengel, al., that the Levitical ceremonies being now at an end, all are alike priests and have access to

c ch. iii. 8 reff. d Matt. x. 30. Luke xii. 7 only. Gen. xvi. 10. e = ver. 4 reff. f ch. v. 9 reff. g plur., ch. x. 11. xi. 9. xvii. 15. Luke ii. 31. Acts iv. 25 (from Ps. ii. 1), 27. Rom. xv. 11. h constr., see ch. i... i ch. i. 4 reff.

[9] Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολύς, [c] ὃν [d] ἀριθμῆσαι [c] αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο, ἐκ [e] παντὸς [f] ἔθνους καὶ [f] φυλῶν καὶ [fg] λαῶν καὶ [f] γλωσσῶν, * [h] ἑστῶτας [i] ἐνώπιον

9. om ιδου C. οχλον πολυν A vulg copt æth Primas. for ον, και A: ... ℵ[1]. om αυτον B rel Andr Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ f 1. 33 (13. 26-7. 36 B[r], e sil). rec ηδυνατο, with [P] f g m n 1. 18-9. 35 (16. 37-9. 40 1-2. 51, e sil) Meth Andr: δυναται k: txt ACℵ B rel. om και φυλων 1. * rec ἑστῶτες, with A[P]ℵ 10-7-8. 36 (h j 1. 13. 37. 40-1-2-9. 90 B[r], e sil) Andr: ἑστώτων C 38: εστωτα a 11-9. εστωτας B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

God: for in some O. T. catalogues, even where territorial division is in question, Levi is not omitted: the cities of the priests being mentioned under the head of this tribe. Cf. 1 Chron. vi.

It yet remains to enquire, before passing on to the second vision in this episode, what is the import and intent of the sealing here mentioned. It has been the general view, that it was to exempt those sealed from the judgments which were to come on the unbelieving. And it can hardly be denied, that this view receives strong support from Scripture analogy, e. g. that of Exod. xii. and Ezek. ix., especially the latter, where the exempted ones are marked, as here, on their foreheads. It is also borne out by our ch. ix. 4, where these sealed ones are by implication exempted from the plague of the locusts from the pit. It is again hardly possible to weigh fairly the language used in this place itself, without coming to the same conclusion. The four angels are commanded not to begin their work of destruction, until the sealing has taken place. For what imaginable reason could such a prohibition be uttered, unless those who were to be sealed were to be marked out for some purpose connected with that work? And for what purpose could they be thus marked out, if not for exemption? The objection brought against this view by Düsterd., that so far from being exempt from trials, the saints in glory have come out of great tribulation, is grounded on the mistake of not distinguishing between the trials of the people of God and the judgments on the unbelieving world. In the latter, the saints have no part, as neither had the children of Israel in the plagues of Egypt. And indeed the very symbolism here used, in which the elect are pointed out under the names of the 12 tribes, serves to remind us of this ancient exemption. At the same time, exemption from the coming plagues is not the only object of the sealing. It serves a positive as well as a negative purpose. It appropriates to God those upon whom it has passed. For the seal contains His own Name, cf. ch. iii. 12, xiv. 1. And thus they are not only gathered out of the world, but declared to be ready to be gathered into the city of God. And thus the way is prepared for the next vision in the episode.

9—17.] *The great multitude of the redeemed in heaven.* The opening of the sixth seal introduced the coming of the Lord. The first vision of the episode revealed the gathering together of the elect from the four winds. But before the seventh and *last* seal can be opened and the book of God's purposes be unrolled, not only must all things on this earth be accomplished, but the whole multitude of the redeemed must be gathered in to the joy of their Lord. Then, and not till then, shall we know even as we are known, and read the mystery of God's ways without hindrance. Accordingly, in this sublime vision we are admitted to a sight of the finished state of glory, in which the seventh seal shall be opened. **After these things** (see above on ver. 1. The term indicates separation from that which went before, and introduces a second and distinct vision in the episode) **I saw, and behold a great multitude, which** (construction, see reff.) **no one could** (the past ἐδύνατο represents the classical ἂν δύναιτο: not that the attempt was actually made, but that if made it was sure to fail) **number, out of every nation** (see ch. v. 9) **and (all) tribes and peoples and tongues** (observe, that this very specification, of a multitude without number, carries us on past the first or millennial resurrection, indicated in the two former parables of Matt. xxv. (see notes there), and past the final judgment sublimely described at the end of that chapter: *οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον* is the point at which our vision takes up that prophecy. We have *οἱ δίκαιοι*, in their robes of righteousness, made white in the blood of the Lamb, already, vv. 15—17, in the midst of those pleasures for

τοῦ [i] θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου, [j] περιβεβλημένους [kl] στολὰς [km] λευκάς, καὶ [n] φοίνικες ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν, 10 καὶ κράζουσιν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγοντες Ἡ [o] σωτηρία τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν τῷ [p] καθημένῳ [p] ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ. 11 καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι [q] εἱστήκεισαν [r] κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων, καὶ [st] ἔπεσαν [is] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [i] θρόνου ἐπὶ τὰ [t] πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ 12 λέγοντες Ἀμήν· ἡ [u] εὐλογία καὶ ἡ [v] δόξα καὶ ἡ [w] σοφία καὶ ἡ [x] εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ [y] δύναμις καὶ ἡ [z] ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν. 13 καὶ [a] ἀπεκρίθη εἷς ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγων μοι

j constr., Matt. vi. 31. Mark xiv. 51. xvi. 5. ver. 13. ch. x. 1. xi. 3 al. Jer. iv. 30. see ch. iii. 5 reff.
k Mark xvi. 5. ver. 13. ch. vi. 11.
l as above (k). Luke xv. 22. xx. 46. vv. 13, 14. ch. xxii. 14. Esth. vi. 8. Ezek. x. 2.
m see ch. iii. 4, 5 reff.
n = here (John xii. 13) only. (Ps. xci. 12.) 2 Macc. xiv. 4.
o (but w. gen.) ch. xii. 10. xix. 1. Ps. iii. 8.
p ch. v. 13 reff.
q see Matt. xii. 46.
r ch. iv. 6 reff.
s ch. iv. 10 reff.
t ch. xi. 16 reff.
u 1 Cor. x. 16. ch. v. 12, 13. Neh. ix. 5. Sir. l. 20.
v = Jude 25 reff.
w = ch. v. 12.
x Rev., ch. iv. 9 only. = Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 15 al.
y ch. iv. 11 reff.
z ch. v. 13. 1 Chron. xxix. 11.
a = Matt. xi. 25. Acts iii. 12 al. Deut. xxv. 9 al.

for 1st ενωπιον, επι A. rec περιβεβλημενοι, with [P]ℵ[3a] n 1. 10-7-8 (h j 37-9 B[r], e sil) Andr Fulg[1] : περιβεβλημενας g 47 : txt ACℵ[1] B rel Andr-coisl Areth Fulg[1]. φοινικας ℵ[1] B rel Areth : txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] m (l 1. 13-7-9. 38, e sil) vulg Andr.

10. rec (for κραζουσιν) κραζοντες, with 1 Andr-p(Del.) Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr lat-ff, κραξουσιν m. Steph om τω θεω ημων, with 1 : ins C[P]ℵ B rel, του θεου A, των k. om τω καθημενω ℵ[1]. rec του θρονου, with ℵ[3a] B l 1. 17-8. 36 (j 37-8. 47. 51, e sil) : txt AC[P]ℵ[1] rel Andr Areth. Steph (aft θρον.) ins του θεου ημων, with 37-8 : θεω ημων 1 : om AC[P]ℵ B rel. του αρνιου ℵ[3a], το αρνιον k : επι τω αρν. 40. at end ins εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων αμην ℵ[1](ℵ[3a] disapproving).

11. om οι ℵ[1]. rec εστηκεσαν (for -κεισαν), with 1. 17. 33. 51 (26 Bch's-5-mss, e sil) : txt A[P] rel Andr Areth, -κησαν B l[2] 32-5-6. 50[1], -κισαν Cℵ.—rec εστ., with C 9. 13-7. 30. 51 (26 Bch's-5-mss, e sil) : txt B rel Andr Areth, ιστ. A[P]ℵ 36. (επεσαν, so AC[P]ℵ 9[1]. 13-6. 27. 33.) aft θρονου ins αυτου B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth : om AC[P]ℵ g h n 10-7-8 (1. 37-8. 40-1. 49. 51 B[r], e sil) vulg Andr lat-ff. rec (for τα προσωπα) προσωπον, with 1 copt Andr-p Fulg: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd arm Andr Areth Primas.

12. om η (bef ευχαρ.) ℵ[1] k. om 2nd αμην C 36 Andr-p Primas Fulg Ansb.

13. om εκ ℵ : εις των πρεσβ. λεγων μοι is repeated by ℵ[1].

evermore which always stand in Scripture for a description of the employments of the life everlasting) **standing before the throne and before the Lamb** (by these words the vision is fixed as belonging to that heaven itself which has been previously described, ch. iv. The celestial scene becomes filled with this innumerable throng: its other inhabitants remaining as before) **clothed in white robes** (see ch. vi. 11, note: and below, ver. 14), **and palm-branches in their hands** (bearing the palm-branch was a mark of festal joy, cf. John xii. 13; 1 Macc. xiii. 51: and this practice extended beyond the Jews, cf. Paus. Arcad. 48, *οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον· εἰς δὲ τὴν δεξιὰν ἐστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστιθέμενος φοῖνιξ*. Remember also Virgil's "palmæ, pretium victoribus," Æn. v. 111. As regards the palm-*branch* being also called *φοῖνιξ*, we have the authority of Pollux (Wetst.), *τοῦ μέντοι φοίνικος καὶ ὁ κλάδος ὁμωνύμως φοῖνιξ καλεῖται*): **and they cry** (the pres. expresses their unceasing occupation) **with a loud voice, saying, Salvation** (*ἡ σωτηρία*, the praise of our salvation: the ascription of the salvation which we have obtained) **(be) to our God who sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb.** 11, 12.] The choir of angels, as in ch. v. 11, respond to the ascription of praise. **And all the angels were standing** (*εἱστήκειν* is in sense imperfect, just as *ἕστηκα* is in sense present: this latter importing "I have placed myself," = "I stand," and the former "I had placed myself," = "I was standing") **round the throne and the elders and the four living-beings, and fell before the throne on their faces** (then they were in the vision in the similitude of men) **and worshipped God, saying, Amen: the blessing and the glory and the wisdom and the thanksgiving and the honour and the power and the might** (observe the sevenfold ascription) **be to our God unto the ages of the ages. Amen.**

13—17.] *Explanation of the vision.* **And one of the elders answered** (on this

b ver. 9.
c perf. as aor., ch. v. 7 reff.
d Ezek. xxxvii. 3.
e Matt. xxiv 21.
f ch. xxii. 14 only. Gen. xlix. 11.
g as above (f). Luke v. 2 only.
h Mark ix. 3 only. Psa. l. 7. Isa. i. 18.
i see ch. i. 5. (Heb. ix. 14. 1 John i. 7.)

Οὗτοι οἱ [b] περιβεβλημένοι τὰς [b] στολὰς τὰς [b] λευκάς, τίνες εἰσίν, καὶ πόθεν ἦλθον; [14] καὶ [c] εἴρηκα αὐτῷ [d] Κύριέ μου, σὺ οἶδας. καὶ εἶπέν μοι Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς [e] θλίψεως τῆς [e] μεγάλης, καὶ [fg] ἔπλυναν τὰς [fb] στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ [h] ἐλεύκαναν [αὐτὰς] ἐν τῷ [i] αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου. [15] διὰ

...ουτοι εισιν C. APℵ B a b c e to n, 1. 2. 4. 6 9. 10-3. 16 to 19 26-7. 30. 32 to 36. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

om 2nd *τας* C n. om *εισιν* 1.

14. for *ειρηκα*, *ειπον* B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ n 36 Andr. rec om *μου*, with A 1 æth Primas: ins C[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Cypr. om *μοι* ℵ. *απο θλιψ. μεγ.* [omg *της* twice] A. *επλατυναν* a b e g j k 2. 9. 13[1]. 30. 41-2. 50. 82: *επλατειναν* 1. rec aft *ελευκαναν* ins *στολας αυτων* (with n?); *αυτας* A[P]ℵ h(n?) 1. 10-2-9. 37. 49 Br vulg Andr-p lat-ff: om B rel æth arm Andr-coisl Areth.

use of *ἀπεκρίθη*, see reff.) **saying to me** (the elders symbolizing the Church, one of them fitly stands out as the interpreter of this vision in which the glorified Church is represented), **These that are clothed in the white robes, who are they, and whence came they** ('ad hoc interrogat, ut doceat,' Bede. The questions are those ordinarily put when we seek for information respecting strangers. Wetst. compares the *τίς; πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν;* of Homer, and the "Qui genus? unde domo?" of Virgil. Both enquiries are answered in ver. 14)? **And I said to him, My Lord** (the address is one of deep reverence as to a heavenly being. See the limits of this reverence in ch. xix. 10, xxii. 8, 9), **thou knowest** (see ref. Ezek., from which the form of expression comes. The *σὺ οἶδας* must not with Ebrard be forced to mean, "I know well, but thou knowest better:" but must be taken in its simple acceptation, "I know not, but thou dost." And this again need not mean that the Apostle had no thought on the subject, but that he regarded himself as ignorant in comparison with his heavenly interlocutor). **And he said to me, These are they that come** (not, as E. V., "that *came*:" nor again must the *present* be put prominently forward, that *are coming*, as if the number in the vision were not yet complete: still less is it to be taken as a quasi-future, "that *shall come*," cf. *ἔπλυναν* and *ἐλεύκαναν* below;—but as in the expression *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, the present is merely one of *designation*. Their description, generically, is, that "they are they that *come*," &c.) **out of the great tribulation** (the definite art. ought not to be omitted as in E. V. It is most emphatic: "out of the tribulation, the great one." And in consequence some, e. g. Düsterd., have explained the words of that last great time of trial which is to try the saints before the coming of the Lord. But to limit it to this only, is manifestly out of keeping with the spirit of the vision. I would rather understand it of the whole sum of the trials of the saints of God, viewed by the Elder as now complete, and designated by this emphatic and general name: q. d. "all that tribulation"), **and they washed their robes** (the aor. is that so often used of the course of this life when looked back upon from its yonder side: they did this in that life on earth which is now (in the vision) past and gone by) **and made them white** (the reff. are full of interest) **in the blood of the Lamb** (i. e. by that faith in the atoning blood of Christ of which it is said, *τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*, Acts xv. 9: and 1 John i. 7, *τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ .... καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας.* See also Eph. v. 25—27. Several of the ancient Commentators have misunderstood this: e. g. Areth.,—*φαμὲν ὡς ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῶν ἡ ὑπὲρ χριστοῦ ἔκχυσις πάσης ἀπήλλαξεν αὐτοὺς κηλῖδος. τῷ γὰρ οἰκείῳ αἵματι βαπτισθέντες λευκοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου λουτροῦ ἀνέβησαν πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτῶν βασιλέα χριστόν*: and, though differently, Joachim:—"sed cum sancti martyres in sanguine suo baptizati sint, quomodo sanguini Christi ascribitur quod abluti sunt, et non potius proprio sanguini quem pro Christo fuderunt? sed sciendum est, quod postquam empti sumus sanguine Christi, et ejus sacratissimo cruori communicare concessi, etiam sanguis noster sanguis ejus effectus est." Similarly Lyra: "merito dicitur sanguis Agni, quia est sanguis membrorum ejus, in quibus dicit se persecutionem pati." Ansbert ambiguously, "eas in sanguine agni candificant, subaudis, in Christi passionibus habitum mentis exornant." And Ewald has fallen into the same mistake: "sanguine Christi, i. e. cæde quam ob Christi doctrinam, Christi et in hac re exemplar secuti, passi sunt." Observe, we must not separate the two acts, washing and making white, as Hengstb., interpreting the former of the forgiveness of sins, the

τοῦτό εἰσιν [k] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [k] θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ [lm] λατρεύουσιν αὐτῷ [mn] ἡμέρας καὶ [mn] νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ [o] καθήμενος [o] ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου [p] σκηνώσει [q] ἐπ' αὐτούς. 16 οὐ [r] πεινάσουσιν ἔτι οὐδὲ [r] διψήσουσιν ἔτι, * οὐδ' οὐ μὴ [s] πέσῃ [s] ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ [t] ἥλιος οὐδὲ [u] πᾶν [v] καῦμα, 17 ὅτι τὸ ἀρνίον τὸ [w] ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θρόνου [x] ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς καὶ [y] ὁδηγήσει αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ [z] ζωῆς [z] πηγὰς [z] ὑδάτων, καὶ [ab] ἐξαλείψει ὁ θεὸς πᾶν [b] δακρύον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.

k ch. i. 4 reff.
l ch. xxii. 3 reff.
m so, but acc., Luke ii. 37. Acts xxvi. 7.
n gen., ch. iv. 8 reff.
o see ch. iv. 2 note.
p John i. 14. ch. xii. 12. xiii. 6. xxi. 3 only. J. Gen. xiii. 12. Judg. viii. 11 B only. (Lev. xxvi. 11. Ezek. xxxvii. 27.)
q = Luke ii. 8. v. 27. xii. 14. Acts xxi. 5.
r Matt. v. 6. John vi. 35. Isa. xlix. 10.
s = ch. viii. 10. Matt. xxi. 44 ‖ L. Amos ix. 9.
t = Isa. l. c. Ps. cxx. 6.
u = ch. ix. 4. Matt. xxiv. 22. Acts x. 14. Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16. Exod. xv. 26.
v ch. xvi. 9 only. Isa. xviii. 4. = καύσων, l. c.
w = Matt. xiii. 25. Mark vii. 31 (1 Cor. vi. 5) only. Isa. lvii. 5. see ch. v. 6.
x ch. ii. 27 reff.
y Matt. xv. 14 ‖ L. John xvi. 13. Acts viii. 31 only. Psa. xxii. 3.
z ch. xxi. 6. (xxii. 1, 17. John iv. 10. vii. 38. Psa. xxxv. 9. Prov. xviii. 4. Isa. l. c.) Jer. ii. 13 BN. (xvii. 13.)
a ch. iii. 5 reff.
b ch. xxi. 4. Isa. xxv. 8 Symm. (ἀφεῖλε LXX.)

C δακρυον... ACPℵ B a b c, e to n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

15. επι τω θρονω [P] B rel Areth: txt Aℵ n 1. 34-5-6. 49[1] (e j m 17-8-9 Bch's-5-mss, e sil) Andr. for σκηνωσει, γινωσκει (omg επ, which is insd by ℵ[3a]) ℵ[1] (txt ℵ[3c]): κατασκην. n 79 Andr-a.

16. om 1st ετι ℵ 36 vulg syr-dd æth arm Cypr Primas Fulg. aft 1st ουδε ins μη A f 18: om [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. διψασουσιν ℵ e[: διψησωσιν P f.] om 2nd ετι m 1. 34-5-6-8. 40 æth arm Fulg. * rec οὐδέ, with A[P]ℵ f n 1. 17-8. 36-7. 40: ουδ' ου B rel Andr Areth. aft ηλιος ins ετι (but marked for erasure) ℵ[1].

17. ποιμαινει and οδηγει a b c e g h[2] j k m 4. 6. 9. 19. 26-7. 32-3(-4-5, e sil) 47-8-9[1]. 50 Br: ποιμανει and οδηγει l 2. 13-6. 30-7. 40-1, but of these 16 (al?) has ποιμάνει. rec (for ζωης) ζωσας, with 1. 38 Andr: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg æth Andr-coisl Areth lat-ff. δρακυον ℵ[1]. rec (for εκ) απο, with ℵ f n 9. 16 (g 27. 47. 90, e sil) Andr Tert: txt AC[P] B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth Cypr. (1. 38 omit the clause.)

latter of sanctification: the latter-is only the result of the former: they washed them, and by so doing made them white. The act was a life-long one,—the continued purification of the man, body, soul, and spirit, by the application of the blood of Christ in its cleansing power). **On this account** (*because* they washed their robes white in Christ's atoning and purifying blood: for nothing that has spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, can stand where they are standing: cf. again Eph. v. 27: none will be there who are not thus washed) **they are before the throne of God** (in the presence of His throne: seeing Him (Matt. v. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 12) as He sees them), **and they serve Him by day** (gen. sing.) **and by night** ("more nostro loquens æternitatem significat," Bede) **in His temple** (as His priests, conducting the sweet praises of that heavenly choir, ver. 10, and doing what other high and blessed service He may delight to employ them in): **and He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His habitation over them** (it is exceedingly difficult to express the sense of these glorious words, in which the fulfilment of the O. T. promises, such as Levit. xxvi. 11; Isa. iv. 5, 6; Ezek. xxxvii. 27, is announced. They give the fact of the dwelling of God *among* them, united with the fact of His protection being over them, and assuring to them the exemptions next to be mentioned. In the word σκηνώσει are contained a multitude of recollections: of the pillar in the wilderness, of the Shechinah in the holy place, of the tabernacle of witness with all its symbolism. These will all now be realized and superseded by the overshadowing presence of God Himself). **They shall not hunger any more, nor yet** (the repeated οὐδέ is exclusive, and carries a climax in each clause) **thirst any more, neither shall the sun ever light upon them, no, nor any** (reff.) **heat** (as, e. g., ὁ καύσων, the sirocco, which word is used in Isa. xlix. 10, from whence this whole sentence is taken): **because the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne** (the ἀνὰ μέσον is somewhat difficult to express in its strict meaning. In ref. Matt., it has the sense of *among*: in ref. Mark, that of *through the midst of*: in ref. Isa., of *between*. It seems to imply at least two things, between or in the midst of which any thing passes, or is situate. And in order to apply this here, we must remember the text and note at ch. v. 6, where we found reason to believe that ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου, κ.τ.λ., imported in the middle point in front of the throne. If so, the two points required for ἀνὰ μέσον would be the two extreme ends of the throne to

see ch. iv. 9. Mark iii. 11. 1 Tim. v. 11. Winer, edn. 6, § 42. 5.

VIII. [1] Καὶ [c] ὅταν ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν ἑβδόμην,

CHAP. VIII. 1. rec (for οταν) οτε, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: om k: txt AC.

the right and to the left. See, besides reff., Exod. xi. 7; Levit. xxvii. 12, 14; Judges xv. 4; 3 Kings v. 12; Ezek. xxii. 26) **shall tend them** (as a shepherd his flock), **and shall guide them to the fountains of the waters of life** (cf. ch. xxii. 1. ζωῆς is prefixed for emphasis, as σαρκός in 1 Pet. iii. 21, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου. It is not found in the place of Isaiah, which runs thus: ὁ ἐλεῶν αὐτοὺς παρακαλέσει, καὶ διὰ πηγῶν ὑδάτων ἄξει αὐτούς. See Ps. xxiii. 2): **and God shall wipe away** (see reff.) **every tear out of their eyes.**

All is now ready for the final disclosure by the Lamb of the book of God's eternal purposes. The coming of the Lord has passed, and the elect are gathered in. Accordingly, THE LAST SEAL IS NOW OPENED, which lets loose the roll.

CH. VIII. 1.] **And when** (for ὅταν with indic., see reff. Notice, that it occurs in the opening of this seal only, giving it an indefiniteness which does not belong to any of the rest. The touch is so slight as not to be reproducible in another language: but it can hardly be denied that in the Writer's mind it exists) **he opened the seventh seal** (what sign may we expect to follow? The other six seals have been accompanied each by its appropriate vision. Since the opening of the last one, followed as it was by the portents and terrors of the day of the Lord, there has been an episodical series of visions, setting forth the gathering in of the elect, and the innumerable multitude of the glorified Church. What incident is appropriate for the removal of this last, the only obstacle yet remaining to the entire disclosure of the secret purposes of God?) **there was** (there became, there came on, supervened, from a state very different, viz. the choral songs of the great multitude, re-echoed by the angelic host) **silence in the heaven about** (see reff. There is no ellipsis in the ὡς: the duration is contained in the ἡμίωρον) **half an hour** (in enquiring into the meaning of this silence, let us first see whether we have any indication by analogy in the book itself, which may guide us. In ch. x. 4, when the Apostle is about to write down the voices of the seven thunders, he is commanded to abstain, and not to write them down. And though neither the manner nor the place of that withholding exactly corresponds to this half-hour's silence, yet it holds a place related to the sounding of the seventh trumpet, quite sufficiently near to that of this, with regard to the seventh seal, to be brought into comparison with it. It imports 1) a passing over and withholding, as far as the Apostle is concerned, of that which the seventh seal revealed: i.e. of that complete unrolling of God's book of His eternal purposes, of the times and seasons which He holds in His own power. For this unrolling, every thing has been prepared: even to the taking off of the last seal which bound the mysterious roll. But as to what the roll itself contains, there is silence. 2) But it also imports, as Victorinus beautifully says, "semihora, initium quietis æternæ:" the beginning of that blessed sabbatical state of rest, during which the people of God shall be in full possession of those things which ear hath not heard nor eye seen. With equal truth and beauty does the same, our earliest apocalyptic expositor, proceed: "sed partem intellexit, quia interruptio eadem per ordinem repetit. Nam si esset juge silentium, hic finis narrandi fieret." So that the vexed question, whether what follows belongs, or not, to the seventh seal, is, in fact, a question not worth seriously answering. Out of the completion of the former vision rise up a new series of visions, bearing a different character, but distinguished by the same number, indicating perfection, and shewing us that though evolved out of the completion of the former series, they do not belong to the last particular member of that series, any further than as it leads the way to them. Even more marked is this again below in ch. xi.—xvi., where the pouring out of the seven vials can in no way be said to belong to or form part of the blowing of the seventh trumpet. It will be seen then that I believe all interpretation to be wrong, which regards the blowing of the seven trumpets as forming a portion of the vision accompanying the seventh seal in particular: and again that I place in the same category all that which regards it as taking up and going over the same ground again. In the seven seals, we had revealed, as was fitting, the opening of the great Revelation, the progress and fortunes of God's Church and people in relation to the world, and of the world in relation to the church.

ἐγένετο [d] σιγὴ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ [e] ὡς [f] ἡμιώρον. [2] καὶ εἶδον

d τω ουρανω... ACP א B n *lo* n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

d Acts xxi. 40 only †. Wisd. xviii. 14 only. e = Mark v. 13. Luke viii. 42. John i. 40. vi. 19. xi. 18. f here only †.

rec ημιωριον, with [P] B rel: ημιοριον 1: ειμιωριον א: txt AC j.

With regard to the trumpets themselves, we may observe, 1) that they repeat again the same mystic number *seven*, indicating that the course of events (see below) represented by this sounding is complete in itself, as was that indicated before by the breaking of the seals, and as is also that afterwards to be indicated by the pouring out of the vials: 2) that as in the case of the seals, there is a distinction made between the first four and the following three. Cf. below, ver. 13. 3) that as also in the case of the seals, there is an interval, with two episodical visions, between the sixth and the seventh trumpet. Cf. ch. x., and ch. xi. 1—14. 4) that of the trumpets, six only announce visions partaking of the common character of judgments, whereas the seventh forms, as we also saw in the case of the seventh seal, the solemn close to the rest. 5) and further, that as regards this seventh trumpet, the matters imported by it as being ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ τρίτη (ch. xi. 14) are not given, but merely indicated by ἦλθεν . . ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι, κ.τ.λ. (ch. xi. 18): just as we saw that the things imported by the opening of the seventh seal were not detailed, but only indicated by the episodical visions, and by the nature of the similitude used. 6) that before the sounding of the seventh trumpet, the mystery of God is finished, as far as relates to the subject of this course of visions. This is indicated by the great Angel in ch. x. 7; and again by implication in ch. xi. 15—19, both by the purport of the voices in heaven, ver. 15, and by the ascriptions of praise, vv. 16—18. This is the same again at the pouring out of the seventh vial, where the great voice from the throne announces γέγονεν, ch. xvi. 17: as we saw that it was at the opening of the seventh seal, as indicated by the silence of half an hour. Each course of visions is complete in itself: each course of visions ends in the accomplishment of that series of divine actions which it sets forth. 7) that as, when the preparation for the seven angels to sound their trumpets is evolved out of the opening of the seventh seal, the vision of the seals is solemnly closed in by ἐγένοντο βρονταὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ σεισμός, so the vision of the trumpets is solemnly closed in by ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμὸς καὶ χάλαζα μεγάλη. That the similar occurrence, ch. xvi. 18, does not close the series of the vials, seems to be owing to special circumstances belonging to the outpouring of the seventh vial: see there (ch. xvi. 21). 8) that as in vv. 3—5, which form the close of the vision of the seals, and the opening of that of the trumpets, the offering of the prayers of the saints is the prominent feature (see notes below), so in the close of the series of the trumpets we have a prominent disclosure of the ark of the covenant of God, declaring and sealing His faithfulness to His church. Similarly again at the beginning of the series of the vials, we have the temple of the tabernacle of witness opened. Why we have not a similar appearance at the close of that series, is to be accounted for as above. 9) that, seeing that this course of visions opens and closes as last noticed, it (to say nothing at present of the following series of the vials) is to be regarded as embracing a course of judgments (for such evidently is every one of its six visions) inflicted in answer to those prayers, and forming a portion of that ἐκδίκησις invoked by the souls of the martyrs in ch. vi. 10. 10) If this be so, then, as this series of visions is manifestly to be regarded as extending to the end of the whole period of *time* (cf. ch. x. 7, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἑβδόμου ἀγγέλου, ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.), we may fairly say that it takes up the great world-wide vision of the seals at the point where it was said to the vengeance-invoking martyrs ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι χρόνον: and that the judgments of this series of visions occur during the time of waiting. This view is confirmed by finding that οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, upon whom the vengeance is invoked in ch. vi. 10, are the objects of vengeance during this series of judgments, cf. ver. 13. 11) In reference to this last remark, we may observe that no one portion especially of the earth's inhabitants is pointed out as objects of this series of judgments, but all the ungodly, as usurpers of the kingdom of Christ. This is plain, by the expressions in the ascription of praise with which it closes, I mean, ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία κ.τ.λ. Earthly domination is cast down, and the Lord's Kingdom is brought in. And it is also plain, from the expression used in that same ascription of praise, καὶ διαφθεῖραι τοὺς διαφθείροντας τὴν γῆν, of what character have been these ungodly—the

g ch. vii. 9. xi. 4. see Luke i. 19. 2 Chron. xxix. 11.
h see ch. iii. 20.
i = ch. vi. 9. ix. 13. xi. 1. xiv. 18. xvi. 7.

τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλους οἳ [g] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ [g] ἑστήκασιν, καὶ ἐδόθησαν αὐτοῖς ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγες. [3] καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἦλθεν καὶ ἐστάθη [h] ἐπὶ τοῦ [i] θυσιαστηρίου, ἔχων [k] λιβανω-

ACP a to i 2. 4. 10-3 to 19. 26-7 32 to 40-1 47 to 9) B^r.

k here bis only ‡. (1 Chron. ix. 29 only.) (-νος, ch. xviii. 13.)

2. om τους επτα 1. for εδοθησαν, εδοθη A a g h k m 30. 51. 90.
3. rec το θυσιαστηριον (bef εχων), with A[P] 1. 17. 36 (d 27. 49, e sil): txt C א B rel

corrupters of the earth—the tainters and wasters of the means and accessories of life. 12) Whatever be the interpretation which follows from the foregoing considerations, two canons must not be violated. a) As in the case of the seals, so it is manifest here, from ch. xi. 18, ἦλθεν . . . . ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι, κ.τ.λ., that the series of visions reaches forward to the time of the end, and is only terminated by the great events indicated in those words. And b) as yet, no particular city, no especial people is designated as the subject of the apocalyptic vision. All is general. The earth, the trees, the grass, the sea, the waters, the lights of heaven, mankind,—these are at present the objects in our field of view. There is as yet no θρόνος τοῦ θηρίου, as in the outpouring of the vials, ch. xvi. 10. The prophecy goes on becoming more specific as it advances: and it is not for us to anticipate its course, nor to localize and individualize where it is as yet general and undefined. The further details will be treated as we go on).

2.] *First appearance of the seven trumpet angels.* **And I saw** (viz. during the symbolic silence, at the end of the half-hour. What now follows is not to be considered as in the interpretation chronologically consequent upon that which was indicated by the seals, but merely as in the *vision* chronologically consequent on that course of visions. The evolution of the courses of visions out of one another does not legitimately lead to the conclusion that the *events represented by them* are consecutive in order of *time*. There are other and more important sequences than that of time: they may be independent of it, or they may concur with it) **the seven angels which stand before God** (cf. Tobit xii. 15, ἐγώ εἰμι Ῥαφαήλ, εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἁγίων ἀγγέλων οἳ προσαναφέρουσι τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ εἰσπορεύονται ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου. The agreement is not entire, inasmuch as here *another angel*, and not one of the seven, presently offers the prayers of the saints. These are not the archangels, as De W. and Stern, nor are they the seven spirits of ch. iv. 5, as Aret. and Ewald: nor again are they merely seven angels selected on account of the seven trumpets, as Hengstb. and Ebrard: this is entirely precluded by the article τούς. It is clear that the passage in Tobit and the words here refer to the same matter, and that the fact was part of that revelation with regard to the order and employments of the holy angels, which seems to have taken place during the captivity), **and there were given to them seven trumpets** (understand, with intent that they themselves should blow them). **And another angel** (not to be identified with *Christ*, as is done by Bede, Vitringa, Calov., al., and recently by Elliott: for thus confusion is introduced into the whole imagery of the vision. In ch. v. 8, we have the twenty-four elders falling down with vials containing the prayers of the saints: here we have an angel offering incense that it may mingle with the prayers on the heavenly altar. Any theological difficulty which belongs to the one belongs also to the other; and it is a canon which we must strictly observe in interpretation, that we are not, on account of any supposed doctrinal propriety, to depart from the plain meaning of words. In ch. vii. 2 we have ἄλλος ἄγγελος in the sense of a created angel (see note there): and would it be probable that St. John would after this, and I may add with his constant usage of ἄγγελος throughout the book for angel in its ordinary sense, designate our Lord by this title? There is something to me far more revolting from theological propriety in such a supposition, than in an angel being seen in the heavenly ministrations offering incense to mix with the prayers of the saints. It ought really to be needless to remark, in thus advocating consistency of verbal interpretation, that no countenance is hereby given to the invocation of angels: the whole truth of their being and ministration protesting against such an inference. They are simply λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, and the action here described is a portion of that their ministry. *Through Whom* the prayers are offered, we all know. He is our only Mediator and channel of grace) **came and stood over** (ἐπί with gen., not simply *juxta*, nor *ante*, but *super*; so that his

τὸν χρυσοῦν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [l] θυμιάματα πολλά, [m] ἵνα δώσει [o] ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ [lp] θυσιαστήριον τὸ [p] χρυσοῦν τὸ [q] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [q] θρόνου. [4] καὶ [r] ἀνέβη ὁ [rs] καπνὸς τῶν [l] θυμιαμάτων [o] ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. [5] καὶ

l ch. v. 8 reff. Psa. cxl. 2.
m constr., ch. iii. 9 reff.
o dat., = here bis only?
p Exod. xl. 26.
q ch. i. 4 reff.
r ch. ix. 2. xiv. 11. xix. 3. Exod. xix. 18.
s Rev. (ch. ix. 2, &c. xv. 8 al3.) only, exc. Acts ii. 19, from Joel ii. 30.

...θεου C. AP ℵ B a ln 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26. 7. 30. 32 to 38. 40-1 2. 47 to 51. 90 B[r].

Andr Areth. for λιβανωτον, λιβανον το C. rec δωση, with [P] B (rel?) Andr-p-coisl[2] Areth: δῳ f 36: txt ACℵ b e g h m n 1. 34-5. om last το ℵ.

4. αναβη and om ο ℵ[1].

form appeared above it; the altar being between the Apostle and him) **the altar** (viz. the altar named ch. vi. 9, as the repetition of the word with the art. shews: see below on ver. 5), **having a golden censer** (the word **λιβανωτός** is elsewhere the *frankincense itself*: so ref. 1 Chron.: so also Schol. on Aristoph. Nub., cited by Grot., λίβανος . . . . αὐτὸ τὸ δένδρον λιβανωτὸς δὲ ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ δένδρου: and Ammonius (ib.), λίβανος μὲν γὰρ κοινῶς καὶ τὸ δένδρον καὶ τὸ θυμιώμενον λιβανωτὸς δὲ μόνον τὸ θυμιώμενον. But here it unquestionably means a *censer*: cf. below, ver. 5, εἴληφεν τὸν λ. καὶ ἐγέμισεν αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ. No argument can be derived from the censer being a *golden* one, as Elliott, partly after Sir I. Newton. The spirit of the heavenly imagery will account for this without going farther: we have, throughout, crowns (ch. iv. 4), incense-vials (v. 8), vengeance-vials (xv. 7), girdles (xv. 6), a measuring-reed (xxi. 15), &c., all of the same costly metal). **And there was given to him** (viz. by divine appointment, through those ministering: not, by the saints who offered the prayers (Ell.), for two reasons: 1) because the incense is mentioned as something distinct from the prayers of the saints; see below: 2) because no forcing of ἐδόθη will extract this meaning from it. It is a frequent apocalyptic formula in refereuce to those things or instruments with which, or actions by which, the ministrations necessary to the progress of the visions are performed: cf. ver. 2, ch. vi. 2, 4 bis, 8, 11, vii. 2, ix. 1, &c.) **much incense** (see ch. v. 8, and on the difference of the imagery, below), **that he might** (if we read δώσει, which after all is not really a various reading,—η, and ῃ, being in the MSS. perpetually confused with ει,—we must remember that the fut. with ἵνα is a mixed construction, made up of ἵνα δώσῃ and ἃ δώσει. We are compelled in English to choose *one* of these) **give it to** (various renderings and supplyings of the construction have been devised: but the simple dative after δώσει appears the only legitimate one: and the sense as expressed by Calov., "ut daret ταῖς πρ., orationibus sanctorum, eadem, i. e., ut redderet eas boni odoris preces." This object was, to *incense* the prayers of the Saints: on the import, see below) **the prayers of all the saints** (not only now of those martyred ones in ch. vi. 9: the trumpets which follow are in answer to the whole prayers of God's church. The martyrs' cry for vengeance is the loudest note, but all join) **upon** (the ἐπί with accus. carrying *motion*; which thus incensed were offered on the golden altar, &c. From what follows it would seem that the prayers were already before God: see below) **the altar of gold which was before the throne** (this may be a different altar from that over which the angel was standing; or it may be the same further specified. The latter alternative seems the more probable. We must not imagine that we have in these visions a counterpart of the Jewish tabernacle, or attempt to force the details into accordance with its arrangements. No such correspondence has been satisfactorily made out: indeed to assume such here would perhaps be inconsistent with ch. xi. 19, where first the temple of God in heaven is opened. A general analogy, in the use and character of the heavenly furniture, is all that we can look for). **And the smoke of the incense ascended to** (such again seems to be the only legitimate rendering of the dative. The common one, "*with*," cannot be justified: see Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 6. The prayers, being already offered, received the smoke of the incense. The whole imagery introduces the fact that those prayers are about to be answered in the following judgments) **the prayers of the saints out of the hand of the angel, before God** (these latter words belong to ἀνέβη, or rather to ἀνέβη ταῖς πρ. τ. ἁγ. Notice, that no countenance is given by this vision to the idea of angelic intercession. The angel is simply a minister. The incense (importing here, we may perhaps say, acceptability owing to the ripeness of the season in the

[t] εἴληφεν ὁ ἄγγελος τὸν [k] λιβανωτὸν καὶ [u] ἐγέμισεν αὐτὸν ἐκ [v] τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ [w] ἔβαλεν [w] εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ [x] ἐγένοντο [y] βρονταὶ καὶ [xy] φωναὶ καὶ [xy] ἀστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμός.

[6] Καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἔχοντες τὰς ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγας [z] ἡτοίμασαν ἑαυτοὺς [z] ἵνα [a] σαλπίσωσιν.

t perf. as aor., ch. v. 7 reff. u Mark iv. 37. xv. 36. Luke xiv. 23. xv. 16. John ii. 7 (bis). vi. 13. ch. xv. 8 only. Gen. xlv. 17 only. v see ch. xiv. 18. w ch. xii. 4, 9, 13. xiv. 19 al. (Ezek. x. 2.) x (Exod. xix. 16.) ch. xi. 19. xvi. 18. y ch. iv. 5 reff. z Mark xiv. 12. Luke xxii. 8. Acts xxiii. 23. ch. ix. 15. a Rev. (here, &c., 6 times. ch. ix. 1, 13. x. 7. xi. 15) only, exc. Matt. vi. 2. 1 Cor. xv. 52. Num. x. 3.

APℵ B 1 to P, 1. 2. 4. 6 to 13. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30 32 to 35. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 B^r.

5. Steph (for τον .. αυτον) το .. αυτο, with 1 33(-4, e sil): το .. αυτον 36. 40. 50: txt A[P]ℵ B rel. for εβαλεν, ελαβον A. rec places φωναι bef βρονται, with [P] h n 1. 10-7-8-9. 36 (37. 49 B^r, e sil): om και φωναι j: φω. κ. αστρ. κ. βρ. l: βρ. κ. αστρ. κ. φ. A a b c d e f g k m 16. 38 syr-dd copt: txt ℵ B rel vulg Primas.
6. om 1st οι 1. rec om 2nd οι, with ℵ 16 (34-5-6. 47, e sil) Andr-b(Del): ins A[P] B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth. for εαυτους, αυτους ℵ[1], εν αυτους f.

divine purposes, so that the prayers, lying unanswered before, become, by the fulness of the time, acceptable as regards an immediate reply) is *given* to him: he merely wafts the incense up, so that it mingles with the prayers. Düsterd. well remarks, that the angel, in performing sacerdotal offices, is but a fellow-servant of the saints (ch. xix. 10) who are themselves priests (ch. i. 6, v. 10, vii. 15)). **5.] And the angel took** (it is quite impossible to maintain a perfect sense: an aorist (ἐγέμισεν) is indeed coupled to εἴληφεν) **the censer** (after having used it as above, i. e. shaken from it the incense on the altar) **and filled it** (while the smoke was ascending) **from the fire of the altar** (i. e. from the ashes which were on the altar), **and cast it** (i. e. the fire with which the censer was filled: the hot ashes) **towards the earth** (to signify that the answer to the prayers was about to descend in the fire of God's vengeance: see below, and compare Ezekiel in ref.): **and there took place thunders and voices and lightnings and an earthquake** ("per orationes sanctorum," says Corn.-a-lap., ". . . . precantium vindictam de impiis suisque persecutoribus, ignis vindictæ, i. e. tonitrua, fulgura et plagæ sequentes vii. angelorum et tubarum in impios sunt demissa." All these immediate consequences of the casting down of the hot ashes on the earth are the symbolic precursors of the divine judgments about to be inflicted).

One point must here be noticed: the intimate connexion between the act of this incense-offering angel and the seven trumpets which follow. It belongs to them all: it takes place when now the seven angels have had their trumpets given them, and this series of visions is introduced. So that every interpretation must take this into account: remembering that the judgments which follow are answers to the prayers of the saints, and are inflicted on the enemies of the church.

6.] And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves that they might blow (raised their trumpets to their mouths, and stood in attitude to blow them).

7—12.] *The first four trumpets.* It has been before observed, that as in the case of the seals, so here, the first four are marked off from the last three. The distinction is here made, not only, as there, by an intrinsic feature running through the four, but by the voice of the eagle in ver. 13, introducing those latter trumpets and giving them also a distinguishing feature. And as we there maintained (see note on ch. vi. 8) that any interpretation, to be right, must take into account this difference between the four and the three, so here also. But in order to the taking into account of this difference, we must gain some approximate idea of its import. Does the intrinsic feature, common to these four plagues, bear a general interpretation which will suit their character as distinguished from the other three? I imagine it does. For, whereas each of those three (or rather of the former two of them, for, as has been observed, the seventh forms the solemn conclusion to the whole) evolves a course of plagues including separate and independent details, these four are connected and interdependent. Their common feature is destruction and corruption: *not* total, it is true, but partial: in each case to the amount expressed by τὸ τρίτον: but this fractional extent of action appears again under the sixth trumpet, ch. ix. 15, 18, and therefore clearly must not be pressed as carrying the distinctive character of the first four (on its import see note below, ver. 7). It is in the *kind* of

7 Καὶ ὁ πρῶτος [a] ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἐγένετο [bc] χάλαζα καὶ [cd] πῦρ [e] μεμιγμένα ἐν [d] αἵματι, καὶ [w] ἐβλήθη [w] εἰς τὴν

b ch. xi. 19. xvi. 21 (bis) only.
c Exod. ix. 24.
d Joel ii. 30.
e w. ἐν, here only (but see Exod. l. c.). Ps. cv. 34. μετά, Matt. xxvii. 34. Luke xiii. 1. dat., ch. xv. 2 only. Prov. xiv. 16.

7. rec aft ο πρωτος ins αγγελος, with k n 1. 36-8 vulg copt Andr Primas : om A[P]ℵ B rel harl[1] tol syr-dd Areth. μεμιγμενον [P]ℵ 12. 37-8. 46. rec om εν, with 1. 33(-4-5-6, e sil) demid syr-dd Tich : ins A[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas.

exercise which their agency finds, that these four trumpets are especially distinguished. The plagues indicated by them are entirely inflicted on *natural objects:* the earth, trees, grass, sea, rivers, lights of heaven: whereas those indicated by the two latter are expressly said to be inflicted on *men*, and *not* on natural objects: cf. ch. ix. 4, 15. Surely, however these natural objects are in each case to be understood, this is a point not lightly to be passed over. Nor can it fail to strike every unprejudiced student, that we must not, as is done by many expositors, interpret the γῆ and χόρτος and δένδρα as signifying nations and men in the former portion of the series of visions, and then, when the distinction between these and men is made in the latter part, be content with the literal meaning. With every allowance for the indisputable intermixture, in many places, of literal and allegorical meanings, all analogy requires that in the same series of visions, when one judgment is to destroy earth, trees, and grass, and another not to injure earth, trees, or grass, but men only, the earth, trees, and grass should bear the same meaning in the two cases. We may fairly say then, that the plagues of the four former trumpets affect the accessories of life—the earth, the trees, the green grass, the waters as means of transit and of subsistence, the lights of heaven:—whereas those of the last two affect life itself, the former by the infliction of pain, the latter of death.

A certain analogy may be noticed, but not a very close one, between these plagues and those in Egypt of old. The analogy is not close, for the order is not the same, nor are all particulars contained in the one series which are contained in the other: but the resemblance is far too striking to pass without remark. We have the hail and fire, the water turned to blood, the darkness, the locusts(, the infliction of death): five, in fact, if not six, out of the ten. The Egyptian plagues are beyond doubt remembered in the sacred imagery, if they are not reproduced.

The secret of interpretation here I believe to be this: The whole seven trumpets bring before us the punishment of the enemies of God during the period indicated by their course. These punishments are not merely direct inflictions of plagues, but consist in great part of that judicial retribution on them that know not God, which arises from their own depravity, and in which their own sins are made to punish themselves. This kind of punishment comes before us especially in the four first trumpet-visions. The various natural accessories of life are ravaged, or are turned to poison. In the first, the earth and its produce are ravaged with fire: in the second, the sea is mingled with blood, and ships, which should have been for men's convenience, are destroyed. In the third, the waters and springs, the essential refreshments of life, are poisoned, and death is occasioned by drinking of them. In the fourth, the natural lights of heaven are darkened. So that I regard these first four trumpets as setting forth the gradual subjugation of the earth to Him whose kingdom it is in the end to become, by judgments inflicted on the ungodly, as regards the vitiating and destroying the ordinary means of subsistence, and comfort, and knowledge. In the details of these judgments, as also of the two following, there are many particulars which I cannot interpret, and with regard to which it may be a question whether they are to be considered as other than belonging to the requisite symbolic machinery of the prophecy. But in confessing this I must also say, that I have never seen, in any apocalyptic Commentator, an interpretation of these details at all approaching to verisimilitude: never any which is not obliged to force the plain sense of words, or the certain course of history, to make them fit the requisite theory. Many examples of these will be found in the history of apocalyptic interpretation given by Mr. Elliott in vol. iv. of his Horæ Apocalypticæ.

7.] **And the first blew his trumpet, and there took place hail and fire mingled in blood** (i. e. the hail *and* the fire were mingled together (plur.) in blood, as their flux or vehicle; the stones of hail and the balls of fire (not *lightning*, as Ebr.) fell in a shower of blood, just as hail and fireballs commonly fall in a shower of rain. There is here manifestly an allusion to the plague

γῆν· καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς [f] κατεκάη, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν δένδρων [f] κατεκάη, καὶ πᾶς [gh] χόρτος [hi] χλωρὸς [f] κατεκάη. 8 Καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἄγγελος [a] ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ [k] ὡς ὄρος μέγα [l] πυρὶ [l] καιόμενον ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἐγέ-

f ch. xvii. 16. xviii. 8. Ezek. xx. 47. form also, see 1 Cor. iii. 15. 2 Pet. iii. 10. Isa. xlvii. 14 A.
g ch. ix. 4. Matt. vi. 30. 1 Cor. iii. 12. James i. 10, 11 al.
h Mark vi. 39 only. Isa. xv. 6.
i as above (h). ch. vi. 8. ix. 4 only.
k = ch. i. 10 al. fr.
l ch. xxi. 8. Heb. xii. 18. Deut. iv. 11.

APℵ 38 to n. 1. 2. 4. 6 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 34 40-1-2 47 to 51. 90 Br.

rec om και το τριτον της γης κατακαη, with m 1. 35 (Br, e sil) copt: ins A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth lat-ff. om και το τριτον των δενδρων κατακαη B[1] f j k 10. 30-2-3. 90 æth.

8. om αγγελος ℵ. om πυρι B rel Areth: ins A[P]ℵ m n 17[1]. 34-5-6 (1. 18. 38,

of hail in Egypt, of which it is said that "the fire ran along upon the ground:" ἦν δὲ ἡ χάλαζα καὶ τὸ πῦρ φλογίζον ἐν τῇ χαλάζῃ, ref. Exod.: but with the addition of the blood. With regard to this latter, we may remark, that both here and under the vials, where the earth, seas, and rivers are again the objects of the first three judgments, *blood* is a feature common to all three. It appears rather to indicate a general character of the judgments, than to require any special interpretation in each particular case. In blood is life: in the shedding, or in the appearing, of blood, is implied the destruction of life, with which, as a consequence, all these judgments must be accompanied), **and it was cast into the earth** (towards the surface of the earth): **and the third part** (this expression first occurring here, it will be well once for all to enquire into its meaning in these prophecies. I may first say, that all *special* interpretations seem to me utterly to have failed, and of these none so signally as that of Mr. Elliott, who would understand it of a tripartite division of the Roman Empire at the time to which he assigns this judgment. It is fatal to this whole class of interpretations, that it is not said the hail, &c. were *cast on a third part*, but that the destruction occasioned by them *extended to* a third part of the earth on which they were cast. And this is most expressly declared to be so in this first case, by *all green grass* being also destroyed, not a third part: a fact of which Elliott takes no notice. It is this mixture of the fractional third with other designations of extent of mischief, which will lead us, I believe, to the right interpretation. We find it again under the third trumpet, where the star Wormwood is cast ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων: the result being that τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων was embittered. This lax usage would of itself lead us to suppose that we are not to look for strict definiteness in the interpretation. And if we refer to the prophecy in Zech. xiii. 8 f., where the import is to announce judgment on a greater part and the escape of a remnant, we find the same tripartite division: καὶ ἔσται ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ, λέγει κύριος, τὰ δύο μέρη αὐτῆς ἐξολοθρευθήσεται, καὶ ἐκλείψει, τὸ δὲ τρίτον ὑπολειφθήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ. καὶ διάξω τὸ τρίτον διὰ πυρός, κ.τ.λ. Nay, in the Apocalypse itself, we have τὸ τρίτον used where the sense can hardly but be similarly indefinite: e.g., under the sixth trumpet, ch. ix. 15, 18, and xii. 4, where it is said that the dragon's tail σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ: the use of the *present* shewing that it is rather a general power, than a particular event which is designated. Compare again the use of τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς in ch. vi. 8, and of τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως in ch. xi. 13. All these seem to shew, that such prophetic expressions are to be taken rather in their import as to amount, than in any strict fractional division. Here, for instance, I would take the pervading τὸ τρίτον as signifying, that though the judgment is undoubtedly, as to extent, fearful and sweeping, yet that God in inflicting it, spares more than he smites: two thirds escape in each case, while one is smitten) **of the earth** (i.e. plainly of the surface of the earth, and that, of the cultivated soil, which admitted of such a devastation) **was burnt up** (so that the *fire* prevails in the plague, not the hail nor the blood), **and the third part of the trees** (in all the earth, not in the third part) **was burnt up, and all green grass** (upon earth: no longer a third part: possibly because green grass would first and unavoidably every where scorch up at the approach of such a plague, whereas the hardier crops and trees might partially escape) **was burnt up.**

8.] **And the second angel blew his trumpet: and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea** (first, by the ὡς, that which was cast into the sea was *not a mountain*, but only a burning mass so large as to look like one. Then, it was *this mass itself*, not any thing proceeding from it, which was

νετο τὸ τρίτον τῆς θαλάσσης αἷμα, [9] *καὶ ἀπέθανεν τὸ τρίτον τῶν* [m] *κτισμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ τὰ ἔχοντα* [n] *ψυχάς, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων* [o] *διεφθάρησαν.*

[10] Καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἄγγελος [a] *ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ* [p] *ἔπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ* [p] *οὐρανοῦ* [p] *ἀστὴρ μέγας* [q] *καιόμενος ὡς* [q] *λαμπάς, καὶ* [r] *ἔπεσεν* [r] *ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων.* [11] *καὶ τὸ* [s] *ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρος* [s] *λέγεται ὁ* [t] *ἄψινθος, καὶ* [u] *ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων* [u] *εἰς* [t] *ἄψιν-*

m 1 Tim. iv. 4. James i. 18. ch. v. 13 only +. Wisd. xiii. 5 al.
n = ch. xvi. 3. Gen. i. 30.
o Luke xii. 33. 2 Cor. iv. 16. 1 Tim. vi. 5. ch. xi. 18 bis only. 1 Kings xxiii. 10. plur., ch. i. 19 reff.
p ch. ix. 1.
q Sir. xlviii. 1. see ch. iv. 5 reff.
r ch. vii. 16 reff. s here only. t here bis only +. (-*θίον*, Prov. v. 4 Aq.) u = ch. xvi. 19. John xvi. 20 (Matt. xxi. 42, from Ps. cxvii. 22. Luke xiii. 19) al.

e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr lat-ff. *εγενηθη* ℵ.

9. aft 1st *τριτον* ins *μερος* ℵ 34-5-6. om 2nd *των* B rel Andr-p Areth: om *των εν τη θαλασση* 1: ins A[P]ℵ m 33-8. 40. 51 (27. 34-5-6, e sil) Ath Andr. *ψυχην* ℵ. rec (for *διεφθαρησαν*) *διεφθαρη*, with B rel Andr Areth: txt A[P]ℵ h n 1(-*ρισαν*) 10-3-7. 37. 49. 51 B[r] Andr-a.

10. om *και επι τας πηγας των υδατων* A. rec om 2nd *των* (with 4. 17-8-9. 26-7. 30, e sil): ins [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth.

11. rec om *ὁ*, with ℵ f l 1. 33-8 (32-4-6, e sil) Andr: ins A[P] B rel Andr-coisl Areth. *αψινθον* a b c j: *αψινθιον* and adds *και λεγεται* ℵ[1]. (homœotel k, *αψινθ.* 1st to 2nd.) rec (for *εγενετο*) *γινεται*, with 1. 17[1](appy) 36: txt A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth.

cast down. So that the introduction of a *volcano* into the imagery is quite unjustifiable. In the language (hardly in the sense) there seems to be a reminiscence of Jer. xxviii. (li.) 25, *δώσω σε ὡς ὄρος ἐμπεπυρισμένον*. It is remarkable that there the *ὄρος* should be characterized as *τὸ διεφθαρμένον τὸ διαφθεῖρον πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*: cf. our ch. xi. 18), **and the third part of the sea became blood** (so in the Egyptian plague the Nile and all the Egyptian waters. By the *non-consequence* of the *result* of the fiery mass falling into the sea (so De W., "eine Wirkung ohne Analogie") is again represented to us that in the infliction of this plague from above, the instrument of it is merely described as it appeared (**ὡς**), not as it really was. So that all ideas imported into the interpretation which take the *mountain*, or the *fiery* character of it, as elements in the symbolism, are departures from the real intent of the description): **and the third part of the creatures** (reff.) **(that were) in the sea** (not, as Elliott, "in the third part of the sea," but in the whole. Nor again must we stretch *ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ* to mean the maritime coasts, nor the islands, nor the transmarine provinces: a usage not even shewn to exist by the examples cited by him, vol. i. p. 344 note: nor by Tacitus's "*plenum exsiliis mare;*" any more than, if we were to say "the sea is full of emigrants from Ireland," we should by "*the sea*" mean "*the ships*") **died** (cf. Exod. vii. 17—21) **those which have life** (animal souls: see reff.: and for the appositional nominative, ch. ii. 20 reff.), **and the third part of the ships were destroyed** (another inconsequent result, and teaching us as before.

We may remark, at the end of this second trumpet, that the judgments inflicted by these first two are distinctly those which in ch. vii. 3 were held back until the servants of God were sealed: *μὴ ἀδικήσητε τὴν γῆν μήτε τὴν θάλασσαν μήτε τὰ δένδρα, ἄχρι σφραγίσωμεν κ.τ.λ.* So that, as before generally remarked, the place of these trumpet-plagues must be sought *after* that sealing: and consequently (see there) in very close conjunction with the day of the Lord itself).

10.] **And the third angel blew his trumpet, and there fell from heaven a great star burning as a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the rivers and upon the fountains of the waters** (it can hardly be said, as Düsterd., that we are here as matter of course to understand, on the *third part* of the fountains, any more than we are to limit the *πᾶς χόρτος χλωρός* in ver. 7 to all the grass within the third part of the earth). **And the name of the star is called Wormwood** (the more usual forms are *τὸ ἀψίνθιον*, or *ἡ ἄψινθος*. The masc. seems to be chosen on account of its conformity to *ὁ ἀστήρ*. There is a river in Thrace so called. See on the plant, and its medicinal use by the ancients, Winer, Realw. art. Wermuth: and Pliny, xxvii. 28), **and the third part of**

θον, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανον [v] ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων, ὅτι [w] ἐπικράνθησαν.

12 Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ [x] ἐπλήγη τὸ τρίτον τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς σελήνης καὶ τὸ [y] τρίτον τῶν [y] ἀστέρων, ἵνα [z] σκοτισθῇ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα μὴ [a] φανῇ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς, καὶ ἡ νὺξ ὁμοίως.

13 Καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἤκουσα [b] ἑνὸς [c] ἀετοῦ [c] πετομένου ἐν

APℵ B a b n, 1. 2. 4. 6 9. 10-1. 16 to 19. 28 7. 30. 32 to 36. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

v ch. ix. 2, 18. xvi. 10, 11, 21. xviii. 1. Rom. i. 4. Num. xxxv. 18. Josh. xx. 9 A. w Col. iii. 19. ch. x. 9, 10 only. (Exod. xvi. 20 al. Ruth i. 13, 20 al., but met.) x here only. Isa. i. 5. ix. 13. (= πατάσσω, Exod. vii. 25.) y ch. xii. 4. z Matt. xxiv. 29 ∥ Mk. Luke xxiii. 4, 5. Rom. i. 21. xi. 10. ch. ix. 2 v. r. only. Isa. xiii. 10. a = ch. xxi. 23 reff. b = ch. ix. 13. xviii. 21. Matt. viii. 19. Dan. viii. 3. c so ch. iv. 7.

Steph om *των υδατων* appy by mistake. *αψινθιον* ℵ d l n 48. rec om *των* (bef *ανθρ.*): ins A[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth. for *εκ*, *επι* A: *απο* e.

12. for *επληγη*, *πληγη* 1. *το τριτον αυτης μη φανη η ημερα* B rel vulg copt(: om *το τρ. αυτων* precedg 33: for *αυτης*, *αυτων* retaining *αυτων* precedg (30. 40) 90:) *μη φανη η ημερα*, omg *το τριτον αυτης*, j 18. 38: txt A[P]ℵ h (m) 10-7-9. (34.) 47(but *αυτων*). 49 (37 Br, e sil).—rec *φαινη*, with [P(*φενη*)] h 1. 10-7. 49 (37 Br, e sil): txt Aℵ B rel.—for *μη φανη*, *ουκ εφαινεν* m 34 (35) Andr-coisl: *ινα μη φανη* n 47.—*η ημερα ουκ εφαινεν αυτων* (or *αυτης*), omg *το τριτον αυτης*, 35.—*και ημερα μη φαινει το φως αυτης και η νυξ ομοιως το τριτον αυτης* 36.—for *τριτον*, *τεταρτον* A.—om *η* bef *ημ.* B (Tischdf, not Mai).

13. om *ενος* ℵ. rec (for *αετου*) *αγγελου*, with [P] l n 1. 16. (17[1]?) 34-5-6. 47 arm-txt Andr: *αγγελου ως αετου* 13: txt Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth. rec *πετωμενου*, with B l[1] 1. (32-7. 40-1-2, e sil): txt A[P]ℵ rel Andr Areth. om *εν* ℵ.

the waters became (*was turned into*, see reff.) **wormwood: and many of the men** (who dwelt by these waters: such may be the force of the article. But τῶν ἀνθρ. may be general. It is the only place where the expression πολλ. τῶν ἀνθρ. occurs) **died from** (ἐκ of the source whence a result springs, see Winer, edn. 6, § 47, sub voce) **the waters, because they were embittered** (compare the converse history, Exod. xv. 23 ff., of the bitter waters being made sweet by casting a certain tree into them: see also 2 Kings ii. 19 ff. The question whether wormwood was a deadly poison or not, is out of place here. It is not said that all who drank, died. And the effect of any bitter drug, however medicinally valuable, being mixed with the water ordinarily used, would be to occasion sickness and death. It is hardly possible to read of this third plague, and not to think of the deadly effect of those strong spirituous drinks which are in fact water turned into poison. The very name *absinthe* is not unknown in their nomenclature: and there is no effect which could be so aptly described by the falling of fire into water, as this, which results in *ardent* spirit,—in that which the simple islanders of the South Sea call *firewater*. That this plague may go on to destroy even this fearful proportion of the ungodly in the latter days, is far from impossible, considering its prevalence even now in some parts of the civilized world. But I mention this rather as an illustration, than as an interpretation). **And the fourth angel blew his trumpet: and the third part of the sun was struck** (it is not said, as in the case of the former three trumpets, *with what*. And this absence of an instrument in the fourth of these correlative visions perhaps teaches us not to attribute too much import to the instruments by which the previous judgments are brought about. It is the πληγή itself, not its instrument, on which attention should be directed) **and the third part of the moon and the third part of the stars, that the third part of them might be darkened, and the day might not shine during the third part of it** (the limitation of the τὸ τρίτον is now manifestly to time, not to brightness. So E. V. rightly, "*for a third part of it.*" That this consequence is no natural one following upon the obscuration of a third portion of the sun, &c., is not to be alleged as any objection, but belongs to the altogether supernatural region in which these visions are situated. Thus we have a globe of fire turning sea-water to blood—a burning star embittering the waters: &c.), **and the night in like manner** (i. e. the night as far as she is, by virtue of the moon and stars, a time of light. And this is far more so under the glorious Eastern moon and stars, than in our mist-laden climate).

13.] *Introduction of the three remaining trumpets by three woes.* **And I saw and heard** (the construction is zeugmatic)

[d] μεσουρανήματι λέγοντος φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ οὐαὶ [e] τοὺς [f] κατοικοῦντας [f] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [g] ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν [h] φωνῶν τῆς [h] σάλπιγγος τῶν τριῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν μελλόντων σαλπίζειν.

IX. 1 Καὶ ὁ πέμπτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ εἶδον [i] ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ [i] οὐρανοῦ [i] πεπτωκότα εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἡ [j] κλεὶς τοῦ [k] φρέατος τῆς [l] ἀβύσσου, 2 καὶ

d ch. xiv. 6. xix. 17 only †. (see note.)
e constr., see note.
f ch. iii. 10 reff.
g = ver. 11.
h ch. i. 10. Exod. xix. 16.
i ch. viii. 10.
j ch. i. 18 reff.
k = here 4 times (Luke xiv. 5. John iv. 11, 12) only. Ps. liv. 23.
l (=) here bis. ver. 11. ch. xi. 7. xvii. 8. xx. 1, 3. Luke viii. 31. Rom. x. 7 only. (Gen. i. 2.)

μεσουρανισματι 1. ουαι twice only 1. rec τοις κατοικουσιν, with A[P] h l n 1. 10-7-8. 34-6 (16. 37. 47-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: txt ℵ B rel Andr-coisl. σαλπιξειν 1.

Chap. IX. 1. αστερας and πεπτωκοτας ℵ[1]. [for εις, επι P (38, w. gen): προς e.]

an (ἑνός indefinite, as in reff.: see Winer, edn. 6, § 18. 9. Or it may carry meaning—a single or solitary eagle,—as might also be the case in one of the reff., ch. xviii. 21, see there) **eagle** (hardly to be identified with the eagles of Matt. xxiv. 28: for 1) that saying is more proverbial than prophetic: and 2) any application of that saying would be far more aptly reserved for our ch. xix. 17. Nor again is the eagle a bird of ill omen, as Ewald: nor a contrast to the dove in John i. 32, as Hengstb.: but far more probably the symbol of judgment and vengeance rushing to its prey, as in Deut. xxviii. 49; Hos. viii. 1; Hab. i. 8. Nor again is it to be understood as an angel in eagle's shape: but a veritable eagle in the vision. Thus we have the *altar* speaking, ch. xvi. 7) **flying in mid-heaven** (i. e. in the south or noon-day sky where the sun reaches the meridian, for which μεσουρανεῖν is the word. Wetst. cites from Eustath. on Il. θ. 68, αὔξησις ἡμέρας λέγεται καθ' Ὅμηρον τὸ ἀπὸ πρωΐας μέχρις ἡλιακοῦ μεσουρανήματος, τὸ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν φθίνειν ἡμέρα δοκεῖ. See his many other examples. So that the word does not signify the space intermediate between heaven and earth, but as above. And the eagle flies there, to be seen and heard of all. I may also notice that the whole expression favours the true reading ἀετοῦ as against the substituted ἀγγέλου) **saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to those that dwell** (the government of an accus. after οὐαί is also found in ch. xii. 12) **upon the earth** (the objects of the vengeance invoked in the prayers of the martyrs, ch. vi. 10: the ungodly world, as distinguished from the church) **by reason of** (so E. V., well: ἐκ denoting, as in ver. 11, the source whence the woe springs) **the remaining voices of the trumpet** (the sing. is used generically: the three voices all having this common to them, that they are the sound of a trumpet) **of the three angels who are about to blow.**

Ch. IX.—XI.] *The last three, or woe-trumpets.* These, as well as the first four, have a character of their own, corresponding in some measure to that of the visions at the opening of the three last seals. The particulars related under them are separate and detailed, not symmetrical and correspondent. And as in the seals, so here, the seventh forms rather the solemn conclusion to the whole, than a distinct judgment of itself. Here also, as there, it is introduced by two episodical passages, having reference to the visions which are to follow, and which take up the thread of prophecy again at a period previous to things detailed before.

1—12.] *The fifth, or first Woe trumpet.* **And the fifth angel blew his trumpet, and I saw a star fallen** (not, as E. V. *fall*, which gives an entirely wrong view of the transactions of the vision. The star had fallen before, and is first seen as thus fallen) **out of heaven to the earth** (the reader will at once think on Isa. xiv. 12, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" And on Luke x. 18, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." And, doubtless, as the personal import of this star is made clear in the following words, such is the reference here. We may also notice that this expression forms a connecting link to another place, ch. xii. 9, in this book, where Satan is represented as cast out of heaven to the earth: see notes there. It is hardly possible with Andr., Ribera, Bengel, and De W., to understand a *good angel* by this fallen star. His description, as well as his work, corresponds only to an agent of evil. Andreas is obliged to distort words to bring in this view: ἐπὶ γῆν δὲ καταβάντα, τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ πεπτωκέναι σημαίνει, is enough to condemn any interpretation),

ἤνοιξεν τὸ [k] φρέαρ τῆς [l] ἀβύσσου. καὶ [m] ἀνέβη [m] καπνὸς ἐκ τοῦ [k] φρέατος ὡς [mn] καπνὸς [no] καμίνου μεγάλης, καὶ * [p] ἐσκοτώθη ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ [q] ἀὴρ [r] ἐκ τοῦ [m] καπνοῦ τοῦ [k] φρέατος. [3] καὶ ἐκ τοῦ [m] καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον [s] ἀκρίδες εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ [t] ἐδόθη αὐταῖς [t] ἐξουσία ὡς ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ [u] σκορπίοι [v] τῆς γῆς, [4] καὶ [w] ἐῤῥέθη αὐταῖς [wx] ἵνα μὴ [y] ἀδικήσουσιν τὸν [z] χόρτον τῆς γῆς οὐδὲ [a] πᾶν [b] χλωρὸν οὐδὲ [a] πᾶν δένδρον, [c] εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους [d] οἵτινες οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὴν [e] σφραγῖδα τοῦ [e] θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν [f] μετώπων [αὐτῶν]. [5] καὶ

APℵ B 1 to n, 1. 2. 4. c. 9. 10 3 16 to 19. 26-7. 3[?]. 32 to 35. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

m ch. viii. 4 reff. n Exod. xix. 18 A(not F B). o ch. i. 15 reff. Gen. xix. 28. p ch. xvi. 10. Eph. iv. 18 only. Jer. xiv. 2. q Acts xxii. 23. 1 Cor. ix. 26. xiv. 9. Eph. ii. 2. 1 Thess. iv. 17. ch. xvi. 17 only. Ps. xvii. 11. r = ch. viii. 11, 13. s here bis. Matt. iii. 4 ‖ Mk. only. Exod. x. 13 ff. Joel ii. 25. t ch. ii. 26 reff. u Luke x. 19. xi. 12. vv. 5, 10 only. Deut. viii. 15. Ezek. ii. 6. v so Acts x. 12. xi. 6. Gen. i. 25. w ch. vi. 11 only. x = John xiii. 34. xv. 17 al. ind. fut., ch. iii. 9 reff. y = ch. vi. 6 reff. z ch. viii. 7 reff. a ch. vii. 16 reff. b ch. vi. 8 reff. c constr., ch. xxi. 27. d = ch. i. 7 reff. e ch. vii. 2. f ch. vii. 3 reff.

2. om *και ηνοιξεν το φρεαρ της αβυσσου* (*homœotel?*) ℵ B rel am(with harl[1] tol) copt æth arm-zoh Areth: ins A[P] h l m n 10-7-8. 34-6. 41[2]-7-9 (16. 37-8 Br, e sil) vulg-ed (with fuld lipss &c) syr-dd Andr Tich. om *εκ του φρεατος ως καπνος* (*homœotel*) m 1. 35. 41. for *εκ*, *επι* ℵ[1]. for 2nd *καπνος*, *καμινος* (but corrd) ℵ[1]. for *μεγαλης*, *καιομενης* B rel: *καιομενης μεγαλης* 37. 40-1-2: *μεγαλης καιομενης* 36: *μεγαλου καιομενης* 38: txt A[P]ℵ n (1, e sil) 17 vulg copt Andr Tich. * rec ἐσκοτίσθη, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: *εσκοτωθη* A f 12. om *καπνου* to *καπνου* ver 3 ℵ[1].

4. *ερρηθη* B m 34-5. 50 Andr-coisl, *ερριθη* n. *αυτοις* ℵ(so ver 3) B f m 90. rec *αδικησωσι*, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: txt A 36. om *ουδε παν χλωρον* ℵ[1] (ℵ[3] began to write *χλωρ.* above *δενδ.*). for 2nd *ουδε*, *ουδε̄* (sic, Tab. xv.) ℵ. rec aft *ανθρωπους* ins *μονους*, with h 10. 49 Br (37, e sil): om A[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth Tich. *σφραγιδαν*(sic) ℵ[1-3a]. om *του θεου* n 1. 12. (17?) 43. om *αυτων* (*homœotel?*) A[P]ℵ n 1. 12 am(with harl, tol, agst demid fuld lipss) Andr-a: ins B rel vss Andr Areth Cassiod.

and there was given to him (ἐδόθη, as usual, for the purpose of the part which he is to bear in the vision) **the key of the pit of the abyss** (viz. of hell, which in the vision is a vast profundity opening by a pit or shaft upon the surface of the earth, imagined as shut down by a cover, and locked. This abyss is in the Apocalypse the habitation of the devil and his angels: cf. ver. 11, ch. xx. 1, 3: see also ch. xi. 7, xvii. 8), **and he opened the pit of the abyss, and there went up smoke from the pit as smoke of a great furnace** (see ref. Gen.), **and the sun was darkened and the air** (not, as Bengel, a hendiadys, "aer, quatenus per solem illuminatur:" for the sun may be obscured, as by a cloud, without the air being *darkened*) **by reason of the smoke of the pit. And out of the smoke** (which therefore was their vehicle or envelope) **came forth locusts into** (towards, over, so as to spread over: εἰς gives more the sense of distribution than ἐπί would) **the earth, and there was given to them power as the scorpions of the earth** (τῆς γῆς, not as noting any distinction between land-scorpions and water-scorpions, as Ewald, but because the scorpions are natural and of the earth, whereas these locusts are infernal and not of nature) **have power** (viz. to sting, as below explained): **and it was commanded them that they shall not hurt** (for construction, see reff.) **the grass of the earth, nor yet every** (i.e. any) **green thing, nor yet every** (any) **tree** (the usual objects on which locusts prey: cf. Exod. x. 13, 15), **but only** (lit. *except*: the former sentence being regarded as if it had run, "that they should hurt nothing,"—and then "*except*" follows naturally) **the men, the which** (οἵτινες designates the class or kind: see reff.) **have not the seal of God upon their foreheads** (this, as before noticed, fixes this fifth trumpet to the time following the sealing in ch. vii. It denotes a plague which falls on the unbelieving inhabitants of the earth after the servants of God have been marked out among them, and of which the saints are not partakers. Either then it denotes something purely spiritual, some misery from which those are exempt who have peace with God,—which can hardly be, consistently with vv. 5, 6,—or it takes place in a state totally different from this present one, in which the wheat and tares are mingled together. One or other of these considerations will at once dismiss by far the greater number of inter-

ἐδόθη αὐταῖς [x] ἵνα μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' [x] ἵνα [g] βασανισθήσονται μῆνας πέντε· καὶ ὁ [h] βασανισμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς [h] βασανισμὸς [i] σκορπίου ὅταν [j] παίσῃ ἄνθρωπον. [6] καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ζητήσουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸν θάνατον, καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσιν αὐτόν, καὶ [k] ἐπιθυμήσουσιν ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ φεύγει ὁ θάνατος ἀπ' αὐτῶν. [7] καὶ τὰ [l] ὁμοιώ-

g = ch. xi. 10. xii. 2. xiv. 10. xx. 10. Matt. viii. 6 al. Wisd. xi. 9.
h ch. xiv. 11. xviii. 7, 10, 15 only †.
i ver. 3 reff.
j Matt. xxvi. 68 ‖ L. John xviii. 10 ‖ Mk. only. Num. xxii. 28 al.
k constr., Matt. xiii. 17. Luke xv. 16. xvi. 21. 1 Pet. i. 12. Prov. xxiv. 1. see Job iii. 20, 21.
l Rom. i. 23. v. 14. vi. 5. viii. 3. Phil. ii. 7 only. Ezek. i. 16 B F(A def.). x. 22 A.

5. *αυτοις* A [P(Tischdf, prolegg)] ℵ 1. 12 : *αυτους* f (*αυτας* f[1], perhaps). rec *βασανισθωσιν*, with B rel Andr Areth : *βασανησωσιν* l : txt A[P]ℵ 1. 12. 36-8. [*πεση* (*itacism*) P b k l m : *πληξη* h[3] 37. 41-2.]

6. rec (for *ου μη*) *ουχ*, with 33 : txt A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. for *ευρησουσιν*, *ευρωσιν* A[P] m n 12-7. 34-5. 49 : *ευρησωσιν* 1. 19-corr : txt ℵ B rel Andr-p Areth. rec (for *φευγει*) *φευξεται*, with B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Ambr : txt A[P] ℵ(*φυγη*) 1. 12-7. 36-8 Andr-b. *απ' αυτων* bef *ο θανατος* B rel vulg-ed(with lipss) arm Andr-coisl Areth : txt A[P]ℵ l n 1. 17. 36-8 am(with demid ; *mors fug. ab eis* fuld) syr-dd Andr.

pretations. That of Elliott, the fact of Mahomet's mission being avowedly against corrupt Christianity as idolatry, does not in the remotest degree answer the conditions. In the very midst of this corrupt Christianity were at that time God's elect scattered up and down: and it is surely too much to say that every such person escaped scathless from the Turkish sword). **And it was given to them** (allotted to them by God as the limit of their appointed work and office: here the ἐδόθη expresses rather the limitation than the extension of the grant) **that they should not kill them** (the unsealed), **but that they** (the unsealed: the subject is changed) **shall be** (fut. aft. ἵνα, see above, ver. 4) **tormented five months** (the reason seems to be correct, which several Commentators have given for this number being chosen: viz., that five months is the ordinary time in the year during which locusts commit their ravages: so Calov., Vitr., Eich., Ewald, De W., Düsterd., al. At all events we are thus in some measure delivered from the endless perplexities of capricious fancy in which the historical interpreters involve us): **and their torment** (i.e. that of the sufferers: against Düsterd.) **is as the torment of** (arising from: notice the same construction in two senses) **a scorpion, when it has smitten** (παίσῃ, the regular futurus exactus: "whenever it shall have . . ." παίω and πατάσσω (Jon. iv. 7. Achill. Tat. ii. 7, ἡ μέλιττα ἐπάταξε τὴν χεῖρα), as in the Latin *ictus* (Pliny, H. N. vi. 28), are used of the bite or sting of an animal) **a man. And in those days men shall seek death** (observe the transition of the style from the descriptive to the prophetic. For the first time the Apostle ceases to be the exponent of what he saw, and becomes the direct organ of the Spirit), **and shall not** (the οὐ μή, with a subjunctive (its ordinary construction), is a more certain and definite negation than even the future itself. The latter expresses fact; whereas the former states that the fact cannot be otherwise: οὐ μή with the future, as in text, seems to be a later and lax way of expressing the same) **find it: and they shall vehemently desire** (*desire* alone is not strong enough: ἐπιθυμέω, -ία, express the direction of the θυμός (itself from θύω, ferveo—ἀπὸ τῆς θύσεως καὶ ζέσεως τῆς ψυχῆς, Plato, Cratyl. 419 E) upon an object. As *desire* is too strong for θέλω, so is it too weak for ἐπιθυμέω) **to die** (notice what Düsterd. well calls "ein schreckliches Gegenstück," to the Apostle's saying in Phil. i. 23, ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν χριστῷ εἶναι), **and death fleeth** (the pres., of the *habitual* avoidance in those days) **from them** (the longing to die arises from the excruciating pain of the sting. Cf. Jer. viii. 3. I cannot forbear noticing as we pass, the caprice of historical interpreters. On the command *not to kill* the men, &c., in ver. 5, Elliott says, "i.e. not to annihilate them as a political Christian body." If then the same rule of interpretation is to hold, the present verse must mean that the "political Christian body" will be so sorely beset by these Mahometan locusts, that it will vehemently desire to be annihilated, and not find any way. For it surely cannot be allowed that the *killing of men* should be said of their annihilation as a political body in one verse, and their *desiring to die* in the next should be said of something totally different, and applicable to their individual misery. Is it in conse-

m Joel ii. 4. ch. v. 2 reff. n ver. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 21. 1 Macc. xiii. 27. o Joel i. 6. p ch. iv. 7 reff. q here (no. ver. 17. Eph. vi. 14. 1 Thess. v. 8 only. 1 Kings xvii. 5.

ματα τῶν [a]ἀκρίδων ὅμοια [m]ἵπποις [n]ἡτοιμασμένοις [n]εἰς πόλεμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ὡς στέφανοι ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ὡς πρόσωπα ἀνθρώπων, [8] καὶ εἶχαν τρίχας ὡς τρίχας γυναικῶν, καὶ οἱ [o]ὀδόντες αὐτῶν ὡς [p]λεόντων ἦσαν, [9] καὶ εἶχον [q]θώρακας ὡς [q]θώ-

APℵ 11 to 13. 1 2 4 5 8. 10-3. 15 to 19. 26-7. 21. 32 to 35. 40-1-2 47 to 51. 90 Br.

7. for ομοια, ομοιωματα A : ομοιωτατα e : ομοιοι ℵ : txt [P] B rel. for ομοιοι χρυσω, χρυσοι B rel Areth : txt A[P]ℵ m n (1, e sil) 17. 34-5-6 vulg syr-dd (copt) Andr Tich.
8. (ειχαν, so Aℵ.)

quence of foreseeing this difficulty, that Mr. Elliott has, as in the case of many important details in other places, omitted all consideration of this verse?).

7.] The Apostle now returns to the description of the locusts themselves. **And the shapes** (so E. V., rightly: not, the *likenesses*. ὁμοίωμα is the product of ὁμοιόω: the finished form of any thing which is made like (ὅμοιον) to any pattern. See Winer, edn. 6, § 16. A. 2, a) **of the locusts (were) like horses made ready for war** (this resemblance,—cf. ref. Joel, ἡ ὅρασις αὐτῶν ὡς ὅρασις ἵππων,—has been noticed by travellers. Winer, Realw. art. Heuschrecken, refers to Niebuhr, Beschreibung, 173. Ewald gives other references, and says, "refert omnino animal equini corporis quædam similia, unde nostris etiam *Heupferd* dici notum est." And especially does it hold good when the horse is equipped for war; the plates of the horse's armour being represented by the hard laminæ of the outer shell of the locust: see below, ver. 9), **and on their heads as it were crowns like unto gold** (It is not easy to say what this part of the description imports. Elliott tries to apply it to the turban: but granting some latitude to στέφανοι, the ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ will hardly bear this. The appearance of a turban, even when ornamented with gold, is hardly *golden*. I should understand the words, of the head actually ending in a crown-shaped fillet which resembled gold in its material, just as the wings of some of the beetle tribe might be said to blaze with gold and gems. So we have below εἶχον θώρακας ὡς θ. σιδηροῦς: the material not being metallic, but only quasi-metallic. Eichhorn and Heinr. understand these crowns of soldiers' helmets: but this is quite arbitrary and gratuitous): **and their faces (were) as the faces of men** (Düsterdieck well observes, that we must not suppose them actually to have had human faces, but that the face of the locust, which under ordinary circumstances has a distant resemblance to the human countenance, bore this resemblance even more notably in the case of these supernatural locusts. It is not τὰ πρ. αὐτῶν πρόσωπα ἀνθρ. but ὡς πρόσωπα ἀνθρ. Nor again can we agree with Mr. Elliott's idea that ἀνθρώπων is here used to designate the male sex: an interpretation recommended to him by his wish to introduce the moustache of the Arabs. Wherever the general term ἄνθρωπος is used for the particular sex, it must, as in the case of our "*man*," be necessarily so interpreted by the context, as is the case in every one of the passages cited by Mr. E. in support of his view, viz. Matt. xix. 3, 5, 10; 1 Cor. vii. 1; Gen. ii. 18; Exod. xiii. 2; Lev. xx. 10; Esth. iv. 10 (ἄνθρωπος ἢ γυνή); Eccl. vii. 28; Isa. iv. 1. But here there is no such necessity in the context: nay, it is much more natural to take ἀνθρώπων as the general term, their faces were like human faces, and then comes the limitation, not in the face, but in another particular), **and they had hair as the hair of women** (i.e. long and flowing, 1 Cor. xi. 14 f. De Wette quotes from Niebuhr an Arabic proverb in which the antlers of locusts are compared to the hair of girls. But perhaps we must regard the comparison as rather belonging to the supernatural portion of our description. Ewald would understand the hair on the legs, or on the bodies, of the locusts, to be meant, referring to יֶלֶק סָמָר, rough locusts, Jer. li. (xxviii.) 27, where the LXX have merely ἀκρίδων, and the E. V. "rough caterpillars." To infer, from this feature, licentiousness as a characteristic in the interpretation, is entirely beside the purpose): **and their teeth were as the teeth of lions** (so also of the locust in Joel i. 6, οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ὀδόντες λέοντος. Ewald rightly designates as very doubtful a fancied resemblance to a lion in the under jaw. We may observe that this, as some other features in the description, is purely graphic, and does not in any way apply to the plague to be inflicted by these mystic locusts). **and they had breastplates as iron breastplates** (the plate which forms the thorax of the natural locust, was in their case as if of iron), **and the sound of**

ρακας [r] σιδηροῦς, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ τῶν [s] πτερύγων αὐτῶν ὡς [t] φωνὴ [t] ἁρμάτων ἵππων πολλῶν τρεχόντων εἰς πόλεμον. [10] καὶ ἔχουσιν [u] οὐρὰς [v] ὁμοίας [i] σκορπίοις καὶ [w] κέντρα, καὶ ἐν ταῖς [u] οὐραῖς αὐτῶν ἡ [x] ἐξουσία αὐτῶν [y] ἀδικῆσαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μῆνας πέντε. [11] [z] ἔχουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν [z] βασιλέα ἄγγελον τῆς [a] ἀβύσσου, [b] ὄνομα [b] αὐτῷ [c] Ἑβραϊστὶ [d] Ἀβαδδών, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ [e] ὄνομα [e] ἔχει Ἀπολλύων. [12] Ἡ [f] οὐαὶ ἡ [g] μία [h] ἀπῆλθεν· ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται ἔτι δύο [f] οὐαὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.

r ch. ii. 27 reff.
s ch. iv. 8 reff.
t Joel ii. 5.
u here bis. ver. 19 bis. ch. xii. 4 only. Job xl. 12 (17).
v constr., Matt. v. 20. ch. xiii. 11.
w Acts xxvi. 14. 1 Cor. xv. 55 (from Hos. xiii. 14). 56 only.
x vv. 3, 19.
y = ch. vi. 6 reff.
z see Prov. xxx. 27 (xxiv. 62).

a = vv. 1, 2. b ch. vi. 8 reff. c ch. xvi. 16. John v. 2. xix. 13, 17, 20. xx. 16 only †. J. see Acts xxi. 40. 4 Kings xviii. 26. d here only †. see note. e = here only. see ch. iii. 1. f = here bis. ch. xi. 14 bis only. see Ezek. vii. 26. ii. 10. g = Matt. xxviii. 1 al. Gen. i. 5. h = ch. xi. 14. xxi. 1, 4 only.

9. *και η φωνη των πτ. αυτων* is written twice in 1.

10. *ομοιοις* Aℵ. rec (for 3rd *και*) *ην*, with (35, e sil) vulg-ed(with some mss): om l m n 1. 30-2-4-6-8. 40-6-7. 90 am(with tol) Andr Tich: txt A[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel vulg-ms syr-dd copt Areth. rec aft *αυτων* ins *και*, with 1. 37. 47 vulg-ed(with a few mss) Andr: om A[P]ℵ B rel vulg-mss Andr-coisl Areth Tich. for *η εξουσια αυτων*, *εξουσιαν εχουσι* B rel Andr-a Areth: om l: txt A[P]ℵ m 1. 17. 34-5-6 vulg syr-dd copt Andr Tich. ins *του* bef *αδικησαι* B rel: om A[P]ℵ m n 1. 17. 32-4-6. 48. 51 Andr Areth.

11. rec at beg ins *και*, with [P] m n 1. 34. 40-1. 51 fuld syr-dd Andr: om Aℵ B rel. for *εχουσιν*, *εχουσαι* B rel Areth Tich: *ειχον* vulg Andr-p Primas: txt A[P]ℵ m n 1. 26-7. 33-4-6 (26-7. 35 Br, e sil) fuld syr-dd (copt?) Andr. *βασιλεα* bef *επ' αυτων* B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth, *βασιλεα υπ' αυτων* 16, *β. επ' αυτους* l: [om *επ' αυτων* P:] txt A f n 1. 17, *επ' αυτων βασιλεις* 36, *εαυτων τον βασιλεα* (omg *επ'*) ℵ.—rec *εφ'*: txt A B rel. rec ins *τον* bef *αγγελον*, with A(see below) [P]ℵ(see above) f l n 1. 9. 16. 33-5-6(38?) 47-8-9. 50. 90 Andr: om B rel Andr-coisl Areth.—*αρχοντα της αβυσσου τον αγγελον* A. ins *ω* bef 1st *ονομα* ℵ 18. *αββααδων* B (a d) g m 35(Del) Andr-c. for *και εν*, *εν δε* B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas: txt A[P]ℵ 1. 17. 33 (26-7. 36, e sil) æth.—*ελληνιδι* ℵ.—*ελληνιστι δε* 9.—*εν τη ελληνικη δε* 13 6. *εχει* bef 2nd *ονομα* ℵ 36: om *ονομα* 40.

12. om *η* (twice) ℵ(ins 2nd *η* ℵ[3a]). rec *ερχονται*, with [P]ℵ[3a] B m n 1. 18. 34-5-8. 49[2] (6. 26. 32-7. 47 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: txt Aℵ[1] rel. om *ετι* j 1: for *ετι*, *αι* 36.

12, 13. *και* bef *μετα ταυτα* B f, *και μετα ταυτα και* 2. 4. 10-8-9. 40: om *και* (in both places) ℵ: txt A[P] rel.

their wings (was) as a sound of chariots of many horses (by the two genitives the sound of both, the chariots and the horses, is included. The chariots are regarded as an appendage to the horses) **as they run to war. And they have tails like to scorpions** (i. e. to the tails of scorpions: the construction called the comparatio compendiaria: see reff.), **and stings** (viz. in their tails: this is the particular especially in which the comparison finds its aptitude): **and in their tails is their power to hurt men five months** (see above on ver. 5). **They have as king over them** (or, "they have a king over them, viz." . . . . the two accusatives being in apposition. It favours this last alternative, that in this particular, of having a king, they are distinguished from natural locusts: for Prov. xxx. 27, ἀβασίλευτόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀκρίς) **the angel of the abyss** (we can hardly with Luther, render "an angel from the abyss:" ἄγγελος, though anarthrous, is necessarily defined by the genitive τῆς ἀβύσσου); **his name is in Hebrew Abaddon** (אֲבַדּוֹן, *perdition*, from אָבַד, *periit*, is used in the O. T. for the place of perdition, Orcus, in Job xxvi. 6; Prov. xxvii. 20 (Keri: Chetib has אֲבַדֹּה), in both of which places it is joined with שְׁאוֹל,—Ps. lxxxviii. 12; Job xxviii. 22. In all these places the LXX express it by ἀπώλεια. So that this is the local name personified: or rather perhaps that abstract name personified, from which the local import itself is derived), **and in the Greek** (scil. γλώσσῃ) **he has for his name Apollyon** (the name ἀπολλύων seems chosen from the LXX ἀπώλεια, see above.

It is a question, who this angel of the abyss is. Perhaps, for accurate distinction's sake, we must not identify him with

i ch. vi. 6.
k ch. viii. 13 reff.
l here only. Levit. iv. 7. Ezek. xliii. 20.
m Exod. xl. 26 al.
n constr., ch. i. v. 1 al. fr.
o constr., ch. ii. 20 reff.

13 Καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἤκουσα [i] φωνὴν [k] μίαν ἐκ τῶν [τεσσάρων] [l] κεράτων τοῦ [l] θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ [m] χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ 14 * [n] λέγοντα τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀγγέλῳ [o] ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα Λῦσον τοὺς τέσσαρας

13. φωνης μιας ℵ[3a]. om τεσσαρων Aℵ[3a] n am(with fuld harl lips-3 tol) arm demid lipss) syr copt Bede: ins [P] B rel Andr Areth Cypr Primas Tich.—om μιαν εκ των (τεσσ.) κερ. ℵ[1].—μιαν φωνην εκ τ. θυσιαστηριου ενωπιον τ. θῦ, omg all the rest ℵ[1].
14. rec λεγουσαν, with [P] h l m n 1. 10-7. 34-5-6-8 (6. 13. 26. 37. 49 B?, e sil): λεγουσης ℵ[3a]: λεγων 40: *λέγοντος B rel: λεγοντα Aℵ[1]. om εκτω A. rec (for ο εχων) ος ειχε, with 6(e sil) Areth: τω εχοντι m 34 Andr-coisl: txt Aℵ B rel.

Satan himself,—cf. ch. xii. 3, 9,—but must regard him as one of the principal of the bad angels). **The one (first) woe hath passed: behold, there cometh** (singular, the verb applying simply to that which is future, without reference as yet to its plurality) **two woes after these things.** There is an endless Babel of allegorical and historical interpretation of these *locusts from the pit.* The most that we can say of their import is, that they belong to a series of judgments on the ungodly which will immediately precede the second advent of our Lord: that the various and mysterious particulars of the vision will no doubt clear themselves up to the church of God, when the time of its fulfilment arrives: but that no such clearing up has yet taken place, a very few hours of research among histories of apocalyptic interpretation will serve to convince any reader who is not himself the servant of a preconceived system.

13—21.] *The sixth Trumpet.* **And the sixth angel blew his trumpet, and I heard a** (it is doubtful, in the uncertain authenticity of τεσσάρων, whether any stress is to be laid on this μίαν or not. Vitringa gives it the emphasis,—"quatuor hæc cornua simul edidisse vocem, non diversam, sed unam eandemque:" and so Hengstb. The allegorical interpreters give it various imports—the agreement of the four Gospels (Zeger, Calov., al.),—that of the prayers of exiled Jews (Grot.), &c.) **voice out of the [four] horns of the golden altar which was before God** (the same altar as that previously mentioned in ch. viii. 3 and vi. 9, where see notes. From ch. xvi. 7 it would appear that the voice probably proceeded from the altar itself, represented as uttering the cry of vengeance for the blood shed on it; cf. ch. vi. 9, with which cry of the martyred saints the whole series of retributive judgments is connected. The reading in the Codex Sinaiticus (see digest) is very remarkable, and may represent the original text. To suppose, as Elliott, that the cry from the altar is indicative of an altar having been the scene of some special sin on the part of the men of Roman Christendom, and so to apply it to the perversions of Christian rites in the Romish Church, is surely to confuse the whole imagery of the vision. For it is not of *any altar* in the abstract that we are reading, but of *the golden altar which was before God,* where the prayers of the saints had been offered by the angel, ch. viii. 3, 5: and the voice is the result of those prayers, in accordance with which those judgments are inflicted. The horns again, representing the efficiency of the altar, not any special rites with which the horns of an altar were concerned, cannot be pressed into the service of the above-noticed interpretation, but simply belong to the propriety of that heard and seen. The voice proceeded from the surface of the altar, on which the prayers had been offered: and that surface was bounded by the κέρατα) **saying** (the noun to which the participle, in this broken construction, is to be referred, may be either φωνήν, which is most probable, or κεράτων, in which latter case an emphasis would naturally lie on the foregoing μίαν, or, if λέγοντος be read, θυσιαστηρίου) **to the sixth angel who had** (construction, see reff. It is far better to take ὁ ἔχων as the appositional nom., so common in this book, than, as Tregelles, to understand it as vocative. It is natural that the word ἕκτῳ should be further specified by adding the class to which the angel belonged, ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα: but hardly, that he should be singled out by the address, "Thou that hast the trumpet," from the whole seven who had trumpets) **the trumpet** (τήν, as being that one now before us,—belonging to the present vision), **Loose** (it is too much to say that the angel himself is made the active minister of this loosing: we do not read καὶ πορευθεὶς ἔλυσεν following, but simply καὶ ἐλύθησαν. We

ἀγγέλους τοὺς δεδεμένους ἐπὶ τῷ [p] ποταμῷ τῷ [p] μεγάλῳ Εὐφράτῃ. [15] καὶ ἐλύθησαν οἱ τέσσαρες ἄγγελοι οἱ [qr] ἡτοιμασμένοι [q] εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτόν, [r] ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων. [16] καὶ ὁ

p ch. xvi. 12. Gen. xv. 18 al.
q constr., ver. 7 reff. Prov. xxi. 31.
r ch. viii. 6 reff.

Andr. τεσσαρες ℵ m, -ρεις 1 36. [ins ποταμω bef ευφρ. P.] εφρατη B.
15. for ελυθησαν, ελυπηθησαν A. om 2nd οι (*homœotel*) ℵ 41. 51. 90. ins εις την bef ημεραν B rel Andr-coisl Areth; την h n 10. 38. 49 Br: om A[P] 17-8. 33 (6. 26. 35-6-7. 40-1-2, e sil) vulg copt Andr Cypr Primas Tich.—om και ημεραν ℵ 1. aft ινα ins μη ℵ.

must therefore believe that the command is given to him only in so far as he is the representative and herald of all that takes place under his trumpet-blowing) **the four angels which are bound** (so E. V. rightly: "*are* bound" is the true perfect passive, not "have been bound") **on** (not "*in*," as E. V.: ἐπί with the dat. denotes close adherence or juxtaposition: so our Lord sat ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ, John iv. 6) **the great river Euphrates** (the whole imagery here has been a crux interpretum: as to who these angels are, and what is indicated by the locality here described. I will only venture to point out, amidst the surging tumult of controversy, one or two points of apparent refuge to which we *must not* betake ourselves. First, we must not yield to the temptation, so attractive at first sight, of identifying these four angels with the four angels standing on the four corners of the earth and holding in the four winds, in ch. vii. 1 ff. For the mission of these angels is totally distinct from theirs, as the locality is also. There is not a syllable of *winds* here, nor any hurting of earth, sea, or trees. Secondly, the question need not perplex us here, whether these are good or bad angels: for it does not enter in any way into consideration. They simply appear, as in other parts of this book, as ministers of the divine purposes, and pass out of view as soon as mentioned. Here, it would almost seem as if the angelic persons were little more than personifications; for they are immediately resolved into the host of cavalry. Thirdly, that there is nothing in the text to prevent "the great river Euphrates" from being meant literally. Düsterd. maintains, that because the rest of the vision has a mystical meaning, therefore this local designation must have one also: and that if we are to take the Euphrates literally and the rest mystically, endless confusion would be introduced. But this is quite a mistake, as the slightest consideration will shew. It is a common feature of Scripture allegory to intermingle with its mystic language literal designations of time and place. Take for instance the allegory in Ps. lxxx. 8, 11, "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt . . . . she sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river:" where, though the vine and her boughs and branches are mystical, Egypt, the sea, and the river, are all literal. See some good remarks on this in Mr. Elliott's 1st vol., p. 331 ff., where the above example is cited among others). **And the four angels were loosed, which had been prepared** (the perf. part. in conjunction with an aor. verb is necessarily pluperf. in sense) **for** (in the ordinary sense of εἰς after ἑτοιμάζω and its kindred words—viz. "in reference to," "in reservation for," "with a view to:" see ver. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 21; and πρός, 1 Pet. iii. 15) **the hour and day and month and year** (viz. which had been appointed by God: the appointed hour occurring in the appointed day, and that in the appointed month, and that in the appointed year. The art., prefixed, and not repeated, seems to make this meaning imperative. Had the art. been repeated before each, the ideas of the appointed hour, day, month, and year would have been separated, not, as now, united: had there been no art., we *might* have understood that the four were to be added together to make up the time, though even thus the εἰς occurring once only would have made some difficulty. The natural way of expressing this latter meaning would be, εἰς ὥραν κ. εἰς ἡμέραν κ. εἰς μῆνα κ. εἰς ἐνιαυτόν. The only way in which it can be extracted from the words as they now stand, is by understanding the τήν to designate some previously well-known period, "for the (well-known) hour and day and month and year." But as no such notoriety of the period named can be recognized, we must I conceive adhere to, the sense above given), **that** (ἵνα belongs to ἡτοιμασμένοι more naturally than to ἐλύθησαν) **they should kill the third part of men** (on τὸ τρίτον, see above, ch. viii. 7. It seems necessary, that in τῶν ἀνθρώπων we are to include only the κατοικοῦντες

ἀριθμὸς τῶν [s] στρατευμάτων τοῦ [t] ἱππικοῦ [u] δισμυριάδες [v] μυριάδων· ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν. [17] καὶ οὕτως εἶδον τοὺς ἵππους ἐν τῇ [w] ὁράσει καὶ τοὺς [x] καθημένους [x] ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἔχοντας [y] θώρακας [z] πυρίνους καὶ [a] ὑακινθίνους καὶ [b] θειώδεις· καὶ αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ἵππων ὡς [c] κεφαλαὶ [c] λεόντων, καὶ [d] ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν [d] ἐκπορεύεται πῦρ καὶ [e] καπνὸς καὶ [f] θεῖον. [18] [g] ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν [h] πληγῶν τούτων ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, [i] ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ [e] καπνοῦ καὶ τοῦ [f] θείου τοῦ [d] ἐκπορευομένου [d] ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν. [19] ἡ γὰρ [j] ἐξουσία τῶν ἵππων

s Matt. xxii. 7. Luke xxiii. 11. Acts xxiii. 10, 27. ch. xix. 14, 19 bis only †. 1 Macc. ix. 34 al.
t here only †. 1 Macc. xv. 38.
u Psa. lxvii. 17. Dan. vii. 10.
v Heb. xii. 22 reff.
w = Acts ii. 17 (ch. iv. 3) only. Zech. x. 2. Dan. ix. 21 Theod.
x ch. iv. 2 reff. & note.
y ver. 9.
z here only. Ezek. xxviii. 14, 16. Sir. xlviii. 9 only. Arist. de Anima iii. 13. 1.
a here only. Ezek. xxiii. 6. Exod. xxvi. 14 al. (-θος, ch. xxi. 20.)
b here only †. see below (e).
c see 1 Chron. xii. 8.
d ch. i. 16 reff.
e ch. viii. 4 reff.
f Rev. (here bis. ch. xiv. 10. xix. 20. xx. 10. xxi. 8) only, exc. Luke vii. 29, from Gen. xix. 24. Ps. x. 7. see above (b).
g = ch. xii. 6 reff.
h = Rev. only, here first, ch. xi. 6. (xiii. 3, 12, 14.) xv. 1 al. (elsw. = stripe, Luke x. 30. xii. 48. Acts xvi. 23, 33. 2 Cor. vi. 5. xi. 23 only.) Num. xiv. 37.
i = ch. viii. 11 reff.
j vv. 3, 10.

16. rec om *των* (with 6 B[r], e sil) : ins A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. for *τ. ιππικου*, *τ. ιππου* rel Andr-coisl : *των ιππων* b 3 : txt A[P]ℵ B c l n 36. 49[1]-marg (f 1. 6. 17. 38, e sil) Andr Areth. rec *δυο μυριαδες*, with (ℵ) n (4. 6, e sil) Areth : *μυριαδες* (omg *δις-*) B rel Andr : txt A[P] c 1(but with *δις* erased) 11-2. 36, *δισμυριων* 18, *δυο μυριαδων μυριαδας*(sic) ℵ. rec ins *και* bef *ηκουσα*, with (6. 27. 42 B[r], e sil) vulg-ed(with lips-4) Epiph Areth : om A[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel am(with fuld &c) syr-dd copt arm Andr Cypr Primas.

17. for *ιππους*, *ιππικους* B f. *επανω* ℵ. for *θειωδεις*, *θυωδεις*(but corrd) ℵ.

18. rec (for *απο*) *υπο*, with 1 : txt AC[P]ℵ B rel. om *τριων* ℵ. rec om *πληγων*, with 1 (37, e sil) : ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. for 1st *εκ*, *απο* B rel Andr Areth : txt AC[P]ℵ h n 10-7-8. 36 (1. 37-8. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr-a. rec ins *εκ* bef *του καπνου*, with C[P] c 1. 17 syr-dd Andr-a : om Aℵ B rel am(with demid fuld &c) copt Andr Areth Cypr. rec ins *εκ* bef *του θειου*, with [P] c 1. 17[1] syr-dd Andr-a : om ACℵ B rel vulg copt Andr Areth Cypr.

19. rec *αι γαρ εξουσιαι αυτων εν τω στοματι αυτων εισιν*, with 1(but *εστιν*) 27; omg *και εν ταις ουραις αυτων*, with 36 : txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—for *ιππων*, *τοπων*

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of ch. viii. 13, not any of the servants of God): **and the number of the armies of the cavalry was twice myriads of myriads** (i. e. 20,000 × 10,000 : = 200,000,000, two hundred millions. The number seems to be founded on those in the reff.);—**I heard the number of them. And after this manner** (i.e. according to the following description) **saw I the horses in my vision** (Düsterd. suggests, and it seems likely enough, that this express reference to *sight* is inserted on account of the *ἤκουσα* which preceded) **and those who sat upon them, having** (*ἔχοντας* most naturally refers to both horses and riders, not to riders only. The armour of both was uniform) **breastplates fiery-red** (the three epithets express the colours of the breastplates, and are to be separated, as belonging each to one portion of the host, and corresponding to the fire, smoke, and brimstone which proceeded out of the horses' mouths below) **and fuliginous** (answering to *καπνός* below. *ὑακίνθινος* is used for any dark dull colour; Homer calls dark hair *ὑακινθίνῳ ἄνθει ὁμοίας*, Od. ζ. 231, ψ. 158. The hyacinth of the Greeks is supposed to have been our dark blue iris: see Palm and Rost, sub voce) **and sulphureous** (light yellow : such a colour as would be produced by the settling fumes of brimstone): **and the heads of the horses** (*τῶν ἵππων* takes up the horses again, both horses and riders having been treated of in the preceding sentence) **(were) as heads of lions, and out of their mouths goeth forth fire and smoke and brimstone** (i. e. separately, one of these out of the mouths of each division of the host. It is remarkable, that these divisions are *three*, though the angels were *four*). **From** (*ἀπό* indicates not directly the instrumentality, but the *direction from which* the result comes) **these three plagues were killed the third part of men, by** (*ἐκ*, the source out of which the result springs) **the fire and the smoke and the brimstone which went forth** (the participle agrees with the last noun only, but applies to all) **out of**

ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν ἐστιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς [k] οὐραῖς αὐτῶν· αἱ γὰρ [k] οὐραὶ αὐτῶν ὅμοιαι ὄφεσιν, ἔχουσαι κεφαλάς, καὶ [l] ἐν αὐταῖς [m] ἀδικοῦσιν. [20] καὶ οἱ [n] λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἳ οὐκ ἀπεκτάνθησαν [l] ἐν ταῖς [h] πληγαῖς ταύταις οὐδὲ [o] μετενόησαν [o] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, [p] ἵνα μὴ [q] προσκυνήσουσιν τὰ [r] δαιμόνια καὶ τὰ [qs] εἴδωλα τὰ χρυσᾶ καὶ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ [t] χαλκᾶ καὶ τὰ [u] λίθινα καὶ τὰ [v] ξύλινα, [w] ἃ

k ver. 10 reff. l ch. vi. 8 reff. m = ch. vi. 6 reff. n w. gen., ch. xx. 5. Luke xviii. 11. Esth. ix. 16. o here bis. ch. ii. 21, 22. xvi. 11 only. ἀπό, Acts viii. 22. ἐπί, 1 Cor. xii. 21. p w. ind. fut., ch. iii. 9 reff. q Num. xxv. 2. r = 1 Cor. x. 20. 1 Tim. iv. 1. Deut. xxxii. 17. s 1 John v. 21. 1 Thess. i. 9 al. fr. t here only. Num. xxi. 9. Dan. v. 4 Theod. (-κός, ch. xviii. 12.) u John ii. 6. 2 Cor. iii. 3 only. Exod. xxxi. 18. v 2 Tim. ii. 20 only. Dan. v. 4, 23 Theod. Ep. Jer. 30. w Psa. cxlii. 5—7 (13—15). Dan. v. 23 Theod.

A.—εν ταις ουραις και εν τω στοματι αυτων ην 38. ομοιοι 1: om C[1]. οφεων B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ 10-7-8. 36 (1. 30-7-8. 40-9 B[r], e sil) Andr. for εχουσαι, εχουσιν C: εχουσας ℵ[1]: εχουσαις [P]ℵ[3a] 36: txt A B rel.

20. aft πληγαις ins αυτων ℵ. rec ουτε, with A[P] 1. 17. 33. (34-6, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a: ου C rel Andr: txt ℵ B f 38. 92. om μη 1[1] (ins above the line 1[2]). rec προσκυνησωσι, with [P] B rel Andr Areth: txt ACℵ l[1] 36. 42. rec om τα (bef ειδωλα), with B[r] (e sil): ins AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. χρυσαια (i.e. χρυσεα) and χαλκεα ℵ. transp λιθινα and ξυλινα ℵ.

their mouths. For the power of the horses is in their mouths (principally; seeing that by what proceeded from their mouths their mission, to slay the third part of men, was accomplished) **and in their tails: for their tails were like serpents, having heads, and with** (ἐν is the prep. of investiture, used of that in which clad or armed a man does any thing) **them they hurt** (i.e. inflict pain: viz. with the bites of the serpent heads in which they terminate. I cannot but mention, in no unfriendly spirit, but because, both being friends, Truth is the dearer, that which may be designated the culminating instance of incongruous interpretation in Mr. Elliott's historical exposition of these prophecies. These tails are, according to him, the horsetails, borne as symbols of authority by the Turkish Pachas. Well may Mr. Barker say (Friendly Strictures, p. 32), "an interpretation so wild, if it refutes not itself, seems scarcely capable of refutation." Happily, it does refute itself. For it is convicted, by altogether leaving out of view the power in the *mouths*, which is the principal feature in the original vision: by making no reference to the serpent-like character of these tails, but being wholly inconsistent with it: by distorting the canon of symmetrical interpretation in making the *heads* attached to the tails to mean that the tails are symbols of authority: and by being compelled to render ἀδικοῦσι "they commit injustice," a meaning which, in this reference, it surely will not bear. When it is said of fire- and smoke- and brimstone-breathing horses which kill the third part of men, that besides having power in their mouths they have it in their tails, which are like serpents, ending in heads, it would be a strange anti-climax to end, "and with these they do injustice." I will venture to say, that a more self-condemnatory interpretation was never broached than this of the horsetails of the Pachas). [20] **And the rest of men** (this specification which follows clearly shews what sort of men are meant; viz. the ungodly alone) **who were not killed in** (the course of: the ἐν again of that in which, as its vehicle or investiture, their death would come, if it had come) **these plagues, did not even** (the force of οὐδέ, which on the whole seems likely to have been the original reading) **repent of** (ἐκ, so as to come out from: see reff.) **the works of their hands** (i.e. as the context here necessitates, not, the whole course of their lives, but the idols which their hands had made. This will at once appear on comparing our passage with Deut. iv. 28, λατρεύσετε ἐκεῖ θεοῖς ἑτέροις, ἔργοις χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων, ξύλοις καὶ λίθοις, οἳ οὐκ ὄψονται, κ.τ.λ., and Ps. cxxxiv. 15, τὰ εἴδωλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον κ. χρυσίον, ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων· στόμα ἔχουσι καὶ οὐ λαλήλουσιν, κ.τ.λ. See also Acts vii. 41) **that they should not** (in order not to: the final purpose, explaining the οὐ μετεν. ἐκ preceding: cf. Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 6) **worship** (for ἵνα with indic. fut. see above, ch. iii. 9 reff.) **devils** (see reff. 1 Cor.; 1 Tim., and notes there. The objects of worship of the heathen, and of semi-heathen Christians, are in fact

οὔτε βλέπειν δύνανται οὔτε ἀκούειν οὔτε περιπατεῖν, 21 καὶ οὐ ᵉ μετενόησαν ᵉ ἐκ τῶν ˣʸᶻ φόνων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῶν ʸᵃ φαρμάκων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῆς ʸᶻ πορνείας αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῶν ᵇ κλεμμάτων αὐτῶν.

X. 1 Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ᶜ ἄγγελον ᶜ ἰσχυρὸν καταβαί-

x Rev., here only. y see Gal. v. 19 20, 21. ch. xxi. 8. xxii. 15. z Matt. xv. 19 Mk. see Hos. iv. 2. a here only. = 4 Kings ix. 22. Mic. v. 12. Nah. iii. 4 bis (Wisd. i. 14. Sir. vi. 16. xxxviii. 4) only. (-κεία, or -κία, Gal. v. 20. ch. xviii. 23 only.) b here only. Gen. xxxi. 39 bis. Exod. xxii. 3, 4 only. c ch. v. 2. xviii. 21.

ACPℵ B a to c. 1. 2 4 6 9. 10-3. 16 to 9. 32-7. 38 12 to 28. 40 1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Er.

rec (for δυνανται) δυναται, with B¹-corr rel: txt AC[P]ℵ B¹ l m n 34-5-6-8. 47-9. 50. 90. 21. rec φαρμακειων, with B rel, -κιων A[P] l 17: txt Cℵ a b c f g m 2. 4. 6. 9. 13-6-9. 27. 30-3(-4-5-6, e sil) 42-8. 50-1. 90. for πορνειας, πονηριας Aℵ¹: πορνιας ℵ³a or c.

Chap. X. 1. om αλλον [P] B rel Andr-a: ins ACℵ m (l 16) 33 (34-5-6-8, e sil) vss

devils, by whatever name they may be called), and images of gold (lit. the images which are, &c. But this we idiomatically express as above) and of silver and of brass and of stone and of wood, which can neither see nor hear nor walk: and they did not repent of their murders nor of their witchcrafts (lit. their drugs: concrete in sense of abstract, as in all the places in the canonical LXX in reff. On the sense, see note on Gal. v. 20) nor of their fornication (Bengel remarks on πορνείας being in the sing., whereas the rest are plural, "Alia scelera ab hominibus per intervalla patrantur: una perpetua πορνεία est apud eos qui munditie cordis carent." But perhaps this is too refined) nor of their thefts. The character of these sins points out very plainly who are the sufferers by this sixth, or second woe trumpet, and the survivors who do not repent. We are taught by St. Paul that the heathen are without excuse for degrading the majesty of God into an image made like unto corruptible things, and for degenerating into gross immoralities in spite of God's testimony given through the natural conscience. And even thus will the heathen world continue in the main until the second advent of our Lord, of which these judgments are to be the immediate precursors. Nor will these terrible inflictions themselves bring those to repentance, who shall ultimately reject the Gospel which shall be preached among all nations. Whether, or how far, those Christians who have fallen back into these sins of the heathen, are here included, is a question not easy to decide. That they are not formally in the Apostle's view, seems clear. We are not yet dealing with the apostasy and fornication within the church herself. But that they, having become as the κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, even so far as to inherit *their* character of persecutors of the saints, may by the very nature of the case, be individually included in the suffering of these plagues,—just as we believe and trust that many individually belonging to Babylon may be found among God's elect,—it is of course impossible to deny.

Ch. X. 1—XI. 14.] Episodical and anticipatory. As after the sixth seal, so here after the sixth trumpet, we have a passage interposed, containing two episodes, completing that which has been already detailed, and introducing the final member of the current series. But it is not so easy here as there, to ascertain the relevance and force of the episodes. Their subjects here seem further off: their action more complicated. In order to appreciate them, it will be necessary to lay down clearly the point at which we have arrived, and to observe what is at that point required.

The last vision witnessed the destruction of a third part of the ungodly by the horsemen from the East, and left the remainder in a state of impenitent idolatry and sin. Manifestly then the prayers of the saints are not yet answered, however near the time may be for that answer. If then this Episode contains some assurance of the approach of that answer in its completeness, it will be what we might expect at this point in the series of visions. At the same time, looking onwards to the rest of the book, we see, that as out of the more general series of visions at the opening of the seals, affecting both the church and the world, there sprung a new and more particular series of the trumpets, having reference to one incident in the former vision, and affecting especially the "inhabiters of the earth," so if now the gaze of prophecy once more turns to the church and her fortunes, and the Apostle receives a new commission to utter a second series of prophecies, mainly on that subject, it will

νοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, [d] περιβεβλημένον νεφέλην, καὶ ἡ [e] ἶρις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς

d constr., ch. vii. 9 reff.
e ch. iv. 3 only.

Andr Areth Tich.—αγγελον bef αλλον l 16. rec om ἡ, with [P]ℵ[3a] k l 1. 32-3-8 (35-6. 41, e sil) Andr: ins ACℵ[1] B rel Andr-coisl Areth. for ιρις, θριξ ℵ[1]. rec της κεφαλης, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: txt AC (d?) 9. 12. rec om 1st αυτου: ins ACℵ B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff.

also be no more than what we might fairly look for. Again: if the episodical vision in its character and hue partakes of the complexion of the whole series of trumpet-visions, and, as regards the church, carries a tinge of persecution, and of the still crying prayer for vengeance, not yet fully answered,—while at the same time it contains expressions and allusions which can only be explained by reference onward to the visions yet to come; this complex character is just that which would suit the point of transition at which we are now standing, when the series of visions immediately dependent on one feature in the opening of the seals is just at its end, and a new one evolving the other great subject of that general series is about to begin.

Now each one of these particulars is found as described above. For 1) the angel of ch. x. declares, with reference to the great vengeance-burden of the whole series of the trumpet-visions, respecting which the souls of the martyrs had been commanded ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι χρόνον μικρόν, ch. vi. 11,—that χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται, but that in the days of the seventh angel, when he is about to blow, the whole mystery of prophecy would be fulfilled.

2) The same angel gives to the Seer the open little book, with a distinct announcement that he is to begin a new series of prophecies, and that series, by what immediately follows, ch. xi. 1 ff., evidently relating to the church of God in an especial manner.

3) The whole complexion of the episodical vision of the two witnesses, ch. xi. 3 ff., is tinged with the hue which has pervaded the series of trumpet-visions, from their source in ch. vi. 9—11, viz. that of vengeance for the sufferings of the saints: while at the same time allusions occur in it which are at present inexplicable, but will receive light hereafter, when the new series of visions is unfolded. Such are the allusions to τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου, ch. xi. 7, and to ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, ib. ver. 8.

With these preliminary considerations, we may, I think, approach these episodical visions with less uncertainty.

1—11.] THE VISION OF THE LITTLE BOOK. 1—4. *Introductory*. **And I saw another strong angel** (ἄλλον, perhaps in allusion to the many which have been mentioned: but seeing that the epithet ἰσχυρόν occurs in the mention of the angel who cried out in reference to the sealed book, ch. v. 2, and that the present angel's errand also regards a book, we can hardly help taking ἄλλον with both substantive and adjective, and referring it to that first ἄγγελος ἰσχυρός in ch. v. 2. And this consideration may serve to introduce the assertion, to me hardly admitting of a doubt, that this angel is not, and cannot be, our Lord himself. Such a supposition would, it seems to me, entirely break through the consistency of apocalyptic analogy. Throughout the book, as before observed, on ch. viii. 3, angels are the ministers of the divine purposes, and the carriers out of the apocalyptic course of procedure, but are every where distinct from the divine Persons themselves. In order to this their ministry, they are invested with such symbols and such delegated attributes as beseem in each case the particular object in view: but no apparent fitness of such symbolical investiture to the divine character should induce us to break through the distinction, and introduce indistinctness and confusion into the book. When St. John means to indicate the Son of God, he indicates Him plainly: none more so: when these plain indications are absent, and I find the name ἄγγελος used, I must take leave to regard the agent as distinct from Him,—however clothed, for the purposes of the particular vision, with His delegated power and attributes) **descending out of heaven** (the place of the Seer yet continues in heaven: see below, vv. 8, 9), **clothed with a cloud** (as a messenger of divine judgment: see ch. i. 7), **and the rainbow upon his head** (ἡ the well-known, ordinary, rainbow: indicating, agreeably with its first origin, God's covenant of mercy. See note on ch. iv. 3. On the accus. after ἐπί at the first mention of superposition, see note, ch. iv. 2), **and his face as the sun** (indicating the divine glory with which he was invested: see ch. i. 16, xviii. 1: and compare Luke ix.

f Gal. ii. 9. 1 Tim. iii. 15. ch. iii. 12 only. = Exod. xlii. 21. xix. 9.
g constr., ch. iv. 1 al.
h vv. 9, 10 only †.
i Matt. xx. 21. xxv. 33 al.
k here only †. Job vi. 5 Symm. (μύκημα λεαίνης, Theocr. Id. xxvi. 21.)
l so Mark ii. 3 al.

ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς [f] στύλοι πυρός, [2] καὶ [g] ἔχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ [h] βιβλαρίδιον ἠνεῳγμένον, καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸν πόδα αὐτοῦ τὸν [i] δεξιὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸν δὲ [i] εὐώνυμον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [3] καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὥσπερ λέων [k] μυκᾶται. καὶ ὅτε ἔκραξεν, [l] ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν [l] φωνάς. [4] καὶ ὅτε ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταί, ἤμελλον γράφειν· καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσαν [m] Σφράγισον ἃ ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ

ACPℵ 𝔅 a to f. 1 2. 4. 6 10-3 to 15. 16 7. 31. 32 to 38. 40-1-2 47 to 51. 90 Br.

m = (Matt. xxvii. 66.) ch. xxii. 10. Dan. viii. 26 Theod. xii. 4, 9.

στυλος 38 am(with fuld al) syr-dd Tich.

2. rec ειχεν, with h l n 1. 10. 35-6 (37. 47-9 Br, e sil) vulg Andr Areth Primas: εχει 17: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr-coisl. (κατεχων 38.) βιβλιδαριον C[1] f h l n 10-7. 36-7-8. 47-9 Br Andr-a: βιβλιον B rel Andr-coisl: txt AC[2][P]ℵ 1 (18, e sil) Andr-p Areth. rec ανεωγμενον, with B rel Andr-a Areth: om A copt: txt C[P]ℵ c l m Andr, ηνεωγμενων 1. rec την θαλασσαν and την γην, with 1: της θαλασσης but την γην b d: την θ. and της γ. Andr-a: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth.

3. ins ως bef ελαλησαν ℵ[1]. om αι ℵ[1] l 1. for βρονται, φωναι ℵ[1]. ταις εαυτων φωναις ℵ 1: om 34-5-6.—om τας εαυτων to βρονται next ver (*homœotel*) b e n 33.

4. for οτε, οσα ℵ 37. om 1st αι 1. rec aft βρονται ins τας φωνας εαυτων: τας εαυ. φω. m: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. (ημελλον, so AC B b f j 33-8. 42. 50.) rec aft λεγουσαν ins μοι (with 4. 17-8-9. 40, e sil): om AC[P]ℵ B rel harl (and tol) syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth Primas Tich. for α, οσα ℵ. om 2nd επτα C.

26), **and his feet as pillars of fire** (see ch. i. 15. The symbols with which this angel is accompanied, as those which surrounded the throne of God in ch. iv. 2 ff., betoken judgment tempered with mercy, the character of his ministration, which, at the same time that it proclaims the near approach of the completion of God's judgments, furnishes to the Seer the book of his subsequent prophecy, the following out of God's purposes of mercy), **and having in his hand** (his *left* hand, by what follows, ver. 5) **a little book** (the diminutive has been taken by some to point to the subsequent eating of the book by the Apostle: so Eichhorn: but Düsterd. remarks that if so, even the βιβλαρίδιον would be too large:—by others, to the size relatively to the angel: so Bengel. But the most natural reason for its use is to be found by comparison with the βιβλίον of ch. v. ff. That was the great sealed roll of God's purposes: this (see below) but one portion of those purposes, which was to be made the Seer's own for his future prophesyings. The form βιβλαρίδιον is not found in Greek writers: the diminutive is βιβλιδάριον, used by Aristoph. frag. (in Julius Pollux, vii. 210. See also Phot. Bibl. p. 142). On the signification, &c., of this little book or roll, see below ver. 8, notes) **open. And he placed his right foot on the sea, and his left on the earth, and cried with a loud voice as a lion roareth** (the whole imagery represents the glory and majesty of Him whose messenger this angel is: and is to be taken literally in the vision, the earth meaning the earth; the sea, the sea: and the description of the loudness of the voice being simply thus descriptive). **And when he cried, the seven thunders** (it is probable that the art. *αἱ* is prefixed because, like the seven stars, churches, seals, trumpets, and vials, these seven thunders form a complete portion of the apocalyptic machinery: and having no other designation, for the very reason that their meaning is not revealed, they are thus designated, as "*the seven thunders*") **spoke their** (no further stress on ἑαυτῶν, than as it belongs to the peculiar character of the utterances of these thunders. They were to be concealed, remaining unwritten: and this fact, I conceive, reflects back a tinge on the possessive genitive, making it so far emphatic: the voices were, and remained, ἑαυτῶν: not shared by being perpetuated) **voices. And when the seven thunders spoke, I was about to write** (in obedience to the command in ch. i. 19): **and** (not, "*but*:" as I was about to write, a new circumstance arose) **I heard a voice out of heaven** (from which it does not follow that the Seer is on earth, any more than in ver. 1) **saying,**

βρονταί, καὶ μὴ αὐτὰ γράψῃς. [5] καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ὃν εἶδον ἑστῶτα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [n] ἦρεν τὴν [n] χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν [n] εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, [6] καὶ [o] ὤμοσεν [o] ἐν τῷ [p] ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ὃς [q] ἔκτισεν τὸν [q] οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ [q] τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, ὅτι [r] χρόνος

n Deut. xxxii. 40.
o Matt. v. 34, 36. xxiii. 16, &c. Ps. lxii. 11. Jer. v. 7.
p ch. iv. 9, 10. Dan. xii. 7.
q Gen. xiv. 19.
r = (see note) John always. John v. 6. vii. 33. xii. 35. xiv. 9. ch. ii. 21. vi. 11. xx. 3. (never = καιρος John.

rec (for αυτα) ταυτα, with h 1. 10-7. 33-7. 49 B[r] (35-6. 40, e sil): txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth.—και μετα ταυτα γραφεις h 1. 10-7. 37. 49 B[r] Andr-a.

5. rec om την δεξιαν, with A 1. 17. 36 vulg: ins C[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd copt æth arm Andr Areth Primas.

6. om 1st εν (homœotel?) ℵ[1] B rel copt Andr-coisl: ins AC[P]ℵ[3c] c l n 1. 10-7. 36. 49 (h 6. 32-7 B[r], e sil) Andr Areth, *per viventem* vulg Primas. om των αιωνων 1. om και την γην και τα εν αυτη A 1. 12 copt. om και την θαλασσαν και τα εν αυτη Aℵ[1] c k 30-2-8. 40-9 arm: ins C[P]ℵ[3a] B rel.

Seal up the things which the seven thunders spoke, and do not write them (cf. the contrary command, ch. xxii. 10. Many speculations have been raised as to the purport of the utterances of the seven thunders, and the reason for concealing them. From the very nature of the case, these must be utterly in vain. The wisdom of Him who signified this Revelation to His servant John, has not seen fit to reveal these things to us. But the very nature of the case also convicts some of these speculations of error. The thunders, e. g., did not speak "humanum excedentia captum" as Ewald, seeing that not only did St. John understand their utterances, but he was about to write them down for others to read, as intelligible to them also. Again, they were not any utterances of mere human device. They were spoken by command of the great angel, as ver. 3 necessarily implies: they in common with the seals, trumpets, and vials, form part of the divinely-arranged machinery of the Apocalypse. It is matter of surprise and grief therefore, when we find historical interpreters of our day explaining them of the papal anathemas of the time of the Reformation. Elliott, vol. ii. p. 100 ff. It seems to me that no interpretation could be more unfortunate—none more thoroughly condemnatory of the system which is compelled to have recourse to it. For, merely to insist upon one point,—if it were so, then the Apostle sealed the utterances in vain, for all know what those thunders have uttered: then the command should have run σφράγισον . . . . ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας, as in Dan. xii. 4, instead of an absolute command as here. Thus much we may infer; from the very character of thunder,—that the utterances were of fearful import: from the place which they hold, that they related to the church: from the command to conceal them, first, encouragement, that God in His tender mercy to His own does not reveal all His terrors: secondly, godly fear, seeing that the arrows of His quiver are not exhausted, but besides things expressly foretold, there are more behind not revealed to us). 5—7.] *The oath of the strong angel, that the time of fulfilment of all prophecy was close at hand.* In this portion of the vision, the reminiscences of Dan. xii. 7 are very frequent:—καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ ἐνδεδυμένου τὰ βαδδίν, ὃς ἦν ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ ποταμοῦ, καὶ ὕψωσε τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀριστερὰν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ὤμοσεν ἐν τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ὅτι εἰς καιρὸν καιρῶν καὶ ἥμισυ καιροῦ, ἐν τῷ συντελεσθῆναι διασκορπισμὸν γνώσονται πάντα ταῦτα. **And the angel whom I saw standing upon the sea and upon the earth, lifted his right hand** (not both hands, as in Daniel above, seeing that the little book lay open on his left. On the practice of lifting the hand in swearing, cf. ref. and Gen. xiv. 22 (Exod. vi. 8 and Num. xiv. 30, marg. and LXX)) **towards heaven** (as God's dwelling-place, Isa. lvii. 15) **and sware by** (construction, see reff.) **Him that liveth to the ages of the ages** (cf. Dan. above), **who created the heaven and the things in it, and the earth and the things in it, and the sea and the things in it** (this full and formal designation of God as Creator of all is given, because the subject of the angel's oath is, the mystery of God, which necessarily rests in His power alone who made all things.

We may observe, that the fact as well as

οὐκέτι ἔσται, [7] ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ταῖς [s] ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἑβδόμου ἀγγέλου, [t] ὅταν [t] μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, [u] καὶ [v] ἐτελέσθη τὸ [w] μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς [x] εὐηγγέλισεν τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ

s so Luke i. 25. t = Mark xiii. 4 || L. Jer. xxxvi. (xxix.) 10. u so καί, ch. vi. 1, 12. v = John xix. 30. ch. xv. 1. Luke xii. 50. xxii. 37. w Mark iv. 11. Rom. xvi. 25. Eph. i. 9. iii. 3, 4. 9. vi. 19 al. Dan. ii. 29. see ch. i. 20. xvii. 5, 7. x constr. w. acc., Acts xiii. 32.

rec (for ουκετι εσται) ουκ εσται ετι, with 1 Andr-a, *non erit amplius* vulg-ed; ουκετι εστιν ℵ[1]: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel syr-dd Andr Areth, *amplius non erit* am(with fuld lipss al).

7. (αλλ', so AC[P]ℵ B a to e, g to n 1. 4. 10-3-7-8-9. 30-6-8 B[r] Andr Areth. (Wetst Bch &c silent.)) του αγγελου του εβδομου ℵ. rec (for ετελ.) τελεσθῃ, with B h l n 1. 10. 17-corr 36. 49. 51 (37 B[r], e sil) Andr: τελεσθηναι 17[1]: txt AC [P(appy)] ℵ rel syr-dd copt Andr-coisl. rec τοις (ε)αυτ. δουλοις τοις προφηταις, with j n 1. 18

the form of this oath is against the supposition, that this strong angel is the Lord Himself. Considering St. John's own declarations respecting the Son of God, it is utterly inconceivable that he should have related as spoken *by* Him an oath couched in these terms), **that time** (see below) **should no longer be** (i. e. should no more intervene: in allusion to the answer given to the cry of the souls of the martyrs, ch. vi. 11, καὶ ἐῤῥέθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι χρόνον μικρόν. This whole series of trumpet-judgments has been an answer to the prayers of the saints, and now the vengeance is about to receive its entire fulfilment: χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται: the appointed delay is at an end. That this is the meaning is shewn by the ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τ. ἡμ. which follows. Several erroneous views have been taken of this saying: e.g., 1) that of Bede "mutabilis secularium temporum varietas in novissima tuba cessabit," al., and apparently the E. V. ("that there should be time no longer")—that it imports the ending of the state of time, and the beginning of eternity: 2) the *chronological* one of Bengel, who allots a definite length, viz. 1111¼ years (?) to a chronus, and then interprets, "there shall not elapse a chronus:" bringing the end, on his successive-historical system, to the year 1836, which is self-refuted: 3) the view of Vitringa and Hengstenb., which grounds an error on the right understanding of these words themselves,—"moram nullam temporis esse intercessuram inter clangorem septimæ tubæ et oraculorum propheticorum implementum:" for the assertion of ver. 7, which is the carrying out of this denial, expressly identifies the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he is about to sound, with the immediate fulfilment of all prophecy): **but** (ἀλλά is not = εἰ μή, but bears its proper meaning of strong contrast) **in the days of the voice of the seventh angel** (i. e. the days indicated, in the fulfilment of the vision, by the sounding of the seventh angel's trumpet. De W. well observes, that there is in the diction of this clause a mingling of the fulfilment with the prophecy), **when he is about to blow his trumpet** (these words ὅταν μέλλῃ are used, as in reff., in their strictest propriety. For when the seventh angel *does* sound, the completed time of the fulfilment is simultaneous with his blowing: cf. ch. xi. 18: so that it is properly said that the fulfilment comes *in the days* when he is about to blow. Elliott's version, "at what time soever he may have to sound," can hardly be the rendering of ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν. For 1) ὅταν will not in the LXX and N. T. bear this emphatic uncertainty, but is simply "when," in contingent clauses: and 2) μέλλῃ, in a sentence spoken strictly of time, must be kept to its temporal signification. Of course, the E. V., "when he shall begin to sound," is inadmissible), **then** (this καί in apodosi is in fact the token of a mixed construction: which resolved would be ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἥξουσιν αἱ ἡμέραι κ.τ.λ., καὶ κ.τ.λ. So also in reff. See Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 3, f) **the mystery of God** (this expression will be best understood by ref. Rom., connected as it is here with the verb εὐηγγέλισεν (see below). It is the mystery of *the kingdom*, as unfolded in the course of the Gospel dispensation, as is clearly shewn by the thanksgiving after the blowing of the seventh trumpet in ch. xi. 15 ff.) **is fulfilled** (lit., *was fulfilled*,—the speaker looking back, in prophetic anticipation, on the days spoken of, from a point when they should have become a thing past), **as He evangelized** (it is impossible to give the force of εὐηγγέλισεν with the accus. by a periphrasis, without losing its force. It expresses that God *informed them of the glad tidings*: it being left to be understood by their office of προφήτης, that they *published* the εὐαγγέλιον. See Gal. iii. 8, where the sense, though not the con-

[y] δούλους τοὺς [y] προφήτας. [8] καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἣν ἤκουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πάλιν [z] λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσαν Ὕπαγε λάβε τὸ βιβλίον τὸ ἠνεῳγμένον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἑστῶτος ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. [9] καὶ [a] ἀπῆλθον [a] πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον [b] λέγων αὐτῷ [b] δοῦναί μοι τὸ [c] βιβλαρίδιον. καὶ λέγει μοι Λάβε καὶ [d] κατάφαγε αὐτό, καὶ [e] πικρανεῖ σου τὴν [f] κοιλίαν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ἔσται [g] γλυκὺ ὡς [h] μέλι. [10] καὶ ἔλαβον τὸ [c] βιβλαρίδιον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου καὶ [d] κατέφαγον αὐτό, καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ στόματί μου ὡς [h] μέλι [g] γλυκύ· καὶ ὅτε

y ch. xi. 18. Jer. vii. 25 al.
z constr., ch i. 12 al. fr. in Rev.
a = Matt. xiv 25. Mark i 13. Gen. xxiv. 56.
b constr., Matt. v. 34, 39.
c ver. 2.
d here bis. Luke viii. 5 ‖ xv 30 John ii. 17. ch. xii. 4 xx. 9 only. Ezek. iii. 1.
e ch. viii. 11 reff
f = Matt. xv. 17 ‖ Mk. Rom. xvi. 18. 1 Cor. vi. 13. Phil. iii. 19. 2 Kings xx. 10.
g here bis James iii. 11, 12 only. Judg. xiv 14. Sir. xxiv. 20.
h here bis. Matt iii. 4 ‖ Mk only. Ezek. iii 3

Andr Areth: txt AC [P(appy)] ℵ B rel Andr-coisl.—for εαυτου, αυτ. B rel: om k: txt AC [P(appy)] ℵ 1. 17. 38.—ins και bef τ. προφ. ℵ.

8. rec λαλουσα and λεγουσα, with rel lips-5 syr-dd copt Andr Areth: txt AC [P(appy)] ℵ B f l 36 vulg. rec βιβλαριδιον, with [P(appy)] ℵ g 1. 16-8 Andr-p: βιβλιδαριον B rel Andr Areth: txt AC f. ανεωγμενον B rel Andr-a Areth: txt AC [P(appy)] ℵ m c 33 (c 1. 2. 16. 34-5-6, e sil) Andr. om εν τη χειρι C: εκ χειρος 36: om εν c 6. 11. rec om του (bef αγγελου) (with d 6. 34-5. 51 Br, e sil): ins AC [P(appy)] B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth. om θαλασσης και επι της ℵ[1](ins ℵ[3a]): transp θαλ. and γης 37.

9. απηλθα A j 16. 27. 50. rec (for δουναι) δος, with [P] h n 1. 10-7. 33-7-8. 40-9 (34. 51 Br, e sil) copt Andr: txt ACℵ B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth. βιβλιδαριον B rel Andr Areth: βιβλαριον A[1]: βιβλιον ℵ f: txt A(as corrd by origl scribe) C[P] 1 (13-8. 51, e sil). αυτο bef και καταφαγε ℵ[1](in both places ℵ[3a]). for κοιλιαν, καρδιαν A. αλλα ℵ.

10. βιβλιον [for βιβλαρ.] ℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth: βιβλιδαριον d f h n 10-7. 32-6-7. 49 Br Andr-a: txt AC[P] 1. 18 Andr-p. ην το στοματι(sic) 1. γλυκυ bef ως μελι (*from ver* 9) A B 36: txt C[P]ℵ rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth. om οτε

struction, is much the same) **His servants the prophets.**

8—11.] *The delivery of the little book to John, and announcement of a further work of prophecy to be carried on by him.* **And the voice which I heard out of heaven, (I) again (heard) talking with me and saying** (the sentence is a curious instance of mixed construction. One of its simple forms would be κ. ἡ φωνὴ ἣν ἤκ. ἐκ τ. οὐρ. πάλιν ἐλάλει μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγουσα: the other, κ. τὴν φωνὴν ἤκουσα ἐκ τ. οὐρ. πάλ. λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ κ. λέγουσαν. The former member of the first of these, and the latter member of the second, are united in the text), **Go take the book which lieth open in the hand of the angel which standeth upon the sea and upon the earth. And I went away** (from my former place as a spectator in heaven: from which, however, the Seer does not seem wholly to remove, cf. ch. xi. 16; xix. 1 ff., although his principal spot of observation is henceforth the earth: cf. ch. xi. 1, xiv. 1, xvii. 3, &c.) **to the angel telling him** (the pres. part. contains the reason of the ἀπῆλθον) **to give me the little book. And he saith to me, Take and eat it up** (cf. Ezek. iii. 1 ff.; Jer. xv. 16; Ps. xl. 9): **and it shall embitter thy belly, but in thy mouth shall be sweet as honey. And I took the book out of the hand of the angel and ate it up: and it was in my mouth as honey, sweet; and when I had eaten it up, my belly was embittered** (there is the difference between Ezekiel's roll and this, that, in the prophet's case, only the sweetness in the mouth is mentioned. The Angel, dwelling most on the most important thing, the working of the contents of the book, puts the bitterness first: the Evangelist, in relating what happened, follows the order of time. The text itself will guard us against some misinterpretations of this bitterness and sweetness. It is plain that we must understand these to belong, not to differing characters of different portions of the contents of the book (as Heinr., Ewald), but to different sensations of the Evangelist in different parts of his body respecting one and the same content of the book. Nor again must we invert the order, imagining (as Herder and Rinck) that the first bitterness leads afterwards to sweetness and joy, or (as

ἔφαγον αὐτό, [e] ἐπικράνθη ἡ [f] κοιλία μου. [11] καὶ λέγουσίν μοι Δεῖ σε πάλιν προφητεῦσαι [i] ἐπὶ [kl] λαοῖς καὶ [k] ἔθνεσιν καὶ [k] γλώσσαις καὶ βασιλεῦσιν πολλοῖς.

i see John xii. 16. ἐχρηστηριάζοντο ἐν Δελφοῖσιν ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἀρκάδων χώρῃ, Herod. i. 66. k ch. v. 9 reff. l plur., ch. vii. 9 reff.

εφαγον αυτο m 35 Andr-c. for επικρανθη, εγεμισθη ℵ. aft μου ins πικριας ℵ[3a].

11. rec (for λεγουσιν) λεγει, with [P] c h n 1. 10-7-8. 36-8 (6. 37. 47-9. 51 Br, e sil) vss Andr Primas: λεγουσα 13: txt Aℵ B rel am(with harl) Andr-coisl Areth. ins επι bef εθνεσι B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas: om A[P]ℵ c 1. 17-8. 36 (26. 38. 42-7, e sil) Andr. γλωτταις 1.

Bede, Aretius, al.) that the bitterness in the belly indicates the reception by the Evangelist, but the sweetness in the mouth, the declaration to others; proceeding on a misunderstanding of ver. 11. For further particulars, see below). **And they say** (λέγουσιν leaves the speakers quite indefinite; amounting in fact to no more than "it was said") **to me, Thou must** (i. e. it is God's will that thou shouldest: a command is laid upon thee so to do) **again prophesy** (as thou hast done before in writing the former part of the ἀποκάλυψις: see in the interpretation below) **concerning** (not, as E. V. "*before*:" nor can ἐπί with a dat. bear such a meaning. The substantives which follow the preposition are the *objects* of the προφητεῦσαι. So in reff. See Winer, edn. 6, § 48, *c*. c) **peoples and nations and languages and many kings** (i. e. concerning the inhabitants of the earth, as before: cf. ch. v. 9, where the Lamb's worthiness to open the former βιβλίον is connected with His having redeemed ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς κ. γλώσσης κ. λαοῦ κ. ἔθνους).

I have postponed till this point the question, what we are to understand by the βιβλαρίδιον, and the Seer's concern with it. And I will at once say, before discussing the various differing interpretations, that I conceive the simple acceptation of the description and symbolism here can lead but to one conclusion; viz. that it represents the μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ above spoken of, the subject of the remainder of the apocalyptic prophecies. So far, many of the principal Commentators are at one. Indeed it is difficult to conceive how any other interpretation can have been thought of, except as made necessary by some previous self-committal of the Expositor regarding the sealed book of ch. v., or by the exigencies of some historical system. But within the limits of this agreed meaning, there are many different views as to the extent of the reference of the "little book" to that which follows, and as to its relation to the seven-sealed book of ch. v. As regards these points, we may remark, 1) that the contents of the "little book" cannot well be confined to ch. xi. 1—13, or we should not have had so solemn an inauguration of it, nor so wide-reaching an announcement of the duty of the Apostle consequent on the receipt of it: 2) that the oath of the Angel must necessarily be connected with his bearing of the open book on his hand, and if so, makes it necessary to infer that the contents of the book are identical with the mystery, respecting which he swears: 3) that the episode which follows, containing the first work of the Apostle under this his new prophetic commission, inchoates an entirely new matter—the things which befall the Church of God and the holy city, which new character of incidents continues to prevail until the very end of the book: 4) that the relation of this "little book" to the sealed book of ch. v. can hardly be doubtful to the readers of this Commentary, seeing that we have maintained that book to be the sum of the divine purposes, which is not opened at all within the limits of the apocalyptic vision, but only prepared to be opened by the removal of its seven seals. That this is not that complete record of the divine purposes, nor, technically speaking, any portion of it, must be evident to us. For it forms a small detached roll or volume, lying open on the angel's hand; it is destined for the especial individual behoof of the Seer, into whom it passes, and becomes assimilated with himself, to be given forth as he should be directed to utter it. 5) That it contained *more than* we possess in the remaining portion of this book, is probable. St. John doubtless knew more than he has told us. Previously to this, he knew what the seven thunders uttered: and subsequently to this, we can hardly imagine that he was ignorant of the name of the wild beast, whose number he has given us.

It remains that we say something on the circumstances accompanying the Apostle's reception of the mysterious book.

XI. 1 Καὶ ἐδόθη μοι m κάλαμος ὅμοιος ῥάβδῳ, n λέγων

m = ch. xxi. 15, 16. (Matt. xi. 7. 2 John 12 al.) Ezek. xl. 3. see Zech. ii. 1, 2.
n constr., ch. iv. 1 al.

Chap. XI. 1. elz ins *και ο αγγελος ειστηκει* bef *λεγων*, with 36.; *και ειστηκει ο αγγελος* ℵ3c* B f h m 10. 34-5-7. 49 Br syr-dd arm Andr-coisl Vict: *και φωνη* n 79 Andr-a(Del): *και*(only) c: om A[P]ℵ1 rel vulg copt æth Andr Areth. *λεγει* ℵ1: *λεγουσα* n 79 Andr-a(Del).

Its *sweetness*, when he tasted it, allusive as it is to the same circumstance in Ezekiel's eating the roll which was all lamentation, mourning, and woe, doubtless represents present satisfaction at being informed of, and admitted to know, a portion of God's holy will: of those words of which the Psalmist said, Ps. cxix. 103, "How sweet are thy words unto my taste, yea sweeter than honey unto my mouth!" But when the roll came to be not only tasted, but digested,—the nature of its contents felt within the man,—bitterness took the place of sweetness: the persecutions, the apostasies, the judgments, of the church and people of the Lord, saddened the spirit of the Seer, and dashed his joy at the first reception of the mystery of God.

Ch. XI. 1—14.] *The measurement of the temple of God. The two witnesses: their testimony, death, resurrection, and assumption into heaven: the earthquake, and its consequences.*

This passage may well be called, even more than that previous one, ch. x. 1 ff., the *crux interpretum*; as it is undoubtedly one of the most difficult in the whole Apocalypse. Referring to the histories of apocalyptic exegesis for an account of the various interpretations, I will, as I have done in similar cases, endeavour to lay down a few landmarks, which may serve for guidance at least to avoid inconsistency, if we cannot do more. And I will remark, 1) that we are not bound to the hard "wooden" literal sense so insisted on in our day by some of the modern German Expositors. I would strongly recommend any one who takes that view, who will have Jerusalem = nothing but Jerusalem, and confine the two witnesses to two persons bodily appearing there, to read through the very unsatisfactory and shuffling comment of Düsterdieck here: the result of which is, that finding, as he of course does, many discrepancies between this and our Lord's prophecy of the same destruction of Jerusalem, he is driven to the refuge that while our Lord describes matters of fact, St. John *idealizes* the catastrophe, setting it forth not as it really took place, but according to its inner connexion with the final accomplishment of the mystery of God, and correspondently to the hope which God's Old Testament people possessed as contrasted with the heathen power of this world, which abides in "Babylon." But really, if we have come thus far by fighting for the literal interpretation, why not a little further? Or rather why *so far?* If "Babylon" is the abode of the world, why not "Jerusalem" of the church? If our interpreter, maintaining the literal sense, is allowed so far to "idealize," as to exempt the temple of God itself (ver. 1) from a destruction which we know overtook it, and nine-tenths of the city (ver. 13) from an overthrow which destroyed it all, surely there is an end to the meaning of words. If Jerusalem here is simply Jerusalem, and the prophecy regards her overthrow by the Romans, and especially if this passage is to be made such use of as to set aside the testimony of Irenæus as to the date of the Apocalypse by the stronger testimony of the Apocalypse itself (so Düsterd. from Lücke), then must every particular be shewn to tally with known history; or if this cannot be done, at least it must be shewn that none contradicts it. If *this* cannot be done, then we may fairly infer that the prophecy has no such reference, or only remotely, here and there, and not as its principal subject. 2) Into whatever difficulty we may be led by the remark, it is no less true, that the *πόλις ἡ ἁγία* of ver. 2 cannot be the same as the *πόλις ἡ μεγάλη* of ver. 8. This has been felt by the literal interpreters, and they have devised ingenious reasons why the holy city should afterwards be called the great city: so De Wette, "he named Jerusalem the great city, because he can no more call her holy after her desecration" (but he need not therefore call her *great*, by which epithet she is never called)—Düsterd., "because it is impossible in one breath to call a city 'holy,' and 'Sodom and Egypt'" (most true: then must we not look for some other city than one which this very prophecy has called holy?). So far Joachim says well, "Veruntamen quod ait in plateis civitatis magnæ, non satis videtur facere pro eodem intellectu (the literal). Nunquam enim magna civitas forte legitur, sed magis Nineve et Babylon magnæ civitates dictæ sunt: nimirum quia multi sunt vocati,

o = Mark iii. 3 al. 1 Chron. xxii. 19. p here bis. ch. xxi. 15, 16, 17. Matt vii. 2 bis. Mark iv. 24 bis. Luke vi. 38. 2 Cor. x. 12 only. Num. xxxv. 5. q ... iii. 12 (vii. 15.) Matt. xxvi. 61 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17 bis. 2 Cor. vi. 16 bis. 2 Thess. ii. 4. Dan. ... r = ch. vi. 9. viii. 3, 5. s John iv. 20, 21. Ps. xxviii. 2.

o Ἔγειρε καὶ p μέτρησον τὸν q ναὸν τοῦ q θεοῦ καὶ τὸ [θυ-]σιαστήριον καὶ τοὺς s προςκυνοῦντας s ἐν αὐτῷ. 2 καὶ ...

rec εγειραι (*itacism?*), with rel Andr Areth: εγηραι 1: εγειρον 10-8: txt A P ℵ B: f k l m 6. 9. 13. 30-2-5-6. 41-2. 50. 90 B^r Andr-a[1]. for μετρ., μερισον 41: ...

pauci vero electi." His other reason see in the interpretation below. 3) We are compelled, if I am not mistaken, to carry the above considerations somewhat further, by the very conditions of the prophecy itself. For it is manifestly and undeniably of an *anticipatory* character. It is not, and cannot be, complete in itself. The words of ver. 7, τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου, bear no meaning where they stand, but require, in order to be understood at all, to be carried on into the succeeding visions of ch. xiii. ff. And if into those visions, then into a period when this wild-beast has received power from the dragon,—when, as in ch. xiii. 7, he makes war with the saints and conquers them, and all on earth except the elect are worshipping him. 4) Let us observe the result as affecting our interpretation. We are necessarily carried on by the very terms of our present compendious prophecy, into the midst of another prophecy, far more detailed and full of persons and incidents: of one which has its μεγάλη πόλις, its ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, its προσκυνοῦντες ἐν αὐτῷ, its μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, and other coincident particulars. What inference does a sound principle of interpretation force upon us? What, if not this—that our present compendious prophecy, as in the particular of the beast that comes out of the abyss, so in its other features, must be understood as giving in summary, and introducing, that larger one? and consequently, that its terms are to be understood by those of that larger one, not servilely and literally where they stand? And observe, this is deduced from the very necessity of the case itself, as shewn in ver. 7, not from any system throwing its attraction forward and biassing our views. *We cannot understand this prophecy at all, except in the light of those that follow: for it introduces by anticipation their dramatis personæ.* 5) If I mistake not, we thus gain much light on the difficulties of this prophecy. If it is a compendium of the more detailed prophecies which follow, opening the great series regarding God's church, and reaching forward to the time of the seventh trumpet, then its separate parts, so hard to assign on any other view, at once fall into their places. Then, e. g. we ... know what is meant by the temple ... worshippers, viz. that these expre[ssions] are identical in reference with those ... in the subsequent prophecy which ... out an elect remnant, a Goshen in E[gypt], a Zoar from Sodom, a number who ... worship the wild-beast and his im[age], who are not defiled with women. And so of the rest. 6) It will then be ... this principle that I shall attempt ... exposition of this difficult prophecy. Re[-]garding it as a summary of the ... detailed one which follows, I shall ... deavour to make the two cast light on ... another: searching for the meaning of ... symbols here used *in their* fuller exp[osi]tion there, and gaining perhaps so[me] further insight into meanings there ... expressions occurring *here*.

1, 2.] *Command to measure the tem[-] ple, but not the outer court, which ... given to the Gentiles.* And there was given to me (by *whom*, is not said, ... is left indefinite, as at ch. vi. 11, viii. ...) reed like to a staff (see reff.) saying (λέ[-]γων is *out of* the construction, and ... finite: as in ch. iv. 1. Andr., in Catena, imagines that it is the *reed that speaks*, and builds an allegorical interpretation ... the idea: πῶς γὰρ ὁ κάλαμος ... ὃν ἔλεγεν Ἔγειραι κ.τ.λ.; ἐκ τούτου ... δείκνυται, ἀγγελικῇ συνέσει μετρεῖν τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. And so in our own time, remarkably enough, *Bp. Words*worth: "The Reed speaks: it is inspired: the Spirit is in it: it is the Word of ... And it measures the Church: *that is*, ... Canon of Scripture is the rule of faith." (Thus in his Lectures on the Apocalypse. In his notes ad loc., he treats λέγων as ab[-]solute.)), Arise (ἔγειρε does not necessarily imply that the Apostle was kneeling before: see reff.) and measure the temple of God and the altar (apparently, the altar of incense: as that alone stood in the ναός. But perhaps we must not be too minute in particularizing), and them that worship in it (see the previous remarks on this prophecy. The *measuring* here is evidently for the purpose of taking account of, understanding the bearing and dimensions of, that which is to be measured; see ch. xxi. 15, where the heavenly *Jerusalem* is

[t] αὐλὴν τὴν [u] ἔξωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ [v] ἔκβαλε [v] ἔξω καὶ μὴ αὐτὴν [p] μετρήσῃς, ὅτι ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τὴν [w] πόλιν τὴν [w] ἁγίαν [x] πατήσουσιν μῆνας τεσσεράκοντα καὶ δύο. [3] καὶ

t see 4 Kings xxi. 5. Ezek. xl. 20, 23. u w. art., Matt. xxiii. 25. Luke xi. 39, 40. 1 Tim. iii. 7. 1 Pet. iii. 3 only. Ezek. xli. 17. v = Acts ix. 40. see James ii. 25. w Matt. iv. 5. xxvii. 53. ch. xxi. 2, 10. xxii. 19. Isa. xlviii. 2. Dan. ix. 24 Theod. x Luke xxi. 24. x. 19. ch. xiv. 20. xix. 15 only. Isa. xlii. 5. (Dan. viii. 13. 1 Macc. iii. 45.)

2. *της αυλης της* ℵ[1]. Steph *εσωθεν*, with ℵ m 1. 12. 32 Andr-coisl Vict: *ανωθεν* 41: txt A[P] B rel. for *ναου*, *λαου και* ℵ[1](but corrd). for *εξω*, *εξωθεν* Aℵ[3a] f h m n 1. 12. 26. 37 Br Andr: [*εσωθεν* P:] *εσω* ℵ[1]: txt B rel Andr-p Areth. aft *εδοθη* ins *και* ℵ[1]. for *πατησουσιν*, *μετρησουσιν* A. rec om last *και*, with [P]ℵ f 34 (m 2. 13. 30-7-8. 41-2-9, e sil) Andr Areth, and (but *μβ′*) h n 1(*κβ′*) 10-7-8. 36 Br: ins A B rel Andr-p.—(*μ′ και β′* B.)

measured by the angel. But here two questions arise: 1) What is that which is measured? and 2) when does the measuring take place? 1) I have no doubt that, as above hinted, the *ναὸς τ. θεοῦ* and its *θυσιαστήριον* are to be here taken symbolically, as the other principal features of the prophecy: and to one believing this, there can be but little further doubt as to what meaning he shall assign to the terms. Thus understood, they can only bear one meaning: viz., that of the Church of the elect servants of God, every where in this book symbolized by Jews in deed and truth. The society of these, as a whole, is the *ναός*, agreeably to Scripture symbolism elsewhere, e. g. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, and is symbolized by the inner or holy place of the Jerusalem temple, in and among which they as true Israelites and priests unto God, have a right to worship and minister. These are they who, properly speaking, alone are *measured:* estimated again and again in this book by tale and number—partakers in the first resurrection,—the Church of the first-born. Then as to our question 2), it is one which, so far as I know, has not engaged the attention of expositors. When a command is elsewhere in this book given to the Seer, we may observe that his fulfilment of it is commonly indicated. He is commanded to write, and the writing before us proves his obedience. He is ordered to take the little book, *καὶ ἀπῆλθον κ.τ.λ.* But of the fulfilment by him of this command, *ἔγειρε καὶ μέτρησον*, no hint appears to be given. The voice goes on continuously, until it melts imperceptibly into the narrative of the vision. After this, we hear no more of the measuring, till another and more glorious building is measured in ch. xxi. This being so, either 1) which is inconceivable, the measurement does not take place at all, or, 2) which is hardly probable, it takes place and no result is communicated to us, or 3) the result of it is found in the subsequent prophecies: in the minute and careful distinctions between the servants of God and those who receive the mark of the wild-beast—in all those indications which point out to us the length and breadth and depth and height, both of faith, and of unfaithfulness). **And the court which is outside the temple** (i. e. apparently, every thing except the *ναός* itself: not merely the outer court or court of the Gentiles. That only the *ναός* itself, in the strictest sense, is to be measured, is significant for the meaning above maintained) **cast out** (of thy measurement. But these strong words, conveying so slight a meaning, doubtless bear in them a tinge also of the stronger meaning, "reckon as profane," "account not as included in the sacred precinct"), **and measure not it** (*αὐτήν* has a slight emphasis: otherwise it need not have been expressed), **because it was given** (viz. at the time when the state of things subsisting in the vision came in: or, in God's apportionment) **to the Gentiles** (if the *ναός* and the *προσκυνοῦντες* represent the elect church of the first-born, the *ἔθνη* will correspond to those who are outside this sacred enclosure: those over whom eventually the millennial reign of ch. xx. shall be exercised: those from among whom shall spring the enmity against God's church, but among whom also shall be many who shall fear, and give God glory, cf. ver. 13. Of these is formed the outward seeming church, mixed up with the world; in them, though not in each case commensurate with them, is Babylon, is the reign of the wild-beast, the agency of the false prophet: they are the *κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν* or *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, the material on which judgment and mercy are severally exercised in the rest of this book (cf. especially ver. 18), as contrasted with God's own people, gathered and to be gathered out from among them), **and they shall tread down** (i. e. trample as conquerors, the outer church being in subjection to them: see reff. The other meaning, *shall tread*, merely, is of course included; but must not be made the preva-

[y] δώσω τοῖς δυσὶν [z] μάρτυσίν μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἑξήκοντα [a] περιβεβλημένοι [b] σάκ-

y = John iii. 27. v. 36. vi. 65. xi. 22. xv. 16. xvi. 23. xvii. 4 al.
z ch. ii. 13 reff.
a ch. vii. 9 reff.
b ch. vi. 12 reff.

3. aft εξηκοντα ins πεντε ℵ[3c*] f. περιβεβλημενους A[P]ℵ[1] B h l n 4. 48: περιβεβλημενος(sic) 17[1]: txt Cℵ[3a] rel Hip Andr Areth. [σακους P.]

lent one. The period named shall be one during which ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν, Matt. xi. 12) **the holy city** (Jerusalem, in the literal sense of the prophecy: the whole temple except the ναός itself being counted with the city outside) **forty and two months** (this period occurs in three forms in this book: 1) as forty-two months; see ch. xiii. 5: 2) as 1260 days = 42 months × 30, see ver. 3, ch. xii. 6: 3) as time, times, and half a time = 3½ years, 3 × 360 + 180 = 1260 days, see ch. xii. 14. This latter designation is also found in Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7. With respect to these periods, I may say that, *equal* as they certainly seem to be, we have no right to suppose them, in any two given cases, to be *identical*, unless the context requires such a supposition. For instance, in these two verses, 2 and 3, there is strong temptation to regard the two equal periods as coincident and identical: but it is plain that such a view is not required by the context; the prophecy contains no note of such coincidence, but may be very simply read without it, on the view that the two periods are equal in duration, but independent of one another: and the rather, that this prophecy, as has been already shewn, is of a compendious character, hereafter to be stated at large. I will further remark, and the reader will find this abundantly borne out by research into histories of apocalyptic exegesis, that no solution at all approaching to a satisfactory one has ever yet been given of any one of these periods. This being so, my principle is to regard them as being still among the things unknown to the Church, and awaiting their elucidation by the event. It is our duty to feel our way by all the indications which Scripture furnishes, and by the light which history, in its main and obvious salient events, has thrown on Scripture: and, when those fail us, to be content to confess our ignorance. An apocalyptic commentary which explains every thing, is self-convicted of error).

3—13.] The two witnesses: *their testimony, death, resurrection, ascension: consequences on the beholders.* The remarks just made are here especially applicable. No solution has ever been given of this portion of the prophecy. Either the two witnesses are literal,—two individual men,—or they are symbolical,—two individuals taken as the concentration of principles and characteristics, and this either in themselves, or as representing men who embodied those principles and characteristics. In the following notes I shall point out how far one, how far another of these views, is favoured by the text, and leave the reader to judge. **And I will give to my two witnesses** (the heavenly voice is still speaking in the name of Christ. That we must not press the μου to the inference that Christ himself speaks, is plain by ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη below. The art. τοῖς seems as if the two witnesses were well known, and distinct in their individuality. The δυσίν is essential to the prophecy, and is not to be explained away. No interpretation can be right which does not, either in individuals, or in characteristic lines of testimony, retain and bring out this dualism. See further below. As regards the construction, δώσω is followed, not by an infin., but by the less usual apodosis, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν κ.τ.λ. Nothing need be supplied after δώσω, as is done by Lyra and Corn.-a-lap. ("constantiam et sapientiam") and Beza ("sanctam civitatem," which is decidedly wrong, seeing it is given to the Gentiles)), **and they shall prophesy** (προφητεύσουσιν here has generally been taken to mean, *shall preach repentance*. It may be so: but in ch. x. 11, the verb is used in its later and stricter sense of foretelling events, as in 1 Pet. i. 10; Jude 14. If their testimony consisted in denouncing judgment, the other would necessarily be combined with it) **a thousand two hundred and sixty days** (Düsterd. remarks that the fact of a period of the same length as the forty-two months being now expressed in *days*, implies that they will prophesy day by day throughout it. The reader will of course see, that the two questions, of these days being *days* or *years*, and of the individuality or the symbolical character of the witnesses, are mutually connected together. He will also bear in mind that it is a pure assumption that the two periods, the forty-two months and the 1260 days, coincide over the same space of time. The duration of time is that during which the power of Elijah's

κους. 4 οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο [c] ἐλαῖαι καὶ αἱ δύο [d] λυχνίαι αἱ [e] ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς [e] ἑστῶτες. 5 καὶ εἴ τις αὐτοὺς θέλει [f] ἀδικῆσαι, πῦρ [g] ἐκπορεύεται [g] ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ [h] κατεσθίει τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν· καὶ εἴ τις * θέλει αὐτοὺς [f] ἀδικῆσαι, [i] οὕτως δεῖ αὐτὸν ἀποκτανθῆναι. 6 οὗτοι ἔχουσιν [τὴν] ἐξουσίαν [k] κλεῖσαι τὸν [k] οὐρανόν,

c Rev., here only. Rom. xi. 17 al. Zech. iv. 3, 11, 14.
d ch. i. 12 al. Zech. l. c.
e ch. viii. 2 reff.
f = ch. vi. 6 reff.
g ch. i. 16. iv. 5 al. fr.
h Mark xii. 40 ‖ L. 2 Cor. xi. 20. Gal. v. 15 only. (see ch. x. 9, 10 reff.) Joel ii. 5. (4 Kings i. 10, 12, 14. Jer. v. 14. Num. xvi. 35.)
i = 1 Thess. iv. 14.
k Luke iv. 25. see Sir. xlviii. 3.

4. for 1st αι, οι ℵ[1]. for ελαιαι, αυλαιαι A: αλαιαι C: txt [P]ℵ B rel.—om δυο ελαιαι και 1 (but adds in margin και β̄ ελαιαι) Andr-b. rec om [2nd] αι, with ℵ[1] (1-marg) 18. 33(-4-5, e sil): ins AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel Hip Andr. om 3rd αι ℵ c f g l m 6. 32-4-5. 47-8 Areth: οι b. om του A B: ins C[P]ℵ rel. rec (for κυριου) θεου, with n 1. 17. 36 Andr-a: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr Areth Vict Primas. rec εστωσαι, with [P]ℵ[3c] e g l n 1. 10-7-8. 36-8 (h 37 B[r], e sil) Hip Andr: txt ACℵ[1] B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

5. 1st θελει bef αυτους ℵ m 34: θελ. αδικ. αυτους f. rec (for 1st θελ.) θελη, with l 30-3-6: εθελει 42: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. for 2nd ει, η Cℵ[1] 1. rec (for 2nd θελ.) θελη, with l 33: om 40: * θελήσῃ Aℵ 38: θελει C[P] B rel Andr Areth. rec 2nd αυτους bef 2nd θελ., with 1. 36. 47 (51, e sil) Andr Primas: αδικησαι bef αυτους ℵ: txt AC[P] B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth Tich. om ουτως A.

6. τον ουρανον bef [την] εξουσιαν κλεισαι B rel Andr-coisl Areth: τον ουρανον κλεισαι εξουσιαν 33: εξουσιαν τον ουρανον κλεισαι f j 38: txt AC[P]ℵ h n 1. 10-7 (16. 37. 49 B[r], e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr.—rec om την, with ℵ B rel: ins ACP.

prophecy shut up the heaven: viz. three years and six months: see Luke iv. 25, and more on ver. 6 below) **clothed in sackcloth** (in token of need of repentance and of approaching judgment: see Isa. xxii. 12; Jer. iv. 8, vi. 26; Jonah iii. 5. Certainly this portion of the prophetic description strongly favours the individual interpretation. For first, it is hard to conceive how whole bodies of men and churches could be thus described: and secondly, the principal symbolical interpreters have left out, or passed very slightly, this important particular. One does not see how bodies of men who lived like other men (their being the victims of persecution is another matter), can be said to have prophesied *clothed in sackcloth*. It is to be observed that such was the garment of Elijah; see 2 Kings i. 8, and cf. Matt. iii. 4). **These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks which stand before the Lord of the earth** (the whole from ref. Zech., to which the art. αἱ refers. But it is to be observed that while in Zech. we have the two ἐλαῖαι, and spoken of in the same terms as here, there is but one λυχνία, with its seven lights, which very seven lights, as there interpreted in ver. 10, are referred to in our ch. iv. 5, v. 6. So that it is somewhat difficult to say, whence αἱ δύο λυχνίαι has come. The most probable view is that St. John has taken up and amplified the prophetic symbolism of Zechariah, carrying it on by the well-known figure of lights, as representing God's testifying servants. Who the two "sons of oil" in the prophet were, whether Zerubbabel and Joshua, or the prophets Zechariah and Haggai, is of no import to our text here): **and if any one be minded to harm them, fire goeth forth** (the pres., of that which is habitual and settled, though yet future: see also on ver. 7 below) **out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies** (so Elijah, 2 Kings i. 10 ff.; and so ran the word of promise to Jeremiah (ref.), ⌜Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δέδωκα τοὺς λόγους μου εἰς τὸ στόμα σου πῦρ, καὶ τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ξύλα, καὶ καταφάγεται αὐτούς:⌟ the two being here combined together. Cf. also Sir. xlviii. 1, ἀνέστη Ἠλίας προφήτης ὡς πῦρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο); **and if any one be minded to harm them, after this manner** (see Sir. xlviii. 3) **he must be killed** (this whole description is most difficult to apply, on the allegorical interpretation; as is that which follows. And as might have been expected, the allegorists halt and are perplexed exceedingly. The double announcement here seems to stamp the literal sense, and the εἴ τις and δεῖ αὐτὸν ἀποκτανθῆναι are decisive against any mere *national* application of the words (as Elliott). *Individuality* could not be more strongly indicated). **These have** (see on the pres. above) **[the] power to shut the heaven, that the rain may not rain during the days of their prophecy** (as did Elijah: the

ἵνα μὴ [l] ὑετὸς [m] βρέχῃ τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς [n] προφητείας αὐτῶν, καὶ [o] ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσιν [o] ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων [p] στρέφειν αὐτὰ εἰς αἷμα καὶ [qr] πατάξαι τὴν γῆν [r] ἐν πάσῃ [s] πληγῇ [t] ὁσάκις ἐὰν θελήσωσιν. [7] καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσιν τὴν [u] μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν, τὸ [v] θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς [w] ἀβύσσου [x] ποιήσει μετ' αὐτῶν [x] πόλεμον, καὶ νικήσει αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτούς. [8] καὶ τὸ [y] πτῶμα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς

ACP ℵ B a to n. 1. 2. 4. ... 19-3. ... to 19. 2- 7. 3. ... to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

l Acts xiv. 17. xxviii. 2. Heb. vi. 7. James v. 18 only. 3 Kings xvii. 1.
m James v. 17 bis. Matt. v. 45. Luke vii. 38, 44. xvii. 29 only. Isa. v. 6.
n = here only. (ch. i. 3 reff.)
o ch. ii. 26 reff.
p = here only. Exod. vii. 15. Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 13. (Exod. vii. 20. Psa. civ. 29.)
q = Acts xii. 23.
r ch. xix. 15. 1 Kings iv. 8.
s ch. ix. 18, 20 reff.
t 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26 only †.
u ch. i. 2 reff.
v ch. xiii. 1. xvii. 3 al. passim. Dan. vii. 3, &c.
w ch. ix. 1, 2 reff.
x Rev. (ch. xii. 17. xiii. 7. xix. 19) only. Dan. vii. 21 Theod.
y here 3ce. Matt. xiv. 12 ‖ Mk. xxiv. 28. Mark xv. 45 only. Judg. xiv. 8.

rec βρεχη bef υετος, with 1 copt Andr: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd Hip Andr-coisl Areth Primas Promiss. rec (for τας ημερας) εν ημεραις, with 33(-6, e sil) vulg Andr-a: εν ταις ημεραις 1: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr Areth. rec αυτων bef της προφητειας, with 1: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg copt arm Hip Andr Areth. om αυτα 1. om και (bef παταξαι) ℵ[1]. rec om εν, with B (26-7. 51 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd: ins AC[P]ℵ rel copt Hip Andr Areth lat-ff.—οσακις εαν θελ. bef [εν] παση πληγη B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om εν παση πληγη g: om οσακις εαν θελ. 19: txt AC[P]ℵ h n (1, e sil) 10-6-7. 36-7-8. 49. 51 Br Andr-coisl Areth.—αν C 38.—θελησουσιν C: θελωσιν f j 36: ελθωσιν k.

7. οτε τελεσουσιν 1. aft το θηριον ins το τεταρτον A. το αναβαινων A 1: τοτε αναβαινον ℵ[1]. rec πολεμον bef μετ' αυτων, with 1. 36 (41, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd arm Hip Andr-coisl Areth lat-ff. om και αποκτενει αυτους j m 1. 12. 36. 41 Andr-b.

8. rec (for το πτωμα) τα πτωματα, with [P]ℵ m n 1. 10-7-8. 34-5-6-8 (h 37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas Vict: txt AC B rel copt Areth. aft αυτων ins εσται ℵ[3c]: εασει (adding αταφα aft μεγαλης) n 37. 79.

duration of the time also corresponding: see reff.): **and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood** (as had Moses, ref.), **and to smite the earth with** (the ἐν of investiture. See ref. 1 Kings, from which, applying to the plagues in Egypt, the expression is taken) **every plague as often as they shall be minded** (all this points out the spirit and power of Moses, combined with that of Elias. And undoubtedly, it is in these two directions that we must look for the two witnesses, or lines of witnesses. The one impersonates the law, the other the prophets. The one reminds us of the prophet whom God should raise up like unto Moses; the other of Elias the prophet, who should come before the great and terrible day of the Lord; ὁ καταγραφεὶς ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς εἰς καιρούς, κοπάσαι ὀργὴν πρὸ θυμοῦ, Sir. xlviii. 10. But whether we are to regard these prophecies as to be fulfilled by individuals, or by lines of testimony, must depend entirely on the indications here given). **And when they had finished** (τελέσωσιν is a futurus exactus, implying, as plainly as words can imply it, that the whole period of their testimony will be at an end when that which is next said shall happen. All attempts of the allegorical expositors to escape this plain meaning of the words are in vain. Such is that of Mede, "when they shall be about finishing:" of Daubuz, "whilst they shall perform:" of Elliott, "when they shall have completed their testimony," meaning thereby not the whole course of it, but any one complete delivery of it which others might have followed) **their testimony, the wild-beast that cometh up out of the abyss** (this is the first mention of the wild-beast; and the whole description, as remarked above, is anticipatory. The pres. part. ἀναβαῖνον gives simply *designation*, as so often: and is not to be interpreted future, as Elliott, "that is to ascend." The *character* of the beast is that he ascendeth out of the abyss; just as the tempter of our Lord is called ὁ πειράζων, Matt. iv. 3, though the narrative is in the past tense. This wild-beast is evidently identical with that mentioned in ch. xvii. 8, of which the same term is used, ὃ μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου: and if so, with that also which is introduced ch. xiii. 1 ff., as ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον, seeing that the same details, of the seven heads and ten horns, are ascribed to the two. But, though the appellation is anticipa-

[z] πλατείας τῆς [a] πόλεως τῆς [a] μεγάλης, [b] ἥτις καλεῖται [c] πνευματικῶς [d] Σόδομα καὶ [d] Αἴγυπτος, ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη. [9] καὶ βλέπουσιν [e] ἐκ τῶν [fg] λαῶν καὶ

z ch. xxi. 21 reff. a ch. xvi. 19 reff. b = 1 John i. 2 reff. c 1 Cor. ii. 14 only †. Clem. Rom. i. 47. d see note. e ch. v. 9. 2 John 4. see 1 John iv. 13. f plur., ch. vii. 9 reff. g ch. v. 9 reff.

rec om [2nd] *της* (with 35. 41. 51, e sil): ins AC[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth.—(*της μεγ. πολ.* 36.) aft *σοδομα* ins *και εγγυς ο ποταμος* ℵ[3a]. om *και* (bef *ο κυριος*) ℵ[3a] f l m 1. 12. 34 5-6 copt Orig. rec (for *αυτων*) *ημων*, with 1. 33 (26. 34-5. 51, e sil): om ℵ[1]: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel vss Orig Andr Areth Primas Promiss.

9. rec *βλεψουσιν*, with (34-5, c sil) vulg syr-dd copt Primas: txt AC[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth Tich. *των φυλων και λαων* ℵ. aft 2nd *και* ins *των* B.

tory as far as this book is concerned, the beast spoken of was already familiar to its readers from Dan. vii.: see below) **shall make war with them** (see ref. Dan.), **and shall conquer them and kill them. And their corpse** (*πτῶμα*, das Gefallene derselben, as Düsterd. gives it: "their wreck." The singular is used, not for any mystical reason, as Wordsw. imagines (who interprets the two witnesses of the Old and New Testaments, and says, "The two witnesses have but *one* body. They twain are one flesh. The two Testaments are one"), but simply as above, because *πτῶμα* does not properly signify a dead body, but that which has fallen, be it of one, or of many. Below, where the context requires the separate corpses to be specified, the less proper meaning of *πτῶμα* is adopted, and we have the plural) **(is)** (the present is best to supply, on account of the verbs following, which are in the present, until we come to *πέμψουσιν*: and with which the portion relating to the corpses is bound up) **upon the street** (reff.) **of the great city** (not Jerusalem (see above), which is never called by this name: but the *ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη* of the succeeding visions, of which this is anticipatory and compendious), **namely, that which** (*ἥτις*, not = *ἥ*, but specifying and particularizing) **is called spiritually** (i. e. allegorically; in a sense higher than the literal and obvious one. The only other place in which we find this usage of the word is in ref. 1 Cor., which see, and notes there) **Sodom and Egypt** (those Commentators who maintain that the literal Jerusalem is here meant, allege Isa. i. 9 ff., and Ezek. xvi. 48, as places where she is called Sodom. But the latter place is no example: for there Jerusalem is compared, in point of sinfulness, with her *sisters*, Samaria and Sodom, and is not called Sodom at all. And in Isaiah i. 9 ff., 1) it is not Jerusalem, but the Jewish people in general (see also Isa. iii. 9) that are called by this name: and that 2) not so much in respect of depravity, as of the desolation of Judæa, which (vv. 7—9) almost equalled that of the devoted cities. And even supposing this to be a case in point, no instance can be alleged of Jerusalem being called Egypt, or any thing bearing such an interpretation. Whereas in the subsequent prophecy both these comparisons are naturally suggested with regard to the great city there mentioned: viz. that of Sodom by ch. xix. 3, *ὁ καπνὸς αὐτῆς ἀναβαίνει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, compared with Gen. xix. 28, and that of Egypt, and indeed Sodom also, by ch. xviii. 4 ff., *ἐξέλθατε ἐξ αὐτῆς ὁ λαός μου, κ.τ.λ.*), **where their Lord also** (as well as they: not the specific term *ἐσταυρώθη*, but the general fact of death by persecution, underlying it, being in the Writer's mind) **was crucified** (these words have principally led those who hold the literal Jerusalem to be meant. But if, as I believe I have shewn, such an interpretation is forbidden by the previous words, then we must not fall back on an erroneous view on account of the apparent requirements of these words, but enquire whether by the light of the subsequent prophecy, which is an expansion of this, we may find some meaning for them in accordance with the preceding conditions. And this is surely not difficult to discover. If we compare ch. xviii. 24, *καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ αἷμα προφητῶν κ. ἁγίων εὑρέθη κ. πάντων τῶν ἐσφαγμένων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, with Matt. xxiii. 35, *ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, we shall find a wider ground than the mere literal Jerusalem on which to place the Lord's own martyrdom and that of His saints. It is true, He was crucified at Jerusalem: but it is also true that He was crucified not in, but outside the city, and by the hands, not of Jews, but of Romans. The fact is that the literal Jerusalem, in whom was found the blood of all the saints who had been slain on earth, has been superseded by that wider and greater city, of which this prophecy speaks: and as the temple, in pro-

ᵍ φυλῶν καὶ ᵍ γλωσσῶν καὶ ᵍ ἐθνῶν τὸ ʸ πτῶμα αὐτ[illegible] ἡμέρας τρεῖς [καὶ] ʰ ἥμισυ, καὶ τὰ ʸ πτώματα αὐτῶν ⁱ ἀφίουσιν ᵏˡ τεθῆναι εἰς ᵏᵐ μνῆμα. ¹⁰ καὶ οἱ ᵃ κατοικοῦντες ⁿ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ᵒ χαίρουσιν ᵒ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ᵖ εὐφραίνονται, καὶ ᵠ δῶρα ᵠ πέμψουσιν ἀλλήλοις, ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ δύο π[illegible]

h Mark vi. 23. ch. xii. 14 (from Dan. vii. 25. xii. 7) only. i (-ενιεν, Luke xix. 18.) l w John xi. 44. xviii. 8. Gen. xx. 6. k Luke xxiii. 53. Acts vii. 16. 20 Ald. xiv. 11 al. 19. (Micah vii. 8.) l so (but ἐν) Matt. xxvii. 60. Mark vi. 29. Luke xxiii. [illegible] m as above (k). Mark v. 3, 5. Luke viii. 27. xxiii 53. xxiv. 1. Acts [illegible] n ch. iii. 10 reff. o Matt. xviii. 13. Luke i. 14. Acts xv. [illegible] p ch. xii. 12. xviii. 20. Luke xv. 23 al. Deut. xiv. 26. q [illegible] μερίδας, Neh. viii. 10, 12. Esth. ix. 19, 22.

for και εθ. το πτ. αυτ., τα πτωματα αυτων και οι εκ των εθνων 1. rec (for πτωμα) τα πτωματα, with [P] 1. 10-7-8. 33-8 (g h n 34-5-7. 49 Bʳ, e sil) vulg [illegible] Andr Primas: txt ACℵ ʙ rel copt Andr-coisl Areth Tich. om και (bef [illegible]) Andr Areth Cassiod: ins AC[P]ℵ g n 2. 17. 30²-3. 51 (36-7. 49, e sil) vulg [illegible]. om from και τα πτωματα to end k 30. for τα πτωματα, το σωμα [illegible] στοματα n. rec (for αφιουσιν) αφησουσι, with ʙ rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Pr[illegible] αφιασι g: αφουσιν 36: txt AC[P]ℵ n 1. 12 am(with fuld harl lips-5 tol) Andr[illegible]. rec μνηματα, with ℵ¹ᵃ 33 vulg Primas: μνημειον C 36: txt [P]ℵ¹ ʙ rel [illegible] copt Andr Areth Tich. (A def.)—for εις μνημα, εν μνηματι 40.

10. rec (for χαιρ.) χαρουσιν, with vulg syr-dd copt æth Primas: χαρησονται Andr-p Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ ʙ rel Andr Glyc Tich. rec (for ευφραινονται) ευφρανθησονται, with ʙ f(sic) rel vss Andr Areth Primas: txt ACPℵ g n 1. 12. 36 Andr-a [illegible] for πεμψουσιν, δωσουσιν ʙ rel Andr Areth: txt ACℵ¹ᵃ 10-7 (g h 1 1. [illegible] Bʳ, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a Primas, πεμπουσιν [P]ℵ¹ n 36, mittunt vulg-[illegible] αλληλους C 27. οι προφ. οι δυο ℵ: οι δυο οι πρ. 50.

phetic language, has become the church of God, so the outer city, in the same language, has become the great city which will be the subject of God's final judgments. For those who consider this, there can be no hesitation in interpreting even this local designation also of this great city). **And some from among** (construction, see reff.) **the peoples and tribes and languages and nations look upon** (the prophetic history is carried on in the present, as in ch. xviii. 11 compared with ib. ver. 9, and elsewhere) **their corpse** (see above) **three days and a half** (on this period we may remark, that these 3½ days are connected by analogy with the periods previously mentioned: with the 1260 days and 42 months = 3½ years: and that in each case the half of the mystic number 7 enters. Also, that Elliott's calculation of this period as 3½ years, by which he makes out that that period elapsed, "*precisely, to a day*," between the ninth session of the Lateran council, and the posting up of the theses by Luther at Wittenberg,—and on the accuracy of which he exclaims, "O wonderful prophecy! O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the foreknowledge of God!"— labours under this fatal defect:—that whereas his 3 years, from May 5, 1514, to May 5, 1517, are years of 365 days, his half-year, from May 5, 1517, to Oct. 31, of the same year, is "180, or half 360 days:" i. e. wanting 2½ days of the time required according to that reckoning. I may [illegible] that in his Apocalypsis Alfordiana [illegible] he has *repeated this inconsistency*[illegible] not permit (ἀφίουσιν, as ἤφιεν in Mark xi. 16, is from the form ἀφίω. Th[illegible] form occurs in Eccl. ii. 18; Philo, Le[illegible] Cai. § 30, vol. ii., p. 576. See Winer [illegible] § 14. 3 [and Moulton's note, p. 97.[illegible] **corpses to be put into a tomb** (th[illegible] ing exposition will hardly be credi[illegible] is useful, as shewing how far away [illegible] be led in forcing the sense in favo[illegible] particular view. Wordsw. regards [illegible] witnesses as the Old and New Test[illegible] and the beast that makes war with [illegible] Papal Rome. On this clause, he says [illegible] original word here is μνήματα, not [illegible] and is to be rendered not grave[illegible] monuments: i. e. she has laboured [illegible] the Two Witnesses may not be [illegible] mitted to the immortal monument[illegible] Editions, Translations, and Expo[illegible] It will be hardly necessary to [illegible] any N. T. student that μνῆμα nev[illegible] curs in it in any sense but in the [illegible] crete one of a grave or tomb: see [illegible] The same is true of the LXX, where it occurs fifteen times. And again it is [illegible] to this strange exposition, that it is [illegible] the beast, but ἐκ τῶν λαῶν κ. φυλ. [illegible] who will not permit their bodies to be [illegible] into a tomb. It may also be remark[illegible] that it is now to a Roman printing [illegible] that we owe our only edition of the [illegible] published codex of the Greek Old [illegible]

φῆται [r] ἐβασάνισαν τοὺς [n] κατοικοῦντας [n] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
11 καὶ μετὰ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ [h] ἥμισυ, [s] πνεῦμα [s] ζωῆς
ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰςῆλθεν [ἐν] αὐτοῖς, καὶ [t] ἔστησαν [t] ἐπὶ τοὺς
πόδας αὐτῶν, καὶ φόβος μέγας [u] ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τοὺς [v] θεω-
ροῦντας αὐτούς. 12 καὶ ἤκουσαν φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ λεγούσης [s] αὐτοῖς Ἀνάβατε [w] ὧδε. καὶ ἀνέβησαν
εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐν [x] τῇ νεφέλῃ, καὶ [v] ἐθεώρησαν αὐτοὺς
οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν. 13 καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐγένετο
[y] σεισμὸς [y] μέγας, καὶ τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως ἔπεσεν, καὶ
ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῷ [y] σεισμῷ [z] ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων χιλιάδες

r ch. ix. 5 reff. s Rom. viii. 2 (10). Ezek. xxxvii. 5. t Acts xxvi. 16. Ezek. ii. 1. Ezek. xxxvii. 10 (but τῶν ποδ.). u Luke i. 12. Acts xix. 17. Ps. civ. 38. v Rev., here bis only. Gospp. & Acts passim. Heb. vii. 4. 1 John iii. 17. Ps. lxiii. 9. w ch. iv. 1. Matt. xxii. 12 al. Ruth ii. 14. x (so art., Luke xii. 54.) y ch. vi. 12 (reff.). z = ch. iii. 4. Acts i. 15. Num. xxvi. 53.

11. om τας [P]ℵ h n 1. 37-8. 40-9. ins το bef ημισυ C. (ημισου Aℵ(but corrd) and A² in ver 9.) rec (for [εν] αυτοις) επ' αυτους, with h 10 Br (26. 33-7. 41-2-9, e sil): εις αυτους ℵ B rel Andr Areth: αυτοις C[P] l 1. 17. 38. εν αυτοις A g n² 18. 36. 51 Andr-a Idac.—εισηλθεν εκ του θεου αυτοις C. (n¹ wanting.) for επι, υπο 1 (30?). rec (for επεπ.) επεσεν, with ℵ B rel Andr Areth: om 40: επιπεσειται 38: txt AC[P] d h l 9. 10-3-6-7-8-9. 27. 37. 47-9 Br Andr-a. επι των θεωρουντων C[P] 17¹: θεορ. ℵ¹.

12. for ηκουσαν, ηκουσα ℵ-corr B rel copt arm Andr Areth Tich: ακουσονται 38: txt AC[P]ℵ¹ (17-8-9?) 32²-4 vulg. rec φωνην μεγαλην . . . . λεγουσαν, with A B rel: txt C[P]ℵ g h n 1. 10-7. 36-7. 49 Br Andr-a-p. om αυτοις A n. rec αναβητε, with B rel Andr Areth: txt ACPℵ 26. 36. 42.

13. om 1st και B rel Areth Tich: ins AC[P]ℵ g h l m n 10-7-8. 34 (1. 26. 37. 40-1-2-9 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr Primas. for ωρα, ημερα B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ g 33 (1. 36, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a Primas. for και το, ωστε το C. for δεκατον, γ' B.

New Testaments). **And they that dwell upon the earth** (see reff.: the godless world) **rejoice over them** (at their fall: ἐπί with dat., of the close juxtaposition which connects a mental affection with its object) **and are glad and shall send gifts to one another** (as on a day of festival, see reff.; and Winer, Realw. i. 411, art. Geschenke), **because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt upon the earth** (viz. by the plagues above mentioned, vv. 5, 6). **And after the three days and half, the Spirit of life** (not, *a spirit:* the whole diction is closely imitated from that used of the dry bones in Ezek. xxxvii. 10, where A reads εἰςῆλθεν εἰς αὐτοὺς πνεῦμα ζωῆς: and no inference as to indefiniteness can be drawn from the absence of the art. from such a word as πνεῦμα) **from God** (*may* belong to ζωῆς only; but much better to πνεῦμα ζωῆς taken as one word. The art. τό would strictly be required, but may well be wanting in later Greek) **entered into them** (the ἐν would be a pregnant construction: entered into, so as to be in), **and they stood upon their feet** (the very words of Ezek. l. c., but with one difference, the accus. πόδας, which, as remarked on ch. iv. 2, is characteristic of our Writer at the first mention of a superimposition), **and great fear fell upon those who beheld them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying to them, Come up hither. And they went up to heaven in the cloud** (or, as we more commonly say in English, *the clouds:* viz. the cloud which ordinarily floats in the air; the mist: see ref.: not, as Wordsw., "the cloud of Christ's glory:" nor needing, as Elliott, identification with any cloud previously mentioned in this book. But the ascension of the witnesses partakes of the character of His ascension. No attempt has been made to explain this ascension by those who interpret the witnesses figuratively of the Old and New Testaments or the like. The modern historical system, which can interpret such a Scripture phrase of "calling up to political ascendancy and power," surely needs no refutation from me), **and their enemies beheld them. And in that hour there was a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city** (the great city, as above) **fell, and there were slain in the earthquake names of men** (i.e. men themselves, the ὀνόματα showing that the number is carefully and precisely stated, as if the name of each were recounted: see reff.: and more below) **seven thousands** (i.e. the

ἑπτά, καὶ [a] οἱ λοιποὶ [b] ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο καὶ [c] ἔδωκαν [c] δόξαν τῷ [d] θεῷ τοῦ [d] οὐρανοῦ. 14 Ἡ [e] οὐαὶ ἡ δευτέρα [f] ἀπῆλθεν· ἰδού, ἡ [e] οὐαὶ ἡ τρίτη ἔρχεται ταχύ.

15 Καὶ ὁ ἕβδομος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, [g] λέγοντες Ἐγένετο ἡ [h] βασιλεία

a Acts v. 13. Eph. ii. 3. 1 Thess. iv. 13. v. 8. 1 Tim. v. 20 al
b Luke xxiv 5, 37. Acts x. 4. (xxii 9.) xxiv. 25 only †. Sir. xix. 24. 1 Macc. xiii. 2 B (ἐκφ AN) only.
c ch. xiv. 7. xvi. 9. xix. 7. Luke xvii. 18. John ix 24. Acts xii. 23. Josh. vii. 19.
d ch. xvi. 11. Ezra i. 2. Neh. i. 4. Dan. ii. 18, 19 Theod.
e = ch. ix. 12.
f = ch. ix. 12. xxi. 1, 4 only.
g constr., ch. iv. 1 al fr.
h see Matt. iv. 8 ‖ L.

for εμφοβοι, εν φοβω ℵ f 82, ενφοβοι C(Del). [P def.]

14. om 1st η ℵ[3a] m 1. παρηλθεν ℵ n. η ουαι η τριτη bef ιδου B rel Andr Areth : om ιδου 1 6. 32-3(-5, e sil) fuld æth : txt AC[P] g 1. 17. 38 vss Andr-a Primas. —ιδου ερχεται η ουαι η τριτη ℵ 36.

15. om ὁ A. for εγενοντο, εγενετο ℵ[1]. rec (for λεγοντες) λεγουσαι, with C[P]ℵ rel Andr Areth : om 33 : txt A B a d f k 2. 6. 9. 16-9. 26-7. 30. 41-2. 90. rec εγενοντο αι βασιλειαι, with 1 1. 36 Andr-b : txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff.

number 7000. In every place of the 23 where χιλιάς occurs in the N. T., it signifies simply the numeral 1000, and never a chiliad, or a province, as Elliott, forcing the expression to mean, in his historical interpretation, the seven Dutch united provinces (so also Cocceius), which were lost to the Papacy at the Reformation. He also forces ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων out of its idiomatic sense to import "titles of dignity and command," Duchies, Marquisates, Lordships), **and the rest** (of the inhabitants of the city) **became terrified, and gave glory** (it would be entirely needless to contend that ἔδωκαν belongs to the same *subject* as ἐγένοντο, viz. οἱ λοιποί, had not an attempt been made (Ell. ii. 466) to supply "the ascended witnesses" as a new subject. To say nothing of the inapplicability of the instances cited to justify such a view, our ch. xiv. 7 is decisive against it, where men are exhorted φοβήθητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν: as also ch. xvi. 9, where the men tormented οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν. In fact, the *giving glory to God* is not equivalent in the Scriptures to *thanking God*, but is as Bengel notices, "character conversionis," or at all events, the *recognition* of God. The exceptions to this are more apparent than real, e. g. Luke xvii. 18, where *recognition* is the main feature: ch. iv. 9, where δόξαν does not stand alone. See also LXX, 1 Kings vi. 5. Josh. vii. 19 is a remarkable example of the ordinary meaning of the phrase) **to the God of heaven** (an expression, see reff., confined to the later books of the O. T.).

14.] *Transitional.* **The second woe is past** (see on ch. ix. 12): **behold, the third woe cometh quickly** (the episodical visions of ch. x. 1—11, xi. 1—13, are finished: and the prophecy recurs to the plagues of the sixth trumpet, ch. ix. 13—21. These formed the second woe: and upon these the third is to follow. But in actual relation, and in detail, it does not immediately follow. Instead of it, we have voices of thanksgiving in heaven, for that the hour of God's kingdom and vengeance is come. The Seer is not yet prepared to set forth the nature of this taking of the kingdom, this reward to God's servants, this destruction of the destroyers of the earth. Before he does so, another series of prophetic visions must be given, regarding not merely the dwellers on the earth, but the Church herself, her glory and her shame, her faithfulness and her apostasy. When this series has been given, then shall be declared in its fulness the manner and the process of the time of the end. And consequently as at the end of the vision of the seals, so here also. The sixth seal gave the immediately preceding signs of the great day—we were shewn in anticipatory episodes, the gathering of the elect and the multitude before the throne, and then the veil was dropt upon that series of visions and another began. And now God's avenging judgments on the earth, in answer to the prayers of His saints, having reached their final point of accomplishment, and the armies of heaven having given solemn thanks for the hour being come, again the veil is dropt, and again a new procession of visions begins from the beginning. The third woe, so soon to come, is in narration deferred until all the various underplots, so to speak, of God's Providence have been brought onward to a point ready for the great and final dénouement).

15—19.] *The seventh trumpet.* **And the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were great voices in heaven** (notice, a) that the seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, and the seventh vial, are all differently accompanied from any of the preceding series in each case. b) At each seventh

τοῦ [h] κόσμου τοῦ [i] κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ [i] χριστοῦ [i] αὐτοῦ, καὶ [k] βασιλεύσει [k] εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. 16 καὶ [οἱ] εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι [οἱ] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ [l] καθήμενοι [l] ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους αὐτῶν [m] ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ τὰ [m] πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ, 17 λέγοντες [n] Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, [o] Κύριε ὁ [o] θεὸς ὁ [o] παντοκράτωρ,

i Acts iv. 26, from Ps. ii. 2. (ch. xii. 10.) gen., 1 Cor. iii. 23 al.
k Luke i. 33. (ch. xxii. 5.) Psa. ix. 16 (37). cxlv. 10.
l ch. iv. 2 reff.
m ch. vii. 11. Matt. xvii. 6. xxvi. 39. Luke v. 12. xvii. 16. 1 Cor. xiv. 25. Num. xvi. 4.
n Rev., here only. = Luke xviii. 11. John xi. 41. Rom. i. 8 al.† Judith viii. 25. Wisd. xviii. 2. 2 Macc. i. 11 only.
o ch. i. 8 reff.

at end ins *αμην* ℵ 12. 18(Sz). 38. 40 vulg(not harl lips-3 Primas).

16. om 1st *οἱ* Aℵ[1]: ins C[P]ℵ[3a] B rel. rec *εικοσι και τεσσαρες*, with 19. 33 B[r] (30-7. 41-2, e sil): *κδ'* B a g h k l n 1. 10. 49. 50. 90: txt AC[P]ℵ rel Andr Areth. om 2nd *οι* A B f g l 1. 12: ins C[P]ℵ rel Andr Areth. ins *του θρονου* bef *του θεου* B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth (*του θρονου αυτου* c): om AC[P]ℵ g h n 10 (1. 37. 49 B[r], e sil) vulg copt Andr Primas. for *καθημενοι*, *οι καθηνται* ℵ[1] B rel Andr-coisl Areth; *καθηνται* Cℵ[3a] g 2 arm: *οι καθημενοι* f 12: txt A[P] n 10-7. 36-8. 47 (h l 1. 37. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr. ins *και* bef *επεσ.* ℵ g. *επεσον* B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ d j l 1(e sil). 2. 13. 32-3. 49[1] Andr.—(om from *αυτων* to *αυτων* 35.)

17. for *σοι*, *σε* B. *κυριος* ℵ. om 2nd *ὁ* ℵ.

member of the series we hear what is done, not on earth, but in heaven,—the half-hour's silence, the song of thanksgiving, the voice from the temple and the throne, saying, "It is done." c) At each seventh member likewise we have it related in the form of a solemn conclusion, 1) *ἐγένοντο βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμός*, ch. viii. 5,—2) *ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμὸς καὶ χάλαζα μεγάλη*, ch. xi. 19,—3) *ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταί, καὶ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας κ.τ.λ.*, ch. xvi. 18 ff. d) At each seventh member we have plain indication in the imagery or by direct expression, that the end is come, or close at hand: 1) by the imagery of the sixth seal, and the two episodes, preceding the seventh seal: 2) by the declaration here, *ἦλθεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι*: 3) by the *Γέγονεν* sounding from the temple and the throne on the pouring out of the seventh vial. e) All this forms strong ground for inference, that the three series of visions are not continuous, but resumptive: not indeed going over the same ground with one another, either of time or of occurrence, but each evolving something which was not in the former, and putting the course of God's Providence in a different light. It is true, that the seals involve the trumpets, the trumpets the vials: but it is not in mere temporal succession: the involution and inclusion are far deeper: the world-wide vision of the seals containing the cry for vengeance, out of which is evolved the series of the trumpets: and this again containing the episodical visions of the little book and the witnesses, out of which are evolved the visions of ecclesiastical faithfulness and apostasy which follow), **saying** (whose these voices were, is not specified: but we may fairly assume them to have been those of the armies of heaven and the four living-beings, as distinguished from the twenty-four elders which follow. For the masc. part., see ref.), **The Kingdom of the world** (i. e. *over* this world: *ἡ βασιλεία* abstract. In the received text, reading *αἱ βασιλεῖαι*, it is *the kingdoms*, concrete, *of the world*) **is become** (aor., but alluding to the result of the whole series of events past, and not to be expressed in English except by a perfect) **our Lord's and of His Christ** (no supply, such as "*the Kingdom*," is required: nor is this the case even in the rec. text. The gen. in both cases is one merely of possession), **and He** (no emphasis on *He*, as we are almost sure to lay on it, perhaps from the accent unavoidable in the Hallelujah Chorus of Handel) **shall reign to the ages of the ages** (this announcement necessarily belongs to the time close on the millennial reign: and this is no more than we might expect from the declaration of the strong angel in ch. x. 7). **And the twenty-four elders** (representing the church in glory) **which before God sat upon their thrones** (or, omitting the *οἱ*, **sitting upon their thrones before God**), **fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thanks to Thee, O Lord God the Almighty** (this ascription of thanks is the return for the answer to the prayers of the saints furnished by the judgments of the trumpets), **who art and wast** (for construction, see reff.), **because Thou hast taken Thy great might and hast reigned** (on the

p ch. i. 4 reff. q ch. xii. 17. Matt. v. 22. xviii. 34. xxii. 7. Luke xiv. 21. xv. 28. Eph. iv. 26 only. Psa. xcviii. 1. r = Matt. iii. 7. Eph. v. 6. Col. iii. 6. 1 Thess. i. 10. ii. 16. Zeph. ii. 2. s constr. w. gen., Matt. xxi. 41. xxvi. 18 al. w. inf., Heb. xi. 15. 1 Pet iv. 17. w. both, Esth. ii. 12. t 2 John 8 reff. u ch. x. 7. Jer. vii. 25. v ch. xvi. 6. xviii. 20, 24.

ᵖ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᵖ ἦν, ὅτι εἴληφας τὴν δύναμίν σου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐβασίλευσας. [18] καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ᵠ ὠργίσθησαν καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ ʳ ὀργή σου, καὶ ὁ ˢ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι, καὶ δοῦναι τὸν ᵗ μισθὸν τοῖς ᵘ δούλοις σου τοῖς ᵘᵛ προφήταις, καὶ τοῖς ᵛʷ ἁγίοις, καὶ τοῖς ˣ φοβουμένοις τὸ ˣ ὄνομά σου τοὺς ʸ μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς ʸ μεγάλους, καὶ ᶻ διαφθεῖραι τοὺς ᶻ διαφθείροντας τὴν ᵃ γῆν. [19] Καὶ ἠνοίγη ὁ ᵇ ναὸς τοῦ ᵇ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὤφθη ἡ ᶜᵈ κιβωτὸς τῆς ᶜ διαθήκης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ᵉ ἐγένοντο ᵉ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ ᵉ φωναὶ καὶ ᵉ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμὸς καὶ ᶠ χάλαζα μεγάλη.

w = Acts ix. 13, 32, 41. xxvi. 10. Epp. passim. ch. viii. 3, 4 al. Ps. xv. 3. x here only. Ps. ci. 15. Micah vi. 9. y ch. xiii. 16. xix. 5, 8. xx. 12 Isa. ix. 14. see Acts viii. 10. Heb. viii. 11. Jer. vi. 13 al. z ch viii 9 reff. a see ch. xix. 2. b ver. 1 reff. c Heb. ix. 4. Exod. xxxi 7. Num., Deut., Josh. passim. d as above (c). Matt. xxiv. 38 = L. Heb xi. 7. 1 Pet iii. 20 only. e so ch. viii. 5. xvi. 18. (Exod. xix. 16.) f ch. viii. 7. xvi. 21 (bis) only. Exod. ix. 24.

rec aft ὁ ἦν ins και ο ερχομενος, with g h n 10-7. 36. (37, e sil) 49 copt Andr-a: ins και only ℵ[1] : om AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel am(with demid fuld harl &c) syr-dd arm-zoh(ed. 1805) Andr Areth Cypr Primas. ειληφες C.

18. ωργισθη [for -θησαν] ℵ[1]. for καιρος, κληρος C. τους αγιους κ. τους φοβουμενους A : om (τοις bef φοβ.) ℵ. om 6th και 1. rec τοις μικροις κ. τοις μεγαλοις, with [P]ℵ[3c] B rel : txt ACℵ[1]. om last και A. διαφθειραντας C h l m 10. 34-5. 47-8-9 B[r] Andr-coisl : φθειροντας P 1.

19. for ηνοιγη, ηνοιχθη B rel Areth : txt AC[P]ℵ f l m 2. 10-7-8. 36 (h 1. 37. 41-2-9 B[r], e sil), ηγοιγη g n. ins ο bef εν τω ουρανω AC f g m 38 Andr-coisl Vict : om [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth Primas. aft ουρ. ins ανω ℵ[1](ℵ[3a] disapproving). for ωφθη, εδοθη C. for 1st αυτου, [του] κυριου B rel Andr-p Areth Vict(om του B l 40. 90 B[r]) : του θεου ℵ b and some vss : om vulg-ms copt Primas Haymo : txt AC[P] g m n 1(e sil). 17[1]. 34-5-6 vulg syr-dd Andr. εγενετο ℵ[1]. om και σεισμος B rel Areth : ins AC[P]ℵ g n 17[1]-8-9. 33-8. 40-corr[1] (1. 35-6, e sil) vss Andr Primas, και σεισμοι m 34.

aor., see above). **And the nations were angry** (see ref. Ps.), **and Thine anger came, and the time of the dead to be judged** (another indication that the end is at hand when these words are spoken), **and** (the time) **to give their reward to Thy servants the prophets** (see reff. and especially Matt. x. 41, to which reference seems to be made), **and to the saints, and to them that fear Thy name, the small and the great** (the three terms together include the whole church), **and to destroy the destroyers of** (so is the pres. part. best rendered) **the earth** (all this looks onward to judgments and acts of God yet to come when the words are spoken. The thanksgiving is not that God hath done all this, but that the hour is come for it all to take place. Before it does, another important series of visions has to be unfolded). 19.] *Concluding, and transitional.* **And the temple of God was opened in the heaven** (or, according to the apparently grammatical correction of AC, "*the temple of God which was in the heaven was opened*"), **and the ark of His covenant was seen in His temple** (the episode of ch. xi. 1 ff. began with measuring the temple of God, the shadow of things in the heavens: and now, when the time is come for the judgments there indicated to be fulfilled, that temple itself in the heavens is laid open. The ark of the Covenant is seen, the symbol of God's faithfulness in bestowing grace on His people, and inflicting vengeance on His people's enemies. This is evidently a solemn and befitting inauguration of God's final judgments, as it is a conclusion of the series pointed out by the trumpets, which have been inflicted in answer to the prayers of His saints. It is from this temple that the judgments proceed forth (cf. ch. xiv. 15, 17, xv. 5 ff., xvi. 17); from His inmost and holiest place that those acts of vengeance are wrought which the great multitude in heaven recognize as faithful and true, ch. xix. 2. The symbolism of this verse, the *opening* for the first time of the heavenly temple, also indicates of what nature the succeeding visions are to be: that they will re-

XII. 1 Καὶ [g] σημεῖον μέγα ὤφθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, γυνὴ [h] περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ ἡ σελήνη [ik] ὑποκάτω τῶν [k] ποδῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα, 2 καὶ [l] ἐν [lm] γαστρὶ [l] ἔχουσα [καὶ] κράζει [n] ὠδίνουσα καὶ [o] βασανιζομένη [p] τεκεῖν. 3 καὶ ὤφθη ἄλλο [q] σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἰδοὺ [r] δράκων [s] πυῤῥὸς μέγας, ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ [t] κέρατα [t] δέκα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφα-

g = ver. 3. ch. xv. 1. Matt. xxiv. 30. Luke xxi. 11, 25. h ch. vii. 9 reff. i ch. vi. 9 reff. k Matt. xxii. 44. Mark vi. 11. Heb. ii. 8, from Ps. viii. 6. l Matt. i. 18, 23 (from Isa. vii. 14 AN). xxiv. 19 &c. 1 Thess. v. 3 only. Exod. xxi. 22. 2 Kings xi. 5. m as above (l). Luke i. 31. Tit. i. 12 only. n Gal. iv. 19, 27 only. Isa. xxvi. 18 o ch. ix. 5 reff. p constr., see note. q = ver. 1. r Rev. (here. &c., 8 times. ch. xiii. 2, 4, 11. xx. 2) only. Isa. xxvii. 1. s ch. vi. 4 only. Num. xix. 2. t ch. xiii. 1. xvii. 3, &c. Dan. vii. 7.

Chap. XII. 1. for περιβεβλημενη, περιβλεπομενη A. om η j 1. 32: την σεληνην ℵ[1]. δεκαδυο 1.

2. rec om 2nd και, with [P] B rel: ins after κραζει A: ins aft εχουσα Cℵ g. for κραζει, εκραζεν C rel vulg Andr Areth Primas: εκραζεν B e f k l m 9. 26. 30-3-4-5-7. 51 Andr Areth Primas: κραξει 36: txt A[P]ℵ g (1, e sil) 17[1] am(with demid al) copt Hip Meth.

3. rec μεγας bef πυρρος, with A[P] g h m n 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 B[r], e sil) vulg: txt Cℵ B rel syr-dd copt Meth Andr Areth Primas.—πυρος C B rel copt Andr-coisl: txt A[P]ℵ h 10. 13. 27. 30-3-5-6-8. 40[2]-7-8-9. 51 B[r] vulg Meth Andr(but not comm) Areth

late to God's covenant people and His dealings with them): **and there were lightnings and voices and thunderings and an earthquake and a great hail** (the solemn salvos, so to speak, of the artillery of heaven, with which each series of visions is concluded: see this commented on above at the beginning of this section).

Chap. XII. 1—17.] The vision of the Woman and the great red Dragon. On the nature of this vision, as introductory of the whole imagery of the latter part of the Apocalypse, I have already remarked at ch. xi. It is only needful now to add, that the principal details of the present section are rather descriptive than strictly prophetical: relating, just as in the prophets the descriptions of Israel and Judah, to things passed and passing, and serving for the purpose of full identification and of giving completeness to the whole vision. **And a great** (important in its meaning, as well as vast in its appearance) **sign** (σημεῖον, one of those appearances by which God ἐσήμανεν to John the revelations of this book, ch. i. 1) **was seen in heaven** (heaven here is manifestly *not only* the show-place of the visions as seen by the Seer, but has a substantial place in the vision: for below, ver. 7 ff., we have the heaven contrasted with the earth, and the dragon cast out of heaven into the earth. See more there), **a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon** (ἡ σελήνη = ἔχουσα τὴν σελήνην) **beneath her feet** (see Cant. vi. 10, which seems to be borne in mind), **and on her head a crown of twelve stars** (the whole symbolism points to the Church, the bride of God: and of course, from the circumstances afterwards related, the O. T. church, at least at this beginning of the vision. That the blessed Virgin cannot be intended, is plain from the subsequent details, and was recognized by the early expositors. The crown of twelve stars represents the Patriarchs. Victorinus's comment is worth quoting: "Mulier .... antiqua Ecclesia est patrum et prophetarum et sanctorum apostolorum quæ gemitus et tormenta habuit desiderii sui usque quo fructum ex plebe sua secundum carnem olim promissum sibi videret Christum ex ipsa gente corpus sumpsisse. .... Corona stellarum duodecim chorum patrum significat secundum carnem nativitatis, ex quibus erat Christus carnem sumpturus"), **and [she is]** (or, being) **with child [and] crieth out in pangs and tormented to bring forth** (the inf. τεκεῖν, of that which would be the result of the βασανίζεσθαι, has a parallel in Acts vii. 19, ἐκάκωσεν ..... τοῦ ποιεῖν, and in other places, see Winer, edn. 6, § 44. 4, but not without the art.). **And another sign was seen in heaven: and behold, a great red dragon** (interpreted below, ver. 9, to be the devil, the ancient serpent: see also vv. 13, 15. He is πυῤῥός perhaps for the combined reasons, of the wasting properties of fire, and the redness of blood: "rufus, ut homicida," as the gloss. interl.: see John viii. 44), **having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his heads seven diadems** (the Dragon being the devil, these symbolic features must be interpreted of the assuming by him of some

u ch. xiii. 1. xix. 12 only. Esth. i. 11. ii. 17. Isa. lxii. 3.
v ch. ix. 10 (bis), 19 (bis) only. Job xl. 12 (17).
w John xxi. 8. Acts viii. 3. xiv. 19. xvii. 6 only. 2 Kings xvii. 13.
x ch. viii. 12.
y ch. viii. 5 reff.
z ch. x. 9, 10 reff.

λὰς αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ u διαδήματα, 4 καὶ ἡ v οὐρὰ αὐτοῦ w σύρει τὸ x τρίτον τῶν x ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ y ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς y εἰς τὴν γῆν. Καὶ ὁ z δράκων ἕστηκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς μελλούσης τεκεῖν, ἵνα ὅταν τέκῃ τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς z καταφάγῃ. 5 καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν a ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει b ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη c ἐν bc ῥάβδῳ b σιδηρᾷ· καὶ d ἡρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ.

a ver. 13. Matt xix. 4 || Mk. Luke ii. 23. Rom. i. 27. Gal. iii. 28 only. Isa. lxvi. 7. Jer. xx. 15.
b ch. ii. 27. xix. 15. Psa. ii 9. c 1 Cor. iv. 21. d = Acts viii. 39. John vi. 15. 1 Cor. xii. 2, 4. 1 Thess. iv. 17. Judg. xxi. 21.

Primas. for αυτου, αυτων A. rec διαδηματα bef επτα, with vulg-ed Primas: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld &c) Meth Andr Areth.—om επτα 1.

4. om αυτοι 1. αστρων and εστηκει C. aft αστ. ins το τριτον ℵ[1]. om του ουρανου 1. φαγη [for καταφ.] 1.

5. rec (for αρσεν) αρρενα, with ℵ B(αρενα) rel Hip Meth: txt AC, αρσενα [P] g. om εν [P] 1. ηρπαχθη b: ηρπαγη ℵ b c e g h 10. 37. 47-9 B[r] Hip Meth. rec om 2nd προς, with 1. 17. 33(-5-6, e sil) Andr-a: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Meth Andr Areth Primas.

of those details in the form of the beast in ch. xiii. 1 ff., to whom afterwards he gives his power and his throne: in other words, as indicating that he lays wait for the woman's offspring in the form of that antichristian power which is afterwards represented by the beast. At the same time, the *seven crowned heads* may possess an appropriateness of their own, belonging as they do to the dragon alone (the beast has the crowns on his *horns*, ch. xiii. 1). They may represent, as he is Prince of this world, universality of earthly dominion. The ten horns belong to the fourth beast of Daniel, vii. 7, 20). **And his tail draggeth down the third part of the stars of the heaven, and cast them to the earth** (so the little horn in Dan. viii. 10, "cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." The allusion here may be as Areth. in Catena, *συγκατέβαλε γὰρ ἑαυτῇ πλείστων ἀγγέλων μοῖραν συναποστῆσαι πείσασα τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πεποίηκε χθονίους τοὺς οὐρανίους, καὶ σκότος τοὺς λαμπροὺς ὡς ἀστέρας.* The magnitude and fury of the dragon are graphically given by the fact of its tail, in its lashing backwards and forwards in fury, sweeping down the stars of heaven). **And the dragon stands** (not "*stood.*" The Commentators cite from Pliny H. N. viii. 3 of the dragon, "Nec flexu multiplici ut reliquæ serpentes corpus impellit, sed celsus et erectus in medio incedens") **before the woman which is about to bear, that when she has borne he may devour her child** (this was what the devil instigated Herod the Great to do, who was the dependant of the Roman Empire. But doubtless the reference is wider than this: even to the whole course of hostility against the Lord during His humiliation: see below). **And she bore a male** (if ἄρσεν is neuter, and not to be written ἄρσεν', the expression is a solœcism, or rather a combination of genders, ἄρσεν going back from the masculine individual υἱὸν to the neuter of the genus) **son, who shall rule** (lit. shepherd, i. e. order and guide) **all the nations with** (ἐν of investiture, very nearly expressed by our instrumental "*with,*" which in its primitive meaning does but signify accompaniment) **a rod of iron** (these words, cited verbatim from the LXX of the Messianic Psalm ii., and preceded by the ὃς of personal identification, leave no possibility of doubt, who is here intended. The man-child is the Lord Jesus Christ, *and none other*. And this result is a most important one for the fixity of reference of the whole prophecy. It forms one of those landmarks by which the legitimacy of various interpretations may be tested; and of which we may say, notwithstanding the contradiction sure to be given to the saying, that every interpretation which oversteps their measure is thereby convicted of error. Again, the exigencies of this passage require that the birth should be understood literally and historically, of that Birth of which all Christians know. And be it observed, that this rule of interpretation is no confident assertion of mine, as has been represented, but a result from the identifying use of words of the prophetic Scripture, spoken of Him, who will not suffer His honour to be given to another): **and her child was caught up to God and to His throne** (i. e. after a conflict with the Prince

[6] καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, [e] ὅπου ἔχει [e] ἐκεῖ [f] τόπον [f] ἡτοιμασμένον [g] ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ [h] τρέφωσιν αὐτὴν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἑξήκοντα. [7] καὶ [i] ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ [k] Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ

e ver. 14. Judg. xviii. 10. Ruth iii. 4. cf. ch. iii. 8 reff.
f John xiv. 2, 3 only.
g 1 Chron. xv. 3. ch. ix. 18. Luke ix. 22. Rom. xiii. 1. James i. 13 al.
h plur., see ch. xvi. 15 reff.
i constr., Acts x. 25.
k Jude 9 only. Dan. x. 13, 21. xii. 1.

6. rec om 1st εκει, with C f 1. 36-8: ins A[P]א B rel Meth Andr Areth.—τοπον bef εκει 47 Hip. for απο, υπο B rel Meth Andr Areth: txt AC[P]א g h 10-7-8 (1. 49. 51 Br, e sil) Hip Andr-a1. (d def.) om του 10 Br. εκτρεφωσιν B rel Meth Areth: τρεφουσιν Pא: txt AC e f g m n 1. 34-6-8. 51 (49. 90, e sil) Hip Meth Andr. αυτον א1: om f. χιλιαδες 11. at end ins πεντε א3c*.

7. aft ο ins τε A, *et Michael et collegium angelorum* syr-dd.

of this world, who came and tried Him but found nothing in Him, the Son of the woman was taken up to heaven and sat on the right hand of God. Words can hardly be plainer than these. It surely is but needful to set against them, thus understood, the interpretation which would regard them as fulfilled by the "mighty issue of the consummated birth of a son of the church, a baptized emperor, to political supremacy in the Roman empire," "united with the solemn public profession of the divinity of the Son of man." Elliott, iii. 24). **And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath there a place prepared from** (the source of the preparation being His command: see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 47, b) **God, that they** (the subject to the verb is left indefinite. In ver. 14 below, it is simply passive, *ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ*) **may nourish her there for a thousand two hundred and sixty days** (the whole of this verse is anticipatory: the same incident being repeated with its details and in its own place in the order of the narrative below, vv. 13 ff. See there the comment and interpretation. The fact of its being here inserted by anticipation is very instructive as to that which now next follows, as not being consecutive in time after the flight of the woman, but occurring before it, and in fact referred to now in the prophecy as leading to that pursuit of the woman by the dragon, which, as matter of sequence, *led to it*). 7 ff.] **And there was war in heaven** (we now enter upon a mysterious series of events in the world of spirits, with regard to which merely fragmentary hints are given us in the Scriptures. In the O. T. we find the adversary Satan in heaven. In Job i., ii., he appears before God as the Tempter of His saints: in Zech. iii. we have him accusing Joshua the High-priest in God's presence. Again our Lord in Luke x. 18 exclaims, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," where see note. Cf. also John xii. 31. So that this casting down of Satan from the office of accuser in heaven was evidently connected with the great justifying work of redemption. His voice is heard before God no more: the day of acceptance in Christ Jesus has dawned. And his angels, those rebel spirits whom he led away, are cast down with him, into the earth, where now the conflict is waging during the short time which shall elapse between the Ascension and the second Advent, when he shall be bound. All this harmonizes together: and though we know no more of the matter, we have at least this sign that our knowledge, as far as it goes, is sound, —that the few hints given us do not, when thus interpreted, contradict one another, but agree as portions of one whole. The war here spoken of appears in some of its features in the book of Daniel, ch. x. 13, 21, xii. 1. In Jude 9 also we find Michael the adversary of the devil in the matter of the saints of God): **Michael** ("one of the chief princes," Dan. x. 13: "your prince," i. e. of the Jewish nation, ib. ver. 21: "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people," ib. xii. 1: "the archangel," Jude 9: not to be identified with Christ, any more than any other of the great angels in this book. Such identification here would confuse hopelessly the actors in this heavenly scene. Satan's being cast out of heaven to the earth is the result not of his contest with the Lord Himself, of which it is only an incident leading to a new phase, but of the appointed conflict with his faithful fellow-angels led on by the archangel Michael. The *οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ* in both cases requires a nearer correspondence in the two chiefs than is found between Satan and the Son of God) **and his angels to war** (the construction is remarkable, but may

l ch. ii. 16 reff. m vv. 2, &c. reff. n Matt. xxv. 41. o = Acts xix. 16. (Mark ix. 18. Luke xiii. 24.) Ps. xii. 4. Dan. vii. 21 Theod. p ch. xx. 11. (Heb. xii. 17.) Dan. ii. 35 Theod. see Luke ii. 7. q ch. xx. 2. r vv. 14, 15. 2 Cor. xi. 3. Gen. iii. 1, 4. s ch. ii. 20 reff. t = Luke ii. 1. Acts xix. 27. u ch. iii. 10. xvi. 14. Matt. xxiv. 14. Acts xi. 28. Isa. xiv. 26. v ch. viii. 5 reff. w so ch. vii. 10. xix. 1. x ch. xi. 15. Acts iv. 26, from Ps. ii. 2. gen., 1 Cor. iii. 23 al. y here only†. see note. z constr, here only. see Matt. xxvii. 12. Acts xxii. 30.

ACP א B a to n, 1. 2. 4. 6 9. 10-3 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 35. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

[l τοῦ] l πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τοῦ m δράκοντος, καὶ ὁ m δράκων l ἐπολέμησεν καὶ οἱ n ἄγγελοι n αὐτοῦ, 8 καὶ οὐκ o ἴσχυσαν, οὐδὲ p τόπος p εὑρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. 9 καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ m δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ qr ὄφις ὁ q ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος διάβολος καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς, ὁ s πλανῶν τὴν tu οἰκουμένην u ὅλην, v ἐβλήθη v εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ n ἄγγελοι n αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν. 10 καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγουσαν w Ἄρτι ἐγένετο ἡ w σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ x χριστοῦ x αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐβλήθη ὁ * y κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, ὁ z κατηγορῶν * z αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

rec (for του πολεμησαι) επολεμησαν, with vulg Areth Jer: txt AC[P]א B rel syr-dd Andr Primas Cassiod.—om του א B rel Andr: ins AC[P] g h 10-7. 36-9. 49 Br. rec (for μετα) κατα, with b 1. 33-4, *adversus* Ambrst: txt AC[P]א B rel vss gr-lat-ff.
8. ισχυσεν A rel copt Vict Andr-coisl Cassiod; ισχυον B f 38[1](appy): txt C[P]א g n 17. 33 (1. 35-6. 40, e sil) vulg syr-dd. aft ισχ. ins προς αυτον א. rec ουτε, with [P] 1. 17 (33 to 36?): txt ACא B rel Andr Areth. for τοπος, τοτε(sic) א[1] (txt א[3c]). for αυτων, αυτω rel copt Cassiod: αυτοις א[3c] 17. 36: om א[1]: txt AC[P] B f g n 1(e sil). 38. 51 vulg syr-dd Vict Andr Areth Primas Jer. om ετι א[3c] 1 n.
9. om ο (bef οφις) א 1 Andr-p. om 2nd και א. om ὁ (bef σατανας) B rel Andr Areth: ins AC[P]א g 17-8. 33 (1. 30-5-6, e sil) Andr-p. om μετ' αυτου 1.
10. rec λεγουσαν bef εν τω ουρανω, with 1. 33(-4-5, e sil) Andr-a: om εν τω ουρ. 41-2 tol: txt AC[P]א B rel vss Andr Areth Tich Primas. for χριστου, κυριου C. rec κατεβληθη, with h 1. 10-3-7 (49 Br, e sil) Andr-p: txt AC[P]א B rel Andr Areth. om from ὁ to ὁ 1. * rec κατήγορος, with C[P]א B rel Andr Areth: κατηγωρ A. * rec αὐτῶν, with Cא B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om 32: αυτους AP n 1. 36 Andr. om last ημων f k n 1. 50.

easily be explained as one compounded of (τοῦ) τὸν Μ. καὶ τοὺς ἀγγ. αὐτοῦ πολεμῆσαι (in which case the τοῦ depends on the ἐγένετο, as in ref.) and ὁ Μ. καὶ οἱ ἄγγ. αὐτοῦ ἐπολέμησαν. In the next clause, it passes into this latter) **with the dragon, and the dragon warred and his angels, and they prevailed not, nor was even** (οὐδέ brings in a climax) **their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast down, the ancient serpent** (in allusion to the history in Gen. iii. Remember also that St. John had related the saying of our Lord, that the devil was ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), **he who is called the devil and Satan, he who deceiveth the whole inhabited world, was cast to the earth, and his angels were cast with him** (I would appeal in passing to the solemnity of the terms here used, and the particularity of the designation, and ask whether it is possible to understand this of the mere casting down of paganism from the throne of the Roman empire? whether the words themselves do not vindicate their plain literal sense, as further illustrated by the song of rejoicing which follows?). **And I heard a great voice in heaven** (proceeding apparently from the elders, representing the church (cf. τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν): but it is left uncertain) **saying, Now is come** (it is impossible in English to join to a particle of present time, such as ἄρτι, a verb in aoristic time. We are driven to the perfect in such cases) **the salvation and the might and the kingdom of our God and the power of His Christ** (i.e. the realization of all these: ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν being, as so often, that salvation which belongs to God as its Author: see reff. and cf. Luke iii. 6): **because the accuser** (the form κατήγωρ, instead of κατήγορος, is rabbinical, קטיגור. They had also a corresponding term, סניגור, συνήγωρ, = συνήγορος, to designate Michael, the advocate of God's people. See Schöttgen, vol. i. p. 1119 ff., where he accumulates extracts of some interest from the rabbinical books) **of our brethren is cast down, who accuseth** (the pres. part. of the usual habit, though that his office was now at an

[a] ἡμέρας καὶ [a] νυκτός. [11] καὶ αὐτοὶ [b] ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν [c] διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ [c] διὰ τὸν [d] λόγον τῆς [d] μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν, καὶ [e] οὐκ [e] ἠγάπησαν τὴν [ef] ψυχὴν αὐτῶν [g] ἄχρι [g] θανάτου. [12] διὰ τοῦτο [h] εὐφραίνεσθε οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς [i] σκηνοῦντες· [k] οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχων [l] θυμὸν μέγαν, εἰδὼς ὅτι [m] ὀλίγον [m] καιρὸν ἔχει. [13] Καὶ ὅτε εἶδεν ὁ δράκων ὅτι [n] ἐβλήθη [n] εἰς τὴν γῆν, [o] ἐδίωξεν τὴν γυναῖκα [p] ἥτις [q] ἔτεκεν τὸν [q] ἄρσενα. [14] καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ

a ch. iv. 8 reff. b ch. ii. 7 reff. c = John vi. 57. d see ch. i. 2. e see Acts xx. 24. f = Acts xv. 26 al. 1 Kings xxviii. 21. g ch. ii 10 reff. h ch. xi. 10 reff. Isa. xliv. 23. xlix. 13. i ch. vii. 15 reff. k constr., ch. viii. 13 only. (see note.) l = Acts xix. 28 al. Jer. xliii. (xxxvi.) 7. m here only. ὀλ. χρον., Acts xiv. 28. n ch. viii. 5 reff. o Rev., here only. = John v. 16. xv. 20. 2 Kings xxi. 5. p = 1 John i. 2 reff. q ver. 5 (reff.).

11. ουτοι ℵ. for τον λογον της μαρτυριας, την μαρτυριαν C. for 2nd αυτων, εαυτων ℵ[3a].

12. rec ins οι bef ουρανοι, with A c g m n 10-6-7. 32[2]-8 (1. 36-7. 47-9 B[r], e sil) Andr: om C[P]ℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. κατασκηνουντες C: κατοικουντες ℵ c e k 26. 30: κατοικ. bef εν αυτοις ℵ. rec aft ουαι ins τοις κατοικουσιν, with (37. 40-1-2?) Andr-a(and comm): so 1, but with δε written over ουαι: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff.—τη γη κ. τη θαλασση B rel Andr Areth lat-ff: εις την γην κ. την θαλασσαν ℵ: txt (A)C[P] g n. (for γην, αγαπην A.) ins ο bef εχων 1. om μεγαν ℵ.

13. οτι bef ο δρακων ℵ[3a]. for εδιωξεν, εδωκεν ℵ[1]: εξεδιωξεν ℵ[3a]. rec αρρενα, with B rel: txt C[P]ℵ f g, αρσεναν A.

14. for εδοθησαν, εδοθη ℵ[3a] 46.

end) **them before our God by day and by night** (see, as above, the passage cited in Schöttgen). **And they conquered him on account of the blood of the Lamb** (i. e. by virtue of that blood having been shed: not as in E. V., "*by* the blood," as if διά had been with the genitive. The meaning is far more significant; their victory over Satan was grounded in, was a consequence of, His having shed his precious blood: without that, the adversary's charges against them would have been unanswerable. It is remarkable, that the rabbinical books give a tradition that Satan accuses men all the days of the year, *except on the Day of Atonement.* Vajikra Rabba, § 21, fol. 164. 3, in Schöttgen) **and on account of the word of their testimony** (the strict sense of διά with an accus. must again be kept. It is *because* they have given a faithful testimony, even unto death, that they are victorious: this is *their* part, their appropriation of and standing in the virtue of that blood of the Lamb. Without both these, victory would not have been theirs: both together form its ground): **and they loved not their life unto death** (i. e. they carried their not-love of their life even unto death: see reff.). **For this cause** (viz., because the dragon is cast down: as is shewn by the contrast below) **rejoice, ye heavens and they that dwell** (there is no sense of transitoriness in St. John's use of σκηνόω: rather, one of repose and tranquillity (reff.)) **in them. Woe to the earth and the sea** (the construction is a combination of the usual accus. in exclamations, with οὐαί, which takes a dative), **because the devil is come down** (see above on ἄρτι ἐγένετο, ver. 10, on the impossibility of expressing the aor. in such connexions) **to you** (the earth and sea) **having great wrath** (the enmity, which was manifested as his natural state towards Christ, ver. 4, being now kindled into wrath), **because he knoweth** (so E. V., rightly, the participle carrying with it this ratiocinative force) **that he hath but** (in our language this "*but*" is necessary to shew that it is not the ἔχειν but the ὀλίγον which excites his wrath. In Greek this is made clear by the position of ὀλίγον) **a short season** (i. e. because the Lord cometh quickly, and then the period of his active hostility against the church and the race whom Christ has redeemed will be at an end: he will be bound and cast into the pit. Until then, he is carrying it on, in ways which the prophecy goes on to detail). **And when the dragon saw that he was cast down to the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the male child** (the narrative at ver. 6 is again taken up and given more in detail. There, the reason of the woman's flight is matter of inference: here, it is plainly expressed, and the manner of the flight also is related. ἔτεκεν is not to be taken as pluperfect, still less as pointing to what was yet to take place; but is the simple historic tense,

[αἱ] δύο [r] πτέρυγες τοῦ [st] ἀετοῦ τοῦ [t] μεγάλου, ἵνα [u] πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἔρημον εἰς τὸν [vw] τόπον αὐτῆς, [w] ὅπου τρέφεται [w] ἐκεῖ [x] καιρὸν καὶ [x] καιροὺς καὶ [xy] ἥμισυ [x] καιροῦ [z] ἀπὸ [z] προσώπου τοῦ ὄφεως. [15] καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ὄφις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ποταμόν, ἵνα αὐτὴν [a] ποταμοφόρητον ποιήσῃ. [16] καὶ [b] ἐβοήθησεν

r ch. iv. 8 reff. s ch. iv. 7 reff. Deut. xxxii. 11. Exod. xix. 4. t Ezek. xvii. 3, 7. u ch. iv. 7 reff. v ch. vi. 14 reff. w ver. 6 (reff.). x Dan. vii. 25. xii. 7. y ch. xi. 11 reff. z Judg. ix. 21. a here only †. so ἀνεμοφόρητος, Passow. b Matt. xv. 25. Mark ix. 22, 24. Acts xvi. 9. xxi. 28. 2 Cor. vi. 2. Heb. ii. 18 only. Lam. i. 7.

rec om αἱ, with ℵ B rel Hip$_1$ Andr-coisl Areth: ins AC[P] g l n 1. 12. 27[1]. 36 Hip$_1$ Andr. om 1st του ℵ. πεταται n 1. 38. om εις την ερημον 1. 12 Andr-p. om τον ℵ. for οπου, οπως (B ?) rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ 17[1]. 32-3 vulg syr-dd copt Hip$_2$ Primas.—τρεφηται B rel: txt AC[P]ℵ 1. 30-3(-4, e sil) Hip$_2$.—(In Tischdf's edn of B αυτης οπου τρεφεται εκει καιρον και is omitted.) ins και bef καιρον ℵ[3a]: om καιρον ℵ[1]. om και ημισυ καιρου C: ημισου ℵ[1].

15. for εβαλεν, ελαβεν A[1]. rec οπισω της γυναικος bef εκ του στοματος αυτου, with 1: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. rec (for αυτην) ταυτην, with [P] l 1. 17. 33-5 Hip Andr-b-p: txt ACℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas.—ποιηση bef αυτ. C.

used for identification in again taking up the narrative). **And there were given** (in the usual apocalyptic sense of δοθῆναι, to be granted by God for His purposes) **to the woman [the] two wings of the great eagle** (the figure is taken from O. T. expressions used by God in reference to the flight of Israel from Egypt. The most remarkable of these is in ref. Exod., ⌈ἀνέλαβον ὑμᾶς ὡσεὶ ἐπὶ πτερύγων ἀετῶν καὶ προσηγαγόμην ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν.⌋ So also in ref. Deut. But the articles are not to be taken as identifying the eagle with the figure used in those places, which would be most unnatural: much less must they, with Ebrard, be supposed to identify this eagle with that in ch. viii. 13, with which it has no connexion. The articles are simply generic, as in ὁ κροκόδειλος ὁ χερσαῖος, Levit. xi. 29. With these O. T. references before us, we can hardly be justified in pressing the figure of the eagle's wings to an interpretation in the fulfilment of the prophecy, or in making it mean that the flight took place under the protection of the Roman eagles, as some have done), **that she might fly into the wilderness** (the flight of Israel out of Egypt is still borne in mind) **to her place** (prepared of God, ver. 6: so also in Exod. xxiii. 20, ὅπως εἰσαγάγῃ σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἡτοίμασά σοι), **where she is nourished** (**there**) (as God nourished Israel with manna in the wilderness, see Deut. viii. 3, 16, where ψωμίζειν is used) **a time and times and half a time** (i.e. 3½ years = 42 months, ch. xi. 2 = 1260 days, ver. 6 and ch. xi. 3) **from the face of the serpent** (ἀπό must not be joined, as some texts are punctuated, with πέτηται, but belongs, as in ref., ἔφυγεν . . . καὶ ᾤκησεν ἐκεῖ ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἀβ., to the last verb, τρέφεται: importing "safe from," "far from," "hidden from"). **And the serpent cast out of his mouth after the woman water as a river, that he might make her to be borne away by the river. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth** (reff.) **and swallowed down the river which the dragon cast out of his mouth** (in passing to the interpretation, we cannot help being struck with the continued analogy between this prophecy and the history of the Exodus. There we have the flight into the wilderness, there the feeding in the wilderness, as already remarked: there again the forty-two stations, corresponding to the forty-two months of the three years and half of this prophecy: there too the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, not indeed in strict correspondence with this last feature, but at least suggestive of it. These analogies themselves suggest caution in the application of the words of the prophecy; and in this direction. The church in the wilderness of old was not, as some expositors would represent this woman, the pure church of God: His veritable servants were hidden in the midst of that church, as much as that church itself was withdrawn from the enmity of Pharaoh. And, it is to be noted, it was that very church herself which afterwards, when seated at Jerusalem, forsook her Lord and Husband, and committed adultery with the kings of the earth, and became drunk with the blood of the saints. It would seem then that we must not understand the woman of the invisible spiritual church of Christ, nor her flight into the wilderness

ἡ γῆ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ [c] ἤνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ [c] στόμα αὐτῆς, καὶ [cd] κατέπιεν τὸν ποταμὸν ὃν ἔβαλεν ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ

c Num. (xvi. 32) xxvi. 10.
d Matt. xxiii. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 54. 2 Cor. ii. 7. v. 4. Heb. xi. 29. 1 Pet. v. 8 only.

16. for τον ποταμον ον, το υδωρ ο A. ενεβαλεν B: ανεβαλεν f.

of the withdrawal of God's true servants from the eyes of the world. They indeed have been just as much withdrawn from the eyes of the world at all times, and will continue so till the great manifestation of the sons of God. I own that, considering the analogies and the language used, I am much more disposed to interpret the persecution of the woman by the dragon of the various persecutions by Jews which followed the Ascension, and her flight into the wilderness of the gradual withdrawal of the church and her agency from Jerusalem and Judæa, finally consummated by the flight to the mountains on the approaching siege, commanded by our Lord Himself. And then the river which the dragon sent out of his mouth after the woman might be variously understood,—of the Roman armies which threatened to sweep away Christianity in the wreck of the Jewish nation,—or of the persecutions which followed the church into her retreats, but eventually became absorbed by the civil power turning Christian,—or of the Jewish nation itself, banded together against Christianity wherever it appeared, but eventually itself becoming powerless against it by its dispersion and ruin,—or again, of the influx of heretical opinions from the Pagan philosophies which tended to swamp the true faith. I confess that not one of these seems to me satisfactorily to answer the conditions: nor do we gain any thing by their combination. But any thing within reasonable regard for the analogies and symbolism of the text seems better than the now too commonly received historical interpretation, with its wild fancies and arbitrary assignment of words and figures. As to the time indicated by the 1260 days or 3½ years, the interpretations given have not been convincing, nor even specious. We may observe thus much in this place: that if we regard this prophecy as including long historic periods, we are driven to one of two resources with regard to these numbers: either we must adopt the *year-day* theory (that which reckons a day for a year, and consequently a month for thirty years,—and should reckon a year for 360 years), or we must believe the numbers to have merely a symbolical and mystical, not a chronological force. If (and this second alternative is best stated in an inverse form) we regard the periods mentioned as to be literally accepted, then the prophecy cannot refer to long historic periods, but must be limited to a succession of incidents concentrated in one place and lustrum either in the far past or in the far future. Of all prophecies about which these questions can be raised, the present is the one which least satisfactorily admits of such literal interpretation and its consequences. Its actors, the woman and the dragon, are beyond all controversy mystical personages; one of them is expressly interpreted for us to be the devil: respecting the other there can be little doubt that she is the Church of God: her seed being, as expressly interpreted to be, God's Christian people. The conflict then is that between Satan and the church. Its first great incident is the birth and triumph of the Son of God and of man. Is it likely that a few days or years will limit the duration of a prophecy confessedly of such wide import? I own it seems to me that this vision, even if it stood alone, is decisive against the literal acceptation of the stated periods. Rejecting that, how do we stand with regard to the other alternative in its two forms? Granting for the moment the year-day principle, will it help us here? If we take the flight into the wilderness as happening at any time between the Ascension, A.D. 30, and the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, 1260 years will bring us to some time between A.D. 1290 and 1330: a period during which no event can be pointed out as putting an end to the wilderness-state of the church. If again we enlarge our limit for the former event, and bring it down as late as Elliott does, i. e. to the period between the fourth and seventh centuries, we fall into all the difficulties which beset his most unsatisfactory explanation of the man-child and his being caught up to God's throne, and besides into this one: that if the occultation of true religion (= the condition of the invisible Church) was the beginning of the wilderness-state, then either the open establishment of the Protestant churches was the end of the wilderness-state of concealment, or those churches are no true churches: either of which alternatives would hardly be allowed by that author. And if on the other hand we desert the year day principle, and say that these

u = John xii. 19. Acts v. 37. xx. 30. 1 Tim. v. 15. 3 Kings i. 7.
v Exod. xv. 11. Psa. xxxiv. 10. lxx. 19. see note.
w ch. ii. 16 reff.
x Dan. vii. 8. (xi. 36.)
y = Acts vi. 11 2 Pet. ii. 11 (1 Tim. i. 13. 2 Tim. iii. 2) only‡. Isa. lxvi. 3 only. Wisd. i. 6 al.
z = Dan. viii. 24. xi. 28, 30, 32. Ps. xxxvi. 5 (or Acts xv. 33. James iv. 13. Prov. xiii. 23).
a see ch. xi. 2, 3. xii. 6, 14.

καὶ ἐθαύμασεν ὅλη ἡ γῆ [u] ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου, [4] καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ δράκοντι ὅτι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῷ θηρίῳ, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ λέγοντες [v] Τίς [v] ὅμοιος τῷ θηρίῳ; καὶ τίς δύναται [w] πολεμῆσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ; [5] καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στόμα [x] λαλοῦν [x] μεγάλα καὶ [y] βλάσφημα· καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία [z] ποιῆσαι [a] μῆνας τεσσεράκοντα

—ἐξουσία πο. ... ACP‫א‬ ...

Steph εθαυμασθη, with A n 1. 12. 36: εθαυμαστωθη C: txt [P]‫א‬ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. Steph ins εν bef ολη τη γη, with n 1. 12. 36 Andr-p: om AC[P]‫א‬ B rel.

4. rec (for τω δρακοντι) τον δρακοντα: txt AC[P]‫א‬ B rel Andr Areth.—om from θηριου last ver to 2nd θηριω 1. rec (for ὁτι εδωκεν) ὁς εδωκεν: τω δεδωκοτι B rel Areth: τω δοντι f: txt AC[P]‫א‬ g 12. 34-5-6 am (with demid fuld lips-5) syr-dd Andr Iren-int Primas, οτε εδωκεν n 46.—om from τω δρακ. to προσεκυν. e. rec om την: ins AC[P]‫א‬ B rel Andr Areth. rec (for 2nd τω θηριω) το θηριον, with A (40, e sil) Andr-a(Del) Areth: txt C[P]‫א‬ B rel Andr-coisl.—for τω θ. κ. προσεκ. τω θ., του θηριου των θηριων 36. rec om last και, with rel Areth: ins AC[P]‫א‬ B f g h m n 1. 10-7. 34-6-7-8. 42[1]-7-9 B[r] vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr Iren-int Primas. for δυναται, δυνατος B rel Areth: txt AC[P]‫א‬ g j m n 1. (17[1]?) 34-5-6 (38. 49, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr Iren-int Primas.

5. rec (for βλασφημα) βλασφημιας, with C‫א‬ b g 16-8. 51 (27. 38, e sil) vss Andr: βλασφημιαν [P] B rel vulg Dion Areth Iren-int: txt A m n 12. 34. 47.—om from και εδ. to και εδ. c 1. om εξουσια ‫א‬[1]. elz ins πολεμον bef ποιησαι, with B rel Andr-coisl: om AC[P](‫א‬) g n 1. 18. 36 vulg syr-dd Andr Tich.—om ποιησαι (as well as πολεμον) arm Dion Iren-int Primas,: for ποιησαι, πολεμησαι f.—aft ποιησαι ins ο θελει ‫א‬. aft τεσσ. ins και A g 16 fuld syr-dd Iren-int.

tus merely relates, that there were many rumours about Nero's death, "eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque," Hist. ii. 8, and that on the strength of this, a Pseudo-Nero arose in the East, Hist. i. 2, "mota etiam prope Parthorum arma falsi Neronis ludibrio." See also the citations from the Sibylline oracles, Lactantius, and Sulpicius Severus, in Düst.'s note. The first who mentions the idea of Nero *returning from the dead*, is Augustine, Civ. Dei xx. 19. 3, vol. vii. p. 686, in explaining 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.: "quidam putant hoc (ver. 7) de imperio dictum fuisse Romano—ut hoc quod dixit, jam enim mysterium iniquitatis operatur, Neronem voluerit intelligi, cujus jam facta velut Antichristi videbantur. Unde nonnulli ipsum resurrecturum et futurum Antichristum suspicantur." But it is observable that Aug. does not connect the idea with the Apocalypse. This is first done by Sulp. Severus, and completed by Victorinus, whose very words ("unum autem de capitibus occisum in morte et plaga mortis ejus curata est, Neronem dicit. Constat enim, dum insequeretur eum equitatus missus a senatu, ipsam sibi gulam succidisse. Hunc ergo suscitatum Deus mittet regem dignum dignis, et Christum qualem meruerint Judæi") betray the origin of the idea having been from this passage itself). **And the whole earth wondered after** (pregnant construction for wondered at, as they followed, or gazed, after) **the beast, and worshipped the dragon, because he gave the** (or, *his*) **power to the beast, and worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like to the beast? And who is able to war with him** (these words are a sort of parody, in their blasphemy, on ascriptions of praise to God: cf. besides reff., Ps. cxii. 5; Isa. xl. 18, 25, xlvi. 5; Jer. xxix. 20 (xlix. 19); Micah vii. 18: they represent to us the relapse into all the substantial blasphemies of paganism under the resuscitated Empire of Rome, and the retention of pagan titles and forms. I may remark, that nothing in those words finds any representative in the history of the times of the Pagan Empire)? **And there was given to it a mouth speaking great and blasphemous things** (so we read of the little horn in Daniel vii. 8): **and there was given to it power to work** (more probably, as in former reff., than "to spend" merely: this meaning is indeed found in latter reff., but the places in Daniel seem to decide for us) **forty-two months** (the well-known period of the agency of antichrist = 3½ years = 1260 days: see Prolegomena, § v. 29 f.), **and he opened his mouth** (spoken, see reff., of the commencement of a series of dis-

δύο· [6] καὶ [b] ἤνοιξεν τὸ [b] στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίας πρὸς τὸν θεόν, [c] βλασφημῆσαι τὸ [c] ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν [d] σκηνὴν· αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ [e] σκηνοῦντας. [7] καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [f] ποιῆσαι [f] πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν [g] ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [h] ἐξουσία [h] ἐπὶ πᾶσαν [i] φυλὴν καὶ [i] λαὸν καὶ [i] γλῶσσαν καὶ [i] ἔθνος. [8] καὶ [k] προςκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ [l] κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [m] οὗ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ [l] ὄνομα [m] αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ [n] βιβλίῳ τῆς [n] ζωῆς τοῦ [o] ἀρνίου τοῦ [o] ἐσφαγμένου [p] ἀπὸ [pqr] κατα-

b Matt. v. 2. xi. 35, from Ps. lxxvii. 2. Acts viii. 35 al. Job iii. 1.
c ch. xvi. 9. Rom. ii. 24 (from Isa. lii. 5). James ii. 7 al.
d ch. xxi. 3.
e ch. vii. 15 reff.
f ch. xi. 7 reff.
g ch. xi. 18 reff.
h see for constr., ch. ii. 26 reff.
i ch. v. 9 reff.
k w. acc., vv. 12, 15 ch. xiv. 9, 11. xx. 4. Judg. vii. 15 A.
l ch. iii. 10 reff.
m constr., ch. iii. 8 reff.
n see ch. iii. 5 reff.
o ch. v. 6, 12.
p = ch. xvii. 8. Matt. xxv. 34. Luke xi. 50. Heb. iv. 3. ix. 26.
q John xvii. 24. Eph. i. 4. 1 Pet. i. 20.
r = as above (p, q) and Matt. xiii. 35 (Heb. xi. 11, only†. (2 Macc. ii. 29 only.)

6. rec *βλασφημιαν*, with [P] B rel vss Andr Areth: txt ACℵ g m 1. 18. 34(-5-6?) vulg Andr-coisl.—n passes from 1st *αυτου* to 2nd. for *το ονομα αυτου*, *αυτον* ℵ[1]. om *και την σκηνην αυτου* (*homœotel*) C tol[1]. rec ins *και* bef *τους εν τω ουρανω*, with [P]ℵ[3a] B[1] b[2] 19. 32[2]-4. 51 (a m n 1. 35-7-8. 47, e sil) vulg copt Andr Areth Iren-int Primas: om ACℵ[1] rel Andr-coisl. *σκηνουντες*(sic) ℵ.

7. om 1st clause (*homœotel from και εδοθη occurring twice*) AC[P] f 1(but ins (see below) marg) 12 Andr-p Iren-int: ins ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas.—rec *πολεμον* bef *ποιησαι*, with m 1-marg 34 (35. 40-7, e sil) vulg Andr-coisl Ambr: txt ℵ B rel syr-dd copt Andr-a Areth Primas. *νικησει* 1-marg. *εξουσια* ℵ[1]. rec om *και λαον*, with h 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 B[r], e sil) copt Andr-p: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Iren-int Primas.

8. rec (for *αυτον*) *αυτω*, with [P]ℵ g m 1. 17-8. 38 (e h l 30-7. 47-9 B[r], e sil) Andr-p: txt AC B rel Andr Areth. rec (for *οὗ*) *ὧν*, with [P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas Tich; *ὃν* 50: *ὁ* d: txt A(see below) C Iren-int. for *οὐ*, *ουτε* B a d e j k 2. 13-6. 30. 40. 50-1. 90: om ℵ[1]: txt C[P] rel vulg Andr Areth Iren-int Primas Tich.—for *οὗ οὐ*, *ουαι* A. rec (for *το ονομα*) *τα ονοματα*, with [P]ℵ g n 1 (47, e sil) vulg Andr-a Areth Primas: txt AC B rel syr-dd copt Andr Iren-int Tich. rec om *αυτου*, with [P]ℵ[3a] B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas Tich: ins AC, *αυτων* ℵ[1] g. for *εν*, *επι* B. rec (for *τω βιβλιω*) *τη βιβλω*, with 1: *βιβλω* ℵ[1] 36: *τω βιβλω* ℵ[3a]: *βιβλιω* C: txt A[P] B rel Andr Areth. rec om 2nd *του*, with 34 (30-5, e sil): ins AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. for *εσφαγμενου*, *εσφραγισμενου* 1. 47 Andr-a(Del).

courses. These vv. 6, 7, in fact expand into detail that which ver. 5 gave compendiously) **for blasphemies against God, to blaspheme His name and His tabernacle, which dwell in heaven** (the apposition is strange, but if the *καί* must be omitted, the meaning is to enhance the enormity of the blasphemy by bringing out the lofty nature of God's holy Name and dwelling-place. *With* the *καί*, the last clause would mean that he blasphemes them that dwell in heaven, i. e. the holy angels of God. To take this as still the meaning without the *καί*, is to introduce into the apocalyptic style an asyndeton which is not found in it). **And there was given to it to make war with the saints** (see Dan. vii. 21) **and to conquer them** (see ch. xi. 7, of which this is a wider statement): **and there was given to it power over every tribe and people and tongue and nation** (viz. universal empire). **And all shall worship it** (*αὐτόν*, though masculine, must be referred to the *θηρίον*, which has been now for some time spoken of as an agent, and not to an impersonation of it by a living king) **who dwell upon the earth, (every one) whose** (the change into the singular arises from resolving *πάντες* into its component individuals) **name** (*οὗ . . . αὐτοῦ*, the usual Hellenistic redundance: see reff.) **is not written in the book of life of the Lamb which is slain from the foundation of the world** (these last words are ambiguously placed. They may belong either to *γέγραπται*, or to *ἐσφαγμένου*. The former connexion is taken by Hammond, Bengel, Heinr., Ewald, Züllig, De Wette, Hengstb., Düsterd. But the other is far more obvious and natural: and had it not been for the apparent difficulty of the sense thus conveyed, the going so far back as to *γέγραπται* for a connexion would never have been thought of. See this remarkably shewn in the Catena: *ὧν γέγραπται, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γέγραπται· οὕτω γὰρ*

s ch. ii. 7 reff. t = Acts xiii. 48. u here bis. Eph. iv. 8 only. Jer. xv. 2. Ezek. xxxix. 23. v Matt. xxvi. 52. Luke xxii. 49. Heb. xi 37. ch. vi. 8 reff.

βολῆς [p4] κόσμου. [9] Εἴ τις [s] ἔχει [s] οὖς, [s] ἀκουσάτω. [10] Εἴ τις [t] εἰς [u] αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς [u] αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει· εἴ τις [v] ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι, αὐτὸν [v] ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι. [w] ὧδέ ἐστιν ἡ [x] ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων.

[11] Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον [z] ἀναβαῖνον [z] ἐκ τῆς γῆς

w = ver. 18. ch. xiv. 12. xvii. 9. x ch. i. 9. Luke xxi. 19. Rom. ii. 7 al. y ch. v. 8 reff. z 1 Kings xxviii. 13, 14. ... xii. 1 al. Ezra x. 2.

10. rec (for 1st εις αιχμαλωσιαν) αιχμαλωσιαν συναγει, with b[3] 1 Andr-a ... αιχμαλωτιζει 1: αιχμαλωτιει 18 Primas(*qui captivum duxerit*): αιχμαλωσιαν ... εχει αιχμαλωσιαν rel Andr-p: εχει (alone) 9: αιχμαλωσιαν επαγει m: ... απαγει 34: εις αιχμαλωσιαν απαγει 35 vulg-ed(*qui in captivitatem duxerit* ...) Andr-coisl: αιχμαλωσιαν (alone) f 47: txt AC[P]ℵ B g n 6. 12. 32-5-8 ... agst demid). for εις αιχμαλωσιαν υπαγει, αιχμαλωτισθησεται 18 Primas(... *capietur*): αιχμαλωσιαν υπαγει (omg εις) 16. 32: υπαγει (alone) C[P]ℵ B rel ... txt A b[2] l m 34 vulg(*in captivitatem vadet* ed-Clem, *vadet in captivitatem* ...). rec μαχαιρα (twice), with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: txt AC. (Simly ... 2nd εν μαχ. 51. rec (for 1st αποκτανθηναι) αποκτενει δει, with C ... αποκτεινει δει ℵ n, -κτεννει δει g: δει a *to* f j k 2. 4. 6. 13(-9?) 27. 30-2. 40 ... 90: txt A.—for αποκτ. αυτ. εν μαχ. αποκτ., δει αυτον αποκτανθηναι 9. 82.

δεῖ νοεῖν, οὐχ ὡς ἡ γραφὴ ἔχει· ὅτι μηδὲ ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἡ τοῦ ἀρνίου σφαγή. The difficulty however is but apparent: 1 Pet. i. 19, 20 says more fully the same thing. That death of Christ which was foreordained from the foundation of the world, is said to have *taken place* in the counsels of Him with whom the end and the beginning are one. Ch. xvii. 8, which is cited by De W. as decisive for his view, is irrelevant. Of course where simply the writing in the book of life from the foundation of the world is expressed, no other element is to be introduced: but it does not therefore follow, that where, as here, other elements are by the construction introduced, that, and that alone is to be understood).

9, 10.] These verses bear various meanings, according to the reading which we adopt. If the rec. be taken, they express a consolation to the persecuted saints in the form of a jus talionis: the judgment of God will overtake the persecutors, and in that form in which their persecution was exercised. If we take the reading in the text, they form a prophetic declaration how it shall fare with the saints in the day of persecution, and declare also that in holy suffering of captivity and death consists their faith and patience. The latter appears to me, both from critical and contextual considerations, by far the more eligible. Thus we have what is so frequent in this book, an O. T. citation (see below): and all falls into its place in connexion with the victorious war of the beast against the saints: whereas the other declaration is at least out of place in the context. **If any man hath an ear, let him hear** (see reff. This notice is ... bespeak solemn attention to what ... as warning Christians *of their* ... days of the beast's persecution ... **one is for captivity, into captivity he goeth: if any to be slain** (*ἀποκτ.* ... = εἰς τὸ ἀποκτανθῆναι) **with** ... and note on ch. vi. 8) **the sword,** ... **it is necessary that**: δεῖ, as the ... reading supplies) **he should be slain** ... **the sword** (so ref. Jer., "Such as ... death, to death: and such as are ... sword, to the sword: and such as are ... the famine, to the famine: and ... are for captivity, to captivity:" ... Jer. xliii. 11 and Zech. xi. 9. ... was the order and process of God ... in his judgments on his people ... shall the issue be with the saints ... war of persecution which the beast ... wage with them). **Here is** (reff. ... the endurance of these persecutions ... **endurance and the faith of the saints** ...

11—18.] The second wild-beast, the reviver and the upholder of the first. It may be well to pre... few remarks, tending to the right under... standing of this portion of the pro... 1) These two beasts are identical in genus: they are both θηρία, ... powers, hostile to God's *flock* ... 2) They are diverse in origin. The ... came up out of the sea: that is, ... back to the symbolism *of Daniel,* ... empire, rising up out of confusion ... order and life: the latter comes ... the earth: i. e. we may *not unreason*... say, arises out of human society and ... progress: which as interpreted by ... context, will import its origin *and grad*...

εν κέρατα δύο ᵃὅμοια ᵃἀρνίῳ, καὶ ἐλάλει ὡς δράκων. ᵃ constr., ch. ix. 10.

.1. for ομοια, ονομα C. αρνιου 1.

velopment during the reign and pro-ss of the secular empire denoted by the mer beast. 3) The second beast is, in zeal and action, entirely subsidiary to first. It wields its authority, works racles in its support, causes men to ke and to worship its image; nay, it-f is lost in the splendour and importance the other. 4) An important distinc-n exists between the two beasts, in that s second one has two horns like a lamb. other words, this second beast puts on mild and lamb-like appearance, which other did not. But it speaks as a igon: its words, which carry its real aracter, are fierce and unrelenting: ile it professes that which is gentle, its iests are cruel. And now I may peal to the reader, whether all these uisites do not meet in that great wast-Power which arose, not out of anarchy l conquest, but out of men's daily life l habits, out of and in the presence of last form of the secular power, which s the Empire of Pagan Rome; I mean, *sacerdotal persecuting power*, which, ntle in its aspect and professions, was cruel in its actions; which did all the eds of the Empire, in its presence, which pt up its image, its laws, its formulæ, privileges; which, coming in as it did a corrupt and ambitious priesthood, ceived by its miracles the dwellers on rth, and by them maintained the image the despotic secular power? Surely it this Latin Christianity, in its ecclesias-o-secular form, not identical with, but preparing the way for, the great apos-sy, helping, so to speak, to place the oman on the beast, as in ch. xvii., that here depicted before us. It is this iich, owing its power in the main to im-sture and unwarrantably assumed spiri-al authority, deserves best the name of *false prophet*, expressly given to this cond beast in ch. xix. 20. Nor would I iit the interpretation, as has generally en done, by dividing off Pagan from ristian. Primarily, this second beast inly sets forth the Pagan sacerdotal wer; this it was that made the image the Emperors, that compelled Chris-ns to worship that image, that wrought ns and wonders by its omens and magic. ut as the first beast, still subsisting, has ssed into a so-called Christian Roman npire, so has the second beast into a -called Christian priesthood, the verita-e inheritor of pagan rites, images, and superstitions; actually the continuators, nomine mutato, of the same worship in the same places; that of the Virgin for that of Venus, Cosmas and Damian for Romulus and Remus, the image of Peter for that of Jupiter Tonans: lamb-like in profession, with the names and appear-ances of Christianity, but dragon-like in word and act. And this was surely never more strikingly shewn than at the time when I am writing (Jan. 1860), when the Papal priesthood is zealously combining in the suicidal act of upholding the temporal power as necessary to the spiritual pre-eminence of their "Lord God the Pope." So that I believe the interpretation of the second beast to be, the *sacerdotal perse-cuting power, pagan and Christian*, as the first is the secular persecuting power, pagan or Christian. I conceive the view which would limit it to the priesthood of Paganism (Hammond, Grot., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstb., Düsterd.) quite insuffi-cient for the importance of the prophecy; while that of Elliott, al., which would limit it to the priesthood of the Papacy, fails notably in giving a meaning to its acts as here described, the making an image to the beast and causing men to worship it. **And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth** (see the pre-ceding note), **and it had two horns like a lamb** (i. e. like the two horns of a lamb: see ref. It is quite true that the absence of the article before ἀρνίῳ forbids the idea that a direct comparison is intended be-tween this lamb-like beast, and the Lamb on Mount Sion: but it does not follow from this that no reference is made to that Lamb in the choice of the animal to which this beast is compared. I believe the choice is made to set forth the hybrid character of this second beast: see more below. The *number* may perhaps be of no special import, but merely inserted to complete the similarity: it, as a lamb has, had two horns), **and it spoke as a dragon** (here again we cannot doubt that the term is chosen on account of the dragon which has been before mentioned. It is no ob-jection to this, that we do not hear of that dragon speaking (Düsterd.): the character of the animal explains what kind of speech is meant, and the acts of the dragon were of that kind. And as to this second beast, though its appearance and profession are sacerdotal, its words and acts are devilish. The whole description strongly recalls to our mind our Lord's προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν

12 καὶ τὴν [b] ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρώτου θηρίου πᾶσαν [illegible] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· καὶ [c] ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς [d] ἐν [illegible] [d] κατοικοῦντας [e] ἵνα [e] προσκυνήσουσιν τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον, [f] οὗ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ [g] πληγὴ τοῦ [g] θανάτου [f] αὐτοῦ. [illegible] [h] ποιεῖ [h] σημεῖα μεγάλα, [i] ἵνα καὶ [k] πῦρ ποιῇ [k] ἐκ τοῦ [illegible]νοῦ καταβαίνειν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀν[illegible] 14 καὶ [l] πλανᾷ τοὺς [m] κατοικοῦντας [m] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [illegible] [h] σημεῖα ἃ [n] ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [h] ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θ[illegible] λέγων τοῖς [m] κατοικοῦσιν [m] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι [illegible]

b constr., here only. see Matt. xxi. 23 ‖. (cf. ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα, Matt. vii. 21. John, passim.)
c constr., ch. iii. 9 reff.
d Acts vii. 2. xi. 29 al. Ps. cvi. 34.
e w. acc., ver. 8 reff.
f constr., ch. iii. 8 reff.
g ver. 3. cf. Mic. i. 11.
h here bis. ch. xvi. 14. xix. 20. John ii. 11) 23. iii. 2. iv. 54. vi. 2, 14, 30 al7. Acts vi. 8 al. Dan. iii. 32 (iv. 2). see Matt. xxiv. 24 [illegible] 12 (see note).
k 4 Kings i. 10, 12. (3 Kings xviii. 38.)
l ch. ii. 20 reff.
m [illegible]
n constr., ch. ii. 7 reff.
o Matt. xxii. 20 ‖. Rom. viii. 29 al. after this, Rev. passim. Dan. [illegible]

12. for 1st ποιει, εποιει 6: *faciebat* vulg: ποιησει m 34-5 Andr-coisl: [illegible] 10 &c. have txt.) for 2nd ποιει, εποιει B rel syr-dd Andr-p Areth; *faci*[illegible] ποιησει m 34-5 Andr-coisl: txt AC[P]ℵ g n 1. 16-8. 36. 40-7 Andr-a. [illegible] γην και, ενωπιον P(sic).] rec κατοικουντας bef εν αυτη, with C and (a[illegible] e sil) f 40 vulg Iren-int: om κατοικ. 41: txt A[P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr Areth. [illegible] προσκυνησωσι, with [P] B rel: προσκυνιν(sic, omg ινα) ℵ: txt AC f k l[1] 30[1]-6. [illegible] του θανατου A. om αυτου [P] f vulg Primas.

13. for ποιει, εποιει c: ποιησει m 34-5 Andr-coisl. και πυρ bef ινα B rel [illegible] πυρ ινα, omg και, f: πυρ εκ τ. ουρ. bef ινα 40: txt AC[P]ℵ m 34 (g 1. 35-6, e s[il]) syr-dd Hip Andr Iren-int.—ινα εν πλανη ποιει πυρ εκ κ.τ.λ., omg και, n 79 Andr[illegible] rec καταβ. bef εκ του ουρανου, with [P]ℵ 1 (g, e sil) syr-dd (æth) Hip: [illegible] B rel.—for καταβαινειν, καταβαινη (omg ποιη) B rel (-νει B k l 30-6-9. 50) cop [illegible] καταβηναι m 35: txt AC[P]ℵ g (n) 1. 38 vulg Andr Iren-int. (καταβαινειν [illegible]) for εις, επι B rel Andr-p Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ m n 1. 34(-5-6, e sil) Hip Andr.

14. λεγοντος B[1]: λεγον 1. aft 2nd γης ins και ℵ. εικοναν A Andr-[illegible]

ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσιν λύκοι ἅρπαγες, Matt. vii. 15). **And it worketh all the power** (performs all the acts of authority) **of the first beast in his presence** (while the first beast is subsisting and beholding; and as the expression seems to shew, being in a relation to it of serving and upholding), **and maketh the earth and those that dwell in it to worship** (construction, see reff.) **the first beast, whose wound of death was healed** (this was formerly, ver. 4, described as the reason why the world wondered after the former beast): **and worketh great miracles, so that** (ἵνα depends on μεγάλα: "miracula magna, tam magna, ut" &c. So that ἵνα ποιῇ = ὥστε ποιεῖν. See Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 6, who as well as Düsterd. finds fault with Bengel for recognizing here a feature of St. John's style. But Bengel only remarks "ἵνα frequens Johanni particula: in omnibus suis libris non nisi semel, Joh. iii. 16. ὥστε posuit:" and this is true and applicable to the case here in hand, where ὥστε would naturally have stood,—whatever may be the minute shade of difference between the force of ἵνα as connected with the previous words in various passages. We know that the Apocalypse is written in a [illegible] style and more faulty Greek than the Gospel or the Epistles: *what* [illegible] if the use of ἵνα epexegetic be car[illegible] ther in it, and from its meaning [illegible] purpose be extended *to detail of* [illegible] fact? Granting the two meanings [illegible] even as far apart as Düsterd. insists, [illegible] we not say that the *Writer who so* [illegible] uses the one is just the person who, [illegible] writing less strictly, was likely to [illegible] other? As to *the fact describ*[ed] [illegible] is notorious enough that the great [illegible] support of the sacerdotal power, [illegible] and papal, has ever *been the ch*[illegible] work miracles) **he even maketh fi**[re] **come down from the heaven to the ea**[rth] **in the sight of men** ("*hæc magi per* [illegible] los refugas et hodie faciunt," says Vi[ctori]nus, writing in the beginning of the f[illegible] century, before yet the *Empire pr*[illegible] Christianity. But it is probable th[at] [illegible] special miracle is mentioned to rec[all] [illegible] spirit and power of Elias, *and shew* [illegible] the false prophet shall counterfeit [illegible] true). **And he deceiveth those who dw**[ell] **on the earth on account of** (*the prep.* [illegible] presses not the instrument, but the gr[ound] of the deceit: the imposture su[illegible] because of . . .) **the miracles which it ha**[illegible]

ῳ θηρίῳ ὃς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρης καὶ [p] ἔζησεν. καὶ [n] ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [q] δοῦναι [q] πνεῦμα τῇ [o] εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου, ἵνα καὶ λαλήσῃ ἡ [o] εἰκὼν τοῦ θηρίου, καὶ [r] ποιήσῃ [[r] ἵνα] ὅσοι [s] ἐὰν μὴ [s] προςκυνήσωσιν τὴν [o] εἰκόνα τοῦ θηρίου ἀποκτανθῶσιν. [16] καὶ [r] ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς [t] μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς [u] πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς [u] πτωχούς, καὶ τοὺς [v] ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς [v] δούλους, [q] ἵνα [w] δῶσιν αὐτοῖς

p ch. ii. 8 reff.
q Ezek. xxxvii. 6.
r constr., ver. 12.
s ch. iii. 19 reff.
t ch. xi. 18. xix. 5, 18.
xx. 12. Isa. ix. 14.
u Prov. xxii. 2. Sir. x. 22.
v ch. vi. 15. xix. 18. 1 Cor. xii. 13. Gal. iii. 28. Eph. vi. 8. Col. iii. 11.
w = John xviii. 22. xix. 3 al. Ezek. ix. 4. impers. plur., see ch. xvi. 15 reff.

rec (for ὃς) ὅ, with ℵ rel Hip Andr Areth; ꝑ 1 6. 16. 90: txt AC[P] B m n 34-5-6. for εχει, ειχε B rel syr-dd Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ f g h 1. 34-5-6-8 vulg Hip Andr-coisl Primas. om την ℵ B a b c d e f j k 2. 6. 13. 26-7. 30-2. 40-1-2-8. 50-1. 9 Areth.—πληγης(sic) ℵ. ins απο bef της μαχαιρ. f 47: και εζησεν απο της μαχαιρας B rel: και εζησεν απο της πληγης της μαχαιρας 16. 39: txt AC[P]ℵ 10-7-8. 9 (g h m n 1. 34-5-6-7-8. 49 B[r], e sil) vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Primas.

15. for αυτω, αυτη (*mechanical repetition of η from preceding word?*) AC [P[1](corrd idem manu?)]. πνευμα bef δουναι B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth: om δουναι C: txt [P]ℵ f g n 17. 34 (1. 36, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr. ποιησει ℵ f g k 36. 42. rec has ινα bef αποκτανθωσι and not bef οσοι, with 1 (h 37 B[r], e sil): om (altogether) ℵ B rel arm Andr: txt A[P] g l 26. 36. 47-9 vulg syr-dd Hip Andr-a Primas. (homœotel in C n, from θηριου 1st to 3rd.) rec (for εαν) αν, with ℵ 1. 34-6 (35. 40-1-2. 51, e sil) Andr-a: om c g: txt A[P] B rel(including 4. 10-3-6-7-8-9: Mill Wetst silent) Hip Andr Areth. προσκυνησουσιν ℵ e f l, προσκυνησουσουσιν(sic) 36. for την εικονα, τη εικονι [P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth: txt A 1 (l 41-2. 51, e sil) Andr.

16. ποιησει ℵ[3a]. om 2nd τους ℵ. transp πλουσ. and πτωχ. ℵ [και τ. πλ. κ. τ. πτωχ. is written on the margin by P[1](?)]. rec (for δωσιν) δωση, with 34 Hip: δωσει 1: λαβωσι, omg αυτοις, g (26): δωσουσιν b c e 4. 18. 40-7-8 Andr-p Areth(Del): δωσωσιν rel Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B f h m 10-3-7[2]. 35-6-7-8. 49. 51 Andr. (d illeg.) αυτω (for -τοις) ℵ[1].

been given to him to work in the presence of the beast, ordering those who dwell on the earth to make an image to the beast (dat. commodi) **who hath the stroke of the sword and lived** (this part of the prophecy seems to describe the acts of the pagan sacerdotal power then presently to follow. See more below). **And it was given to him to give breath** (or, spirit; by inference, life) **to the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should even speak, and should cause** (the regular subject to ποιήσῃ is the image, not the second beast) **that as many as do not worship the image of the beast, shall be slain.** The Seer is now describing facts which history substantiates to us in their literal fulfilment. The image of Cæsar was every where that which men were made to worship: it was before this that the Christian martyrs were brought to the test, and put to death if they refused the act of adoration. The words of Pliny's letter to Trajan are express on the point: "cum præeunte me deos appellarent, et imagini tuæ, quam propter hoc jusseram cum simulacris numinum afferri, thure ac vino supplicarent, præterea maledicerent Christo, quorum nihil cogi posse dicuntur qui sunt revera Christiani, dimittendos esse putavi." Above he had said, "perseverantes duci jussi." And if it be said as an objection to this, that it is not an image of the Emperor but of the beast itself which is spoken of, the answer is very simple, that as the Seer himself in ch. xvii. 11, does not hesitate to identify one of the ἑπτὰ βασιλεῖς with the beast itself, so we may fairly assume that the image of the beast for the time being would be the image of the reigning Emperor.

It is not so easy to assign a meaning to the giving life and speech to the image of the beast. Victorinus gives a curious explanation: "faciet etiam ut imago aurea Antichristo in templo Hierosolymis ponatur, et intret angelus refuga et inde voces et sortes reddat." The allusion probably is to some lying wonders permitted to the Pagan priests to try the faith of God's people. We cannot help, as we read, thinking of the moving images, and winking and speaking pictures, so often employed for purposes of imposture by their far less excusable Papal successors. **And he** (i. e. the *second beast*, more naturally than *the image*) **maketh all men, the small and**

x Rev. (here bis. ch. xiv. 9, 11 al[5].) only, exc. Acts xvii. 29 †.
y ch. vii. 3 reff.
z Matt. xxi. 12. Luke xvii. 28. Isa. xxiv. 2. 1 Macc. xii. 36.

x χάραγμα ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ y μέτωπον αὐτῶν, 17 [καὶ] q ἵνα μήτις δύνηται z ἀγοράσαι ἢ z πωλῆσαι εἰ μὴ ὁ ἔχων τὸ x χάραγμα τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. 18 a Ὧδε ἡ

a ver. 10.

χαραγματα B rel Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ g j k m n 17. 34-5-6-8. 47 vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Iren-int. for η, δ (with και written over) 1. rec των μετωπων, with B h j n 1. 10. 30[2].4 (17. 35-6-7. 49 B[r], e sil): τω μετωπω 40: του μετωπου C Areth: txt A[P]ℵ rel copt arm Hip Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Tich.

17. om και Cℵ[1] h n 6. 32 tol syr-dd copt Hip Andr-a Iren-int Primas: ins A[P]ℵ[3a] B rel vulg æth Andr Areth. δυναται [P] B b c f l n 1. 6. 16. 27. 32-7. 41-8. 50 Andr-p: txt ACℵ rel Hip Andr Areth. for ὁ, η 1. rec ins ἢ bef το ονομα, with 30[2]-4-8 vulg-ed copt Areth: του θηρια η ℵ 38: om A[P] B rel vulg-mss Hip Andr. (d illeg.)—του ονοματος C fuld(with tol lips-4) syr-dd Andr-a Iren-int Primas: nomine am.—om το ονομα του θ. 40. for του θηριου, αυτου ℵ 38. ins η τον αριθμον του θηριου bef η τ. αρ. του ονομ. αυ. B.

the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free and the bond, that they should give them (i. e. stamp on them. The subject to δῶσιν is left uncertain: it will naturally be understood to be, those whose office it is: see reff. It evidently is not as Düsterd., "that they impress *on themselves*:" nor does this at all follow from ch. xiv. 9, 11, xvi 2, xix. 20, xx. 4, which he quotes to support it, but merely that they may refuse to receive it, and by receiving it become apostates from God) **a mark** (such a mark as masters set on their slaves, or monarchs on their soldiers, a brand, stamped or burnt in, στίγματα, see note on Gal. vi. 17, and Grotius and Wetst. here. We read in 3 Macc. ii. 29, of Ptolemy Philopater, that he ordered the Jews in Alexandria to be forcibly enrolled, τούτους τε ἀπογραφομένους χαράσσεσθαι καὶ διὰ πυρὸς εἰς τὸ σῶμα παρασήμῳ Διονύσου κισσοφύλλῳ. And Philo, de Monarch. i. § 8, vol. ii. p. 221, mentions idolaters who confessed their idolatry by ἐν τοῖς σώμασι καταστίζοντες αὐτὴν σιδήρῳ πεπυρωμένῳ πρὸς ἀνεξάλειπτον διαμονήν, οὐδὲ γὰρ χρόνῳ ταῦτα διαμαυροῦνται) **on their right hand** (στίγματά ἐστι τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν ταῖς χερσίν, Ælian, in Grot.) **or upon** (before, the fact of the mark being visible on the hand was prominent, and the gen. was used: now, that of the act of impression is, and the accus. is used) **their forehead** (i. e. in some conspicuous part of the body, that all may see it: or as Aug. Civ. Dei, xx. 9. 3, vol. vii. p. 674, "in fronte, propter professionem: in manu, propter operationem"), **[and] that no one should be able to buy or to sell, except he who has the mark, the name of the beast, or the number of his name** (τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ. is in apposition with τὸ χάραγμα: it is in this that the mark consists: either in the name stamped in letters, or in the number of the name thus stamped, i. e. the number which those letters make when added together according to their numerical value. The practice of thus calculating the numerical value of the letters in names was widely prevalent: see the instances collected by Mr. Elliott, vol. iii. pp. 220 ff.: and more below.

This particular in the prophetic description seems to point to the commercial and spiritual interdicts which have, both by Pagan and by Papal persecutors, been laid on nonconformity: from even before the interdict of Diocletian mentioned by Bede in his hymn on Justin Martyr ("non illis emendi quidquam, Aut vendendi copia: nec ipsam haurire aquam Dabatur licentia, antequam sacrificarent Detestandis idolis." Mede, p. 511) through those of the middle ages (of which Mr. Elliott gives an example from Harduin vi. ii. 1684, in a canon of the 3rd Lateran Council under Pope Alexander III., "ne quis eos—scil. hæreticos—in domibus vel in terra sua tenere vel fovere vel negotiationem cum eis exercere præsumat"), down to the last remaining civil disabilities imposed on nonconformity in modern Papal or Protestant countries. For these last have their share in the enormities of the first and second beast in as far as they adopt or continue their practices.

With regard to the circumstance of the imposition of the mark, I conceive that with the latitude here given, that it may be the name *or* the number, and having regard to the analogy of the mark inscribed on the saints (ch. vii. 1 ff.: cf. ch. xiii. 1), we need not be anxious to find other than a general and figurative interpretation. As it is clear that in the case of the servants of God no actual visible mark is intended, so it may well be inferred here

ία ἐστίν. ὁ [b] ἔχων [b] νοῦν [c] ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ
'ου· ἀριθμὸς γὰρ [d] ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν· καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς
οῦ ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἕξ.
.IV. [1] Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ ἀρνίον ἑστὸς ἐπὶ τὸ

b 1 Cor. ii. 16. see ch. xvii. 9.
c Luke xiv. 28 only †.
d = ch. xxi. 17. Isa. viii. 1.

. rec ins τον bef νουν, with m 1. 30[2]: om AC[P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr Areth. for , ους ℵ[1] : νους 39, ουν n. aft αυτου ins εστιν 1 : om και ο αριθμος αυτου ℵ. rec χξς', with B rel : χξσ n : χμς or χρς d : εξακοσια δεκα εξ C 11 (as also some td by Iren) Tich(in some edns), χις' 5 : εξακοσια εξηκοντα εξ [P] e g l 16. 47 Andr : οσιαι εξηκοντα εξ ℵ 39 : txt A.

HAP. XIV. 1. rec om το (bef αρνιον), with [P] h n 1. 7. 34 (32-5-6-7. 49 B[r], e sil) r : ins ACℵ B rel copt Orig Meth Areth. (d illeg.) rec (for εστος) εστηκος, ı rel Andr-p Areth, εστηκως l m ; εστηκεν c : txt AC[P]ℵ, εστως B g n 1. 18. 34.

; the mark signifies rather conformity addiction to the behests of the beast, n any actual stigma impressed. Cer- ıly we fail to recognize any adequate osition of such stigma in the sign of Cross as propounded by Mr. Elliott 236), or in the monogram on the la- um as succeeded by the Papal cross- s of Bp. Wordsworth (Apocalypse, pendix G: see also his note in loc.)). **re is wisdom** (these words serve to ect attention to the challenge which lows: see ver. 10, where ὧδέ ἐστιν similarly used): **let him who hath derstanding calculate the number of e beast** (the terms of the challenge rve at once to shew that the feat pro- sed is possible, and that it is difficult. enæus's view, that if St. John had eant the number to be known he would ıve declared it, and that of Andreas, ὁ ούνος ἀποκαλύψει, are, it seems to me, cluded by these considerations. The umber *may* be calculated: and is *in- nded to be known*): **for** (gives a reason hy the calculation may be made) **it is ıe number of a man** (i. e. is counted as ıen generally count; not, as Bede, Grot., L., and recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 37, the number belonging to an indivi- ual man: see against this the reff. which re decisive as to usage), **and the number f it** (the beast) **is six hundred sixty-six** of all the hundreds of attempts which ıave been made in answer to the chal- enge, there is but one which seems to ıpproach near enough to an adequate so- ution to require serious consideration. And that one is the word mentioned, hough not adopted, by Irenæus, v. 30. 3,). 330 (the passage cited in the Prolegg. § i. par. 7), viz. λατεῖνος (the diphthong ει being, as all critical students of the Greek text know, not only an allowable way, but the usual way, of writing the long i by the Greeks of the time): $(\lambda = 30) + (\alpha = 1) + (\tau = 300) + (\epsilon = 5) + (\iota = 10) + (\nu = 50) + (o = 70) + (\varsigma = 200) = 666$. This name describes the com- mon character of the rulers of the former Pagan Roman Empire,—"Latini sunt qui nunc regnant," Iren.: and, which Irenæus could not foresee, unites under itself the character of the latter Papal Roman Em- pire also, as revived and kept up by the agency of its false prophet the priesthood. The Latin Empire, the Latin Church, Latin Christianity, have ever been its commonly current appellations: its lan- guage, civil and ecclesiastical, has ever been Latin: its public services, in defiance of the most obvious requisite for public worship, have ever been throughout the world conducted in Latin: there is no one word which could so completely describe its character, and at the same time unite the ancient and modern attributes of the two beasts, as this. Short of saying ab- solutely that this *was* the word in St. John's mind, I have the strongest persua- sion that no other can be found approach- ing so near to a complete solution. See however the remarks on this subject in the Prolegomena, § v. par. 32, where I have after all thought it best to leave the matter in doubt).

CH. XIV. 1—20.] THE CONTRAST: THE BLESSEDNESS, AND THE COUNTER-AGENCY OF THE SAINTS OF GOD. THE HARVEST AND THE VINTAGE OF THE EARTH. This is not entirely another vision, but an introduction of a new ele- ment, one of comfort and joy, upon the scene of the last. And thus it must be viewed: with reference to the persecution by the beast which is alluded to in its course, vv. 9 ff. It is also anticipatory, first containing reference to the mystic Babylon, hereafter to become the subject of prophecy in detail; and to the consum- mation of punishment and reward, also to be treated in detail hereafter. It is *gene- ral* in its character, reaching forward close to the time of the end, treating

e ch. xvii. 5. xix. 12 (bis), 16. f ch. vii. 3 reff. g ch. i. 15 reff. h ch. vi. 1. (x. 3.) xix. 6. Ps. lxxvi. 18. i ch. v. 8. xiii. 3. k ch. xviii. 22 only †. l 1 Cor. xiv. 7 only. Isa. xxiii. 16 only. m ch. v. 8 reff. n ch. v. 9 (reff.). o ch. i. 4 reff.

ὄρος Σιών, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες, ἔχουσαι τὸ ᵉ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ᵉ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ᵉ γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ τῶν ᶠ μετώπων αὐτῶν. ² καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς ᵍ φωνὴν ᵍ ὑδάτων πολλῶν καὶ ὡς ʰ φωνὴν ʰ βροντῆς μεγάλης, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἣν ἤκουσα ⁱ ὡς ᵏ κιθαρῳδῶν ˡ κιθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς ᵐ κιθάραις αὐτῶν. ³ καὶ ⁿ ᾄδουσιν [ⁱ ὡς] ⁿ ᾠδὴν ⁿ καινὴν ᵒ ἐνώπιον

ACP ℵ a to n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 1. 10-3. 16 to 18. 28-7. 30-2. 34 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

5-6-8 Orig Meth Andr. om το (bef ορος) and σιων C. aft μετ' αυτου ins αριθμος B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P]ℵ 10-7 (f g h k n 1. 36 to 40. 49 Br, e sil) vulg (copt) Orig Meth Andr Cypr. rec om αυτου και το ονομα, with [P] 1. 34(-5, e sil): ins ACℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. ins το bef γεγραμμενον A. for γεγραμμενον, καιομενον 1. for αυτων, αυτω(sic) ℵ¹.

2. om μεγαλης ℵ¹. rec (for η φωνη ην) φωνην, with [P] n 1 Andr: txt ACℵ B rel vss Orig Meth Andr-coisl Areth. rec om ως (bef κιθαρωδων), with 1 Andr-p: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Orig Meth Andr Areth. om αυτων C.

3. om ὡς [P]ℵ B rel syr-dd copt arm Orig Meth Andr Areth: ins AC g n 1. 17. 42¹ vulg Andr-a. (13¹ def.) aft καινην ins και ην (ην above the line) ℵ. the 1st

compendiously of the torment of the apostates and the blessedness of the holy dead, and leading, by its concluding section, which treats of the harvest and the vintage of the earth, to the vision of the seven last vials, now immediately to follow.

It naturally divides itself into three sections: of which the first is, 1—5.] *The Lamb on Mount Sion, and his hundred and forty-four thousand.* **And I saw, and beheld the Lamb** (viz., the same which before was seen in the midst of the throne, ch. v. 6 al.) **standing upon** (see on this accus., when the super-position is first mentioned, note, ch. iv. 2) **the mount Sion** (as in ch. xi., the holy city is introduced as the seat of God's true Church and worship, so by a similar figure (not the same, for thus Mount Sion would be outside the *ναός*, and thus given to the Gentiles) the holy mountain Sion is now chosen for the site of the display of God's chosen ones with Christ, the Son of David, whose city Sion was), **and with Him an hundred and forty-four thousand, having His name and the name of His Father** (observe the tacit assumption that all understand Who is imported by the Lamb) **written on their foreheads** (first observe the contrast: the nations of the earth, constrained to receive the mark of the beast on their forehead and hand, and the Lamb's elect, marked with His name and that of His Father. The question next meets us, Are these 144,000 identical with the same number in ch. vii. 4? This question clearly must not be answered merely by the absence of a defining article here, to identify these *χιλιάδες* as those there spoken of. For it might well be, that the reader should be meant to identify the two in his mind, by recognizing the marks common to the two, without the note of identification being expressly set in the text. The presumption certainly is that the same number occurring here, representing as there the elect and first-fruits of the church, here as there also inscribed on their foreheads with the seal of God in the one case, and His Name in the other, must be descriptive of the same body of persons. And this view, if acquiesced in here, will reflect back considerable light on that former vision of the sealing in ch. vii. Those, as these, will represent the first-fruits or choice ones among God's people, as indeed we have treated them in this commentary, and not the totality of those who shall form the great multitude which no man can number. These, as those, are taken to represent the people of God: their introduction serves to place before us the church on the holy hill of Sion, where God has placed His King, as an introduction to the description of her agency in preaching the everlasting Gospel, and her faithfulness amidst persecutions). **And I heard a voice out of heaven as a voice of many waters** (reff.), **and as a voice of great thunder** (ch. vi. 1): **and the voice which I heard** (was) **as of harpers harping with** (the *ἐν* of investiture, cf. ch. vi. 8, ix. 19 and notes) **their harps. And they sing** [**as it were**] **a new song** (i. e. if the *ὡς* be retained, they sing what sounded like a melody unheard before. The subject to *ᾄδουσιν* is of course not the 144,000, but the heavenly harpers. On the subject of their song, see below) **before the throne and before the four**

τοῦ ° θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο μαθεῖν τὴν ⁿ ᾠδὴν εἰ μὴ αἱ ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες ᵖ οἱ ᑫ ἠγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. ⁴ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἳ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ʳ ἐμολύνθησαν· ˢ παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν. οὗτοι οἱ ᵗ ἀκολου-

p gender, ch. v. 13 al. q = 1 Cor. vi. 20. ch. v. 9 (ἐκ). r ch. iii. 4 reff. s = here only. see 2 Cor. xi 2. 'Αβέλ· οὗτος π. κ. δίκαιος ὑπῆρχε, Suidas. t Matt. viii. 19 || L.

των is written twice in ℵ. om *και των πρεσβυτερων*. C: aft *και* ins *ενωπιον* ℵ. *ουδε εις* B a b c d e 51. rec *ηδυνατο*, with [P] B (f?) g 1. 18. 34 (2. 16. 37. 40-1-2-7, e sil) Meth Andr: txt ACℵ rel Orig Areth. (13[1] def.) om *αι* ℵ[3a] a l n. om *τεσσαρες* C: *μιαν*(sic) ℵ[1].

4. om *ουτοι εισιν* A vulg-ms æth. rec aft 2nd *ουτοι* ins *εισιν*, with B rel syr-dd copt Meth Andr Areth Cypr Primas: om ACPℵ n 1. 38 vulg(with am &c, agst fuld al) arm Orig Andr-a Ambrst. om *οι* ℵ.

living-beings and the elders (the whole heavenly symbolism remaining as before, while the visions regarding God's temple and Mount Sion and the holy city are going forward. I would call the attention of the reader to the fact, essential to the right understanding of the vision, that the harpers and the song are in heaven, the 144,000 on earth): **and no one was able to learn the song** (to apprehend its melody and meaning, so as to accompany it and bear a part in the chorus) **except the hundred and forty-four thousands who** (the gender is *πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον*, see ref.) **were purchased** (reff. and ver. 4) **from the earth** (the song has regard to matters of trial and triumph, of deep joy and heavenly purity of heart, which none other among men but these pure and holy ones are capable of apprehending. The sweetest and most skilful harmonies convey no pleasure to, nor are they appreciated by an uneducated ear: whereas the experienced musician finds in every chord the most exquisite enjoyment. The unskilled ear, even though naturally distinctive of musical sounds, could not learn nor reproduce them: but both these can be done by those who have ears to hear them. Even so this heavenly song speaks only to the virgin heart, and can be learnt only by those who accompany the Lamb whithersoever He goeth). **These are they who were not** (the aor. shews that their course is ended and looked back on as a thing past: and serves to confute all interpretations which regard them as representing saints while in the midst of their earthly conflict and trial) **defiled with women** (see below); **for they are** (always were and have kept themselves till the time present) **virgins** (there are two ways of understanding these words. Either they may be figurative, merely implying that these pure ones lived in all chastity, whether in single or in married life, and incurred no pollution (ref. 2 Cor.): or they may be meant literally, that these purest ones had lived in that state of which St. Paul says 1 Cor. vii. 1, *καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι*. And as between these two meanings I conceive that the somewhat emphatic position of *μετὰ γυναικῶν* goes some way to decide. It is not *ἐμολύνθησαν*, the fact of impurity in allowed intercourse, but *μετὰ γυναικῶν*, that is put forward, the fact of commerce with women. I would therefore believe that in the description of these who are the first-fruits from the earth, the feature of virginity is to be taken in its literal meaning. Nor need any difficulty be found in this. It is on all hands granted that he who is married in the Lord enters into holy relations of which the single have no experience, and goes through blessed and elevating degrees of self-sacrifice, and loving allowance, and preferring others before himself. And as every step of grace assured is a step of glory secured, there is no doubt that the holy married servants of God shall have a peculiar entrance into the fulness of that future Kingdom's employ, which will not be the lot of the single: seeing that in this matter also, the childhood of this state will be the father of the manhood of that one. But neither on the other hand can it be denied that the state of holy virginity has also its peculiar blessings and exemptions. Of these, the Apostle himself speaks of that absence of distraction from the Lord's work, which is apt to beset the married, busy as they are with the cares of a household and with pleasing one another. And another and primary blessing is, that in them that fountain of carnal desire has never been opened, which is so apt to be a channel for unholy thoughts and an access for the tempter. The virgins may thus

cp. R. , 7.

θοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ [tu] ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγει. οὗτοι [v] ἠγοράσθησαν [v] ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων [w] ἀπαρχὴ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ, [5] καὶ ἐν τῷ [x] στόματι αὐτῶν οὐχ [x] εὑρέθη [y] ψεῦδος· [z] ἄμωμοί εἰσιν.

u John viii. 21, 22. xiii. 36, 33. xiv. 4. v ver. 3. w Rom. viii. 23. xi. 16. xvi. 5. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23. xvi. 15. James i. 18 only. Exod. xxiii. 19 al. fr. x 1 Pet. ii. 22. Zeph. iii. 14. y Ezek. xxxiii. 31. Sir. xx. 24. z Jude 24 reff. Psa. xiv. 2.

εαν B a to f j k l 13. 30-2. 40-7-8. 50. 82. 90 Orig Areth. rec υπαγη, with [P]א B rel Orig Meth: txt AC l m n 16. ins υπο ιησου bef ηγορασθησαν B rel syr-dd Areth: om ACא g m n 34-6 (1. 35, e sil) vulg copt arm Orig$_2$ Meth Andr Ps-Ath. om απο των ανθρωπων C. απ αρχης א 39. ins εν bef τω αρνιω א[1].

5. ουχ ευρεθη bef εν τω στοματι αυτων B rel copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas: txt AC[P]א g h n 1. 36. 49 (m 37 B^r, e sil) vulg Orig Meth Andr. rec (for ψευδος) δολος, with 1 Andr-a: txt AC[P]א B rel vss Orig$_2$ Meth Andr Areth Jer. rec aft αμωμοι ins γαρ, with א B rel vulg-ed(with am[2] demid tol lips-6) syr-dd copt Orig$_2$ Meth Andr Areth: om AC[P] 17 am[1](with fuld harl lipss).—om αμωμοι εισιν 36. rec aft εισιν ins ενωπιον του θρονου του θεου, with vulg-ed; ουτοι εισιν οι ακολουθουντες τω αρνιω 34. 35(Del) 47 Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P]א B rel am(with fuld harl tol &c) syr-dd copt Orig$_2$ Meth Andr Jer.

have missed the victory over the lusts of the flesh: but they have also in great part escaped the conflict. Theirs is not the triumph of the toil-worn and stained soldier, but the calm and the unspottedness of those who have kept from the strife. *We* are perhaps more like that which the Lord intended us to be: but they are more like the Lord Himself. And if He is to have round Him a peculiar and closer band, standing with Him on Mount Sion, none will surely grudge this place to those who were not defiled with women. Among these will be not only those who have lived and served Him in holy virginity, but also the dear children whom He has claimed from us for Himself, the youths and maidens who were gathered to His side before the strife began: before their tongues had learned the language of social falsehood, or their good names been tarnished with the breath of inevitable calumny. There is one meaning which these words will not bear, and which it is surprising that any Commentator should ever have attached to them; viz. that μετὰ γυναικῶν refers to the woman mentioned below, ch. xvii. So Bp. Wordsworth, Lectures, p. 284: "They have not been defiled with women. What women? it may be asked. If we proceed, we read of the woman seated on the Beast, and of the harlotry of the woman, with whom the Kings of the earth commit fornication. And soon we see her displayed in all her meretricious splendour. There then is the reply." Similarly in his notes ad loc. The fact, that an indefinite plural sometimes points to a singular, is, as in all other figures of speech, substantiated by the undoubted requirements of the particular context: whereas here the whole context is against it: the following παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν carrying its decisive condemnation): **these (are) they that follow the Lamb wheresoever** (for this use of ὅπου, see reff.) **he goeth** (ἂν seems to have lost its peculiar force, and to have been joined to the ὅπου preceding, so that an indicative after it did not offend the ear.

The description has very commonly been taken as applying to the entire obedience of the elect, following their Lord to prison and to death, and wherever He may call them: so Cocceius, Grot., Vitringa, Wolf (who cites the oath of soldiers, ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ὅπου ποτ' ἂν ἄγωσιν), Bengel, De Wette, Hengstb., Ebrard: but this exposition is surely out of place here, where not their life of conflict, but their state of glory is described. The words, as Aug. (in a beautiful passage, De sancta Virginitate, c. 27, vol. vi. p. 410 f., in which however he rhetorically mingles both meanings), Andreas, Züllig, Stern, Düsterd., are used of special privilege of nearness to the Person of the Lamb in glory): **these were purchased from men as a first-fruit to God and to the Lamb** (all have been thus purchased: but these specially as and for the purpose of being a first-fruit. The ref. James treats of a different matter, the purchase of all the redeemed as the first-fruits of creation. But these are a first-fruit among the purchased themselves), **and in their mouth was not found falsehood: they are blameless** (the Apostle has before him the words of Ps. xiv. 1 ff., so strikingly similar: τίς κατασκηνώσει ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ σου; πορευόμενος ἄμωμος, ... λαλῶν ἀλήθειαν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὃς οὐκ ἐδόλωσεν ἐν γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ. These stand on Mount Sion, with Him who eminently fulfilled this character, and being in all things like Him).

[6] Καὶ εἶδον [ἄλλον] ἄγγελον [a] πετόμενον ἐν [b] μεσουρανήματι, [c] ἔχοντα [d] εὐαγγέλιον [d] αἰώνιον [e] εὐαγγελίσαι [f] ἐπὶ τοὺς [g] καθημένους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ [f] ἐπὶ πᾶν [h] ἔθνος καὶ [h] φυλὴν καὶ [h] γλῶσσαν καὶ [h] λαόν, [7] [i] λέγων [k] ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Φοβήθητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ [l] δότε αὐτῷ [l] δόξαν, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ [m] ὥρα τῆς [n] κρίσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσκυνήσατε τῷ [o] ποιήσαντι τὸν [o] οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν [o] γῆν καὶ [o] θάλασ-

a so (-ο-) ch. iv. 7 reff.
b ch. viii. 13. xix. 17 only †.
c constr., Luke vii. 40. xii. 50. John xvi. 12. 2 John 12. 3 John 13.
d here only.
e act., ch. x. 7 only. pass., Luke xvi. 16 al.
f so Mark ix. 12. Heb. vii. 13.
g = Matt. iv. 16. Luke i. 79. Judith v. 3.
h ch. v. 9 reff.
i constr., ch. iv. 1 al. fr.
k ch. v. 2. vv. 9, 15.
l ch. xi. 13 reff.
m 1 John ii. 18 reff.
n = ch. xvi. 7. xix. 2. Jude 15. Isa. xxxiv. 8 (a).
o Acts iv. 24. xiv. 15. Exod. xx. 11.

6. om αλλον ℵ[1] B rel Orig Andr-p Areth Ambr: ins AC[P]ℵ[3c] g h 10-7. 51 B[r] (26. 49, e sil) vss Andr-a Cypr$_2$, ins aft αγγελον 34 (35?) Andr-coisl. rec πετωμενον, with [P] B l n 1. 32-6 (Bch's-5-mss B[r], e sil): πεταμενον ℵ: txt AC rel Orig Andr Areth. μεσουρανισματι 1: μεσωουρανηματι ℵ[1](txt ℵ[3a]). ευαγγελισασθε ℵ h n 10. 34-5-6. 49 Orig. rec om 1st επι, with B rel Orig Andr Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ 34 (35?) Andr-coisl. rec (for τους καθημενους) τους κατοικουντας, with A f n 51 (syr-dd copt) Andr-a, τους καθημενους και τους κατοικουντας 36, τους καθημενους τους κατοικουντας 1, τοις καθημενοις j 38: txt C[P]ℵ B rel vulg Orig Andr Areth Cypr$_1$. rec om 3rd επι, with n 1. 34(-6, e sil) Andr-a: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Orig Andr Areth Cypr Primas.

7. rec λεγοντα, with 1. 17 (B[r], e sil) am(and others) syr-dd Orig: om ℵ: txt AC[P] B rel vulg(with fuld &c) copt Andr Areth. om εν A. for θεον, κυριον B rel vulg-ed Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ g h n 10-7. 49 (1. 37 B[r], e sil) am syr-dd copt Orig Andr Cypr. om αυτου 1. for τω ποιησαντι, αυτον ποιησαντα B: τον ποιησ. Orig: αυτον τον ποιησ. rel Andr-a Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ g h l 10-6-7. 34 (1. 35-6-7. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr, αυτω τω ποιησαντι 18. 38-9.—πριησαντι(sic, but corrd) ℵ[1]. ins την bef θαλασσαν ℵ B rel Orig Andr Areth: om AC[P] g (1).—θαλασσας 1.

6—13.] *Three Angels appear in mid-heaven, announcing three details of the period of the coming prophecy. A proclamation of the blessedness of the holy dead.* These four announcements form the text and the compendium of the rest of the book: see Prolegg. § v. parr. 57 ff. **And I saw an[other] angel** (besides those already mentioned) **flying in mid-heaven** (see ch. viii. 13), **having the everlasting gospel** (such and no other is the meaning of εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον, notwithstanding that it is anarthrous. From this latter circumstance no argument can be derived in the case of a word which had become so technical an one: even in Rom. i. 1, we have ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ: and in no place in the N. T. does the word occur in any other than the technical sense of "the Gospel." Besides which, the epithet αἰώνιος here, if nothing else, fixes it to this meaning. Düsterd., wishing to evade the prophetic sense, would render it, a message of good tidings (viz. regarding the Lord's coming) determined by God from everlasting. And so Grot. ("bonum nuntium jampridem a Deo definitum"), Ewald, Züllig, Hengstb., al. I should have thought such a rendering only needed mentioning to be repudiated. Ch. x. 7, which is adduced to justify it, is quite beside the purpose. See there.

The epithet αἰώνιος, here only applied to the Gospel, belongs to it as from everlasting to everlasting, like Him whose word it is: in contrast to the enemies of God whose destruction is in view) **to preach** (see reff.) **to** ("*over*," throughout the extent of, and thus "*upon*." Or we may justify it as in reff., by the signification "with reference to," "*towards*." Ch. x. 11, which is referred to by Düsterd., is not to the point) **those that sit** (reff.) **upon the earth, and to every nation and tribe and tongue and people** (cf. Matt. xxiv. 14, κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, εἰς μαρτυρίαν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος), **saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give Him glory** (the message of repentance ever accompanies the hearing of the Gospel among the nations; cf. the first preaching of our Lord and of His Forerunner, Matt. iv. 17, iii. 2, and St. Paul's message to the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. i. 9), **because the season of His judgment is come** (see the citation from Matt. xxiv. above: the time of the end is close at hand when this great era of Christian missions is inaugurated: see below): **and worship Him who made the heaven and the earth and**

σαν καὶ [p] πηγὰς [p] ὑδάτων. [8] Καὶ [q] ἄλλος [q] δεύτερος ἄγγελος ἠκολούθησεν λέγων [r] Ἔπεσεν [ἔπεσεν] [rs] Βαβυλὼν ἡ [s] μεγάλη, ἡ ἐκ τοῦ [t] οἴνου τοῦ [u] θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς [t] πεπότικεν [t] πάντα τὰ [t] ἔθνη. [9] Καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος τρίτος ἠκολούθησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Εἴ τις [v] προσκυνεῖ τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὴν [w] εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαμβάνει [x] χάραγμα ἐπὶ τοῦ [x] μετώπου αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν [x] χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, [10] καὶ αὐτὸς πίεται ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ [y] θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ [z] κεκερασμένου [a] ἀκράτου ἐν τῷ [b] ποτηρίῳ τῆς

p ch. viii. 10. xvi. 4. (viii. 17 reff.) Prov. viii. 24.
q here only.
r ch. xviii. 2. Isa. xxi. 9. Jer. xxviii. (li.) 8.
s ch. xvi. 19. xvii. 5. xviii 2. Dan. iv. 27.
t Jer. xxviii. (li.) 7. xxxii. 1 (xxv. 15).
u = see ver. 10.
v w. acc., ch. xiii. 4 reff.
w ch. xiii. 14, 15 reff.
x ch. xiii. 16 (reff.).
y = ch. xvi 19. xix 15. see ver. 8, note.
z ch. xviii. 6 (bis) only. Isa. xix. 14. (συνεκ., 1 Cor. xii. 24. Heb iv. 2.)
a here only. Psa. lxxiv. 8. Jer. xxxii. 1 (xxv. 15) only.
b ch. xviii. 6. Isa. li. 17. see Matt. xx. 22, 23 ||. xxvi. 39 ||.

8. rec om δευτερος, with f (90, e sil) vulg: ins A([P]ℵ) B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Primas.—αγγελος bef δευτερος [P]ℵ[3c] h n 6. 10-7-8. 36(omg αλλος) 37. 40-9 (Br?) copt arm Andr-p, αγγελος δευτερον C: δευτερος, omg αγγελος, ℵ[1] g. om 2nd επεσεν Cℵ[3a] B rel copt Andr-coisl: ins A[P] g h n 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 42-7-9 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas spec. (homœotel ℵ[1] 27, ηκολουθησεν vv 8 and 9: homœotel 9, λεγων vv 8 and 9.) rec ins η πολις bef η μεγαλη, with (39, e sil) æth: om AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel vulg syr-dd copt arm gr-lat-ff. η μεγαλη bef βαβυλων 1. rec (for ἡ) οτι, with 1. 36 (40-1, e sil) Andr Areth: om [P]ℵ[3a] B rel copt arm: txt AC g 26. 34-5-8. 50[2]-1 vulg syr-dd æth Andr-coisl. (d illeg.) om του θυμου h 1. ταυτης B a e k l 2. 4. 13. 30-2-3-9. 40-2-8. 50. πεπτωκαν(sic) ℵ[3a]. rec om τα, with d(perhaps) k 33 (2. 34-9. 41-2, e sil): txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel Andr Areth.

9. rec (for αλλος αγγελος τριτος) τριτος αγγελος, with vulg(am lips-4-5 al, agst fuld al) Areth Cypr Primas: αλλος αγγελος f 1: αλλος τριτος αγγελος 47: txt AC[P](ℵ[3a]) B 33(sic, Del) rel syr-dd copt Andr.—ηκολ. bef τριτος ℵ[3a]. for αυτοις, αυτω A Primas. rec το θηριον bef προσκυνει, with 1: txt (AC)[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt gr-lat-ff.—τω θηριω C g: το θυσιαστηριον A: το ποτηριον f.—προσκυνησει 38. for 1st αυτου, αυτων C. om 3rd και C f. τω μετωπω ℵ.

10. for εν τω ποτηριω, εκ του ποτηριου A l 6. 39. την οργην A.

the sea and fountains of waters (i. e. turn from idols and vanities to serve the living and true God. The division of the waters into the sea and the fountains is one kept up through this prophecy: cf. ch. viii. 8—11, xvi. 3, 4). **And another second angel followed** ("Quot res nunciandæ, totidem nuncii," of Grot., is not strictly correct, the last being announced merely by a voice in heaven. But it belongs to the solemnity of this series of proclamations that a separate place and marked distinction should dignify each of them) **saying, Babylon the great is fallen, [is fallen]** (aor. of that which is past; only to be expressed in English by a perfect), **which hath given all the nations to drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication** (two things are mingled: 1) the wine of her fornication, of which all nations have drunk, ch. xvii. 2; and 2) the wine of the wrath of God which He shall give her to drink, ver. 10, and ch. xvi. 19. The latter is the retribution for the former: the former turns into the latter: they are treated as one and the same. Grot. and Ewald would render *θυμός venenum*; and Ewald and Züllig understand by *οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ*, vini fervidi, neither of which the words will bear. The whole is from Jer. li. (xxviii.) 7, 8, where Babylon is a cup in the Lord's hand of which the nations are made to drink. This is the first mention of Babylon, hereafter to be so much spoken of. I reserve treatment of the interpretation till ch. xvii.: only mentioning by anticipation that Rome, pagan and papal, but principally papal, is intended). **And another third angel followed them saying with a loud voice, If any one worshippeth the beast and his image** (see above, ch. xiii. 15), **and receiveth the mark on his forehead or upon his hand** (ch. xiii. 16), **he also** (*καί* either 1) may be quasi-redundant, introducing the apodosis merely as an addition to the protasis, or 2) may mean, as well as Babylon. The former sense seems to me the more probable) **shall drink** (we have the second person *πίεσαι* of the same future form in Luke xvii. 8: see also Ps. lxxiv. 8, cited below) **of the wine of the wrath of God, which is mingled** (i. e. as E. V. poured into the

ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ [c] βασανισθήσεται [d] ἐν πυρὶ καὶ [e] θείῳ [f] ἐνώπιον τῶν [f] ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου. 11 καὶ ὁ [gh] καπνὸς τοῦ [i] βασανισμοῦ αὐτῶν εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων [h] ἀναβαίνει, καὶ οὐκ [k] ἔχουσιν [k] ἀνάπαυσιν [k] ἡμέρας καὶ [k] νυκτὸς οἱ [v] προσκυνοῦντες τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὴν [w] εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ [l] εἴ τις λαμβάνει τὸ [x] χάραγμα τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. 12 [m] ὯΩδε ἡ [m] ὑπομονὴ τῶν [m] ἁγίων ἐστίν, [n] οἱ [op] τηροῦντες τὰς [o] ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν [pq] πίστιν [q] Ἰησοῦ. 13 Καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεγούσης, Γράψον Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ [r] ἐν [r] Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκοντες [s] ἀπ' ἄρτι. ναί,

c ch. ix. 5 reff.
d ch. xvi. 8.
e ch. ix. 17, 18 reff. Isa. xxxiv. 9, 10.
f ch. iii. 5. Luke xv. 10.
g ch. viii. 4 reff.
h Isa. xxxiv. 10.
i ch. ix. 5. xviii. 7, 10, 15 only +.
k ch. iv. 8 (reff.).
l 1 Cor. xvi. 22 al.
m ch. xiii. 10 (reff.).
n constr., ch. ii. 20 reff.
o 1 John ii. 3, 4 reff.
p 2 Tim. iv. 7.
q Rom. iii. 22. Gal ii. 16. iii. 22. James ii. 1. see Mark xi. 22.
r see 1 Thess. iv. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 18.
s Matt. xxiii. 39. xxvi. 64. John (i. 52 rec.) xiii. 19. xiv. 7 only.

βασανισθησονται A d f 36 copt. rec ins *αγιων* bef *αγγελων*, with B rel lux(and some other mss of vulg) Andr Areth Cypr$_2$ Primas; so, but omg *των*, f: *αγγελων αγιων*, omg *των*, C[P]ℵ g 38. 92 vulg syr-dd Cypr$_1$: *των αγγελων των αγιων* B[r]: ins *αγιων* both bef and aft *αγγελων* 36: txt A 26 spec vulg-ms copt æth.—(homœotel *ενωπ.* to *ενωπ.* 1.)

11. rec *αναβαινει* bef *εις αιων. αιων.*, with copt Cypr$_2$ Primas: om *ε. α. α. αν.* 39: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld lips-5 tol lux) syr-dd Andr Areth Cypr$_1$ spec.—*αιωνα αιωνος* C n 18: *αιωνα αιωνων* [P] f l 1. 4. 6. 19. 26-7. 48 Andr Areth: *αιωνας των αιωνων* ℵ. om *το* (bef *χαραγμα*) 1.

12. rec om *ἡ*, with 4. 33 (2. 35-6-9. 48. 51 B[r], e sil) Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr. rec ins *ωδε* bef *οι τηρουντες*, with d(perhaps) 1. 10-6. 49 (l n 17-9. 37-9 B[r], e sil) Andr-a: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas. (*των τηρουντων* ℵ g 36-8.) om *του θεου* 1.

13. *λεγουσης* bef *εκ του ουρ.* ℵ 38(insg *μοι* aft *λεγ.*). rec aft *λεγουσης* ins *μοι*, with h n 1. 10-7. 36 (47-9 B[r], e sil) Andr Primas: om AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld lips5) syr-dd copt æth Andr-coisl Areth lat-ff. for *κυριω*, *χριστω* CP.

cup. From the almost universal custom of mixing wine with water, the common term for preparing wine, putting it into the cup, came to be *κεράννυμι*. Hence the apparent contradiction in terms here, *τοῦ κεκερασμένου ἀκράτου* (and in Ps. lxxiv. 8 below). On Od. ε. 93, *κέρασσε δὲ νέκταρ ἐρυθρόν*, Eustathius says, *οὐ δηλοῖ κρᾶμά τι, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνέχει κεῖται.* See Wetst., who gives several citations in which *κεράννυμι* itself is derived from *κέρας*, a drinking-horn) pure (unmixed: cf. Galen in Wetst., *οἶνον ἄκρατον εἶναι λέγομεν, ᾧ μὴ μέμικται τὸ ὕδωρ, ἢ παντάπασιν ὀλίγον μέμικται.* The figure of the cup of the Lord's wrath is found in ref. Ps., *ποτήριον ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου, οἴνου ἀκράτου πλῆρες κεράσματος . . . . πίονται πάντες οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τῆς γῆς*, from which this is evidently taken) in **the cup of His anger, and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the angels and in the presence of the Lamb** (see ch. xx. 10, and ref. Isa. from which the imagery comes. De Wette is certainly wrong in interpreting *ἐνώπιον* "nach dem Urtheile," "in the judgment of." It is literal, and the meaning as in Luke xvi. 23 ff., that the torments are visible to the angels and the Lamb). **And the smoke of their torment goeth up to ages of ages** (see ref. Isa., and Gen. xix. 28, which doubtless is the fountain-head: also ch. xix. 3): **and they have not rest** (from torment) **day and night who worship the beast and his image; and whoever** (from speaking collectively the solemn declaration becomes even more solemn by individualizing) **receives the mark of his name. Here** (viz. in the inference to be drawn from the certainty of everlasting torment to all who worship the beast or receive his mark: that all the saints of God must refuse to do either) **is the endurance of the saints, who keep** (the independent nom. construction, see reff.) **the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus** (gen. objective, which has Him for its object: compare ref. Mark). **And I heard a voice out of heaven** (whose, is not told us, and it is in vain to speculate: certainly not, as Hengstb., from the spirits of the just themselves. The *γράψον* would rather point to the angel who reveals the visions to the Seer, ch. i. 1, and compare ch.

[t] λέγει τὸ [t] πνεῦμα, [uv] ἵνα [vw] ἀναπαήσονται ἐκ τῶν [x] κόπων αὐτῶν· τὰ γὰρ [x] ἔργα αὐτῶν [y] ἀκολουθεῖ [y] μετ᾽ αὐτῶν.

14 Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ νεφέλη λευκή, καὶ [z] ἐπὶ τὴν [z] νεφέλην [z] καθήμενον [a] ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου, ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς

t ch. ii. 7, &c. xxii. 17. 1 Tim. iv. 1.
u = ch. xxii. 14. see Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 6.
v indic. constr., ch. iii. 9 reff.
w ch. vi. 11 reff.
x see ch. ii. 2.
y ch. vi. 8 reff.
z see Matt. xxvi. 64 ‖ Mk.
a ch. i. 13. Dan. vii. 13. x. 16 Theod. (Ezek. i. 26.)

ACP[N] B [illegible] 1. 2. 4. 6 [illegible] 10-1. 1. to [illegible] 7. 3. 32 to 42. 47 to 1. 90 Br.

λεγει bef ναι B rel: om ναι ℵ[1] 16. 34: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] g n (1. 4. 17-8-9. 26. 38. 47, e sil). —for ναι, και k 33 (35-6?). rec (for αναπαησ.) αναπαυσ., with [P] B rel: txt ACℵ.—rec -σωνται, with [P] rel Andr: txt ACℵ B k l n 1. 16. 36. 50 Areth. rec (for γαρ) δε, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ g 18. 26. 38 vulg syr-dd Primas spec Aug. om 2nd αυτων 1.

14. om και ειδον (*hom.*) ℵ. rec καθημενος ομοιος, with h[2] l 1. 10 (16. 37. 47-9 Br, e sil) syr-dd Andr: καθημενος ομοιως 39: καθημενον ομοιος m 30: καθημενος ομοιον a: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas Tich. for υιω, υιον Aℵ B b c d f k 2. 9. 13. 27. 30-2-3. 41-2: om 40: υιος 1: υἱῶν n: υιου [P] 26: txt C rel Synop Andr Areth.—for υιω ανθρωπου, ανθρωπω j. εχον Cℵ[3a]: εχοντα ℵ[1] e g n 13. 26-7. 42[2]: εχοντι 38. την κεφαλην A a b d e k n 30-8. 40-7. 90 Andr-coisl: txt C[P]ℵ B rel Synop Andr Areth.

iv. 1, and xix. 9), **saying, Write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord henceforth** (the connexion is not difficult. The mention of the endurance of the saints brings with it the certainty of persecution unto death. The present proclamation declares the blessedness of all who die not only in persecution, but in any manner, in the Lord, in the faith and obedience of Christ. And the special command to write this, conveys special comfort to those in all ages of the church who should read it. But it is not so easy to assign a fit meaning to ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι. That it belongs to the former sentence, not to the following one, is I conceive plain: few will be found to join with Lambert Bos, Exercitt. p. 209, in connecting it to ναί, and making it = ἀπηρτισμένως, absolutè. And, thus joined with the former sentence, it must express some reason why this blessedness is to be more completely realized from this time when it is proclaimed, than it was before. Now this reason will quickly appear, if we consider the particular time, in connexion with which the proclamation is made. The harvest of the earth is about to be reaped; the vintage of the earth to be gathered. At this time it is, that the complete blessedness of the holy dead commences: when the garner is filled and the chaff cast out. And that not on account of their deliverance from any purgatorial fire, but because of the completion of this number of their brethren, and the full capacities of bliss brought in by the resurrection. Nor can it legitimately be objected to this, that the pres. part. ἀποθνήσκοντες requires a continuance of that which is imported by it: that the deaths implied must follow after the proclamation. For no doubt this would be so, the proclamation itself being anticipatory, and the harvest not yet actually come: but on the other hand so much must hardly be built upon the pres. part., which is so often used to *designate* a class only, not to fix a time). **Yea, saith the Spirit** (the utterance of the voice from heaven still continues. The affirmation of the Spirit (reff.) ratifies the blessedness proclaimed, and assigns a reason for it), **that they shall rest** (the ἵνα gives the ground of the μακάριοι, and the construction with an indic. fut. is a mixed one compounded of "that they may," and "in that they shall." The future ἀναπαήσονται from ἀναπαύω is formed as κατακαήσομαι from κατακαίω. It seems not to be elsewhere found) **from their labours: for their works follow with them** (γάρ, which has seemed so difficult, and which apparently gave rise to the δέ of the rec., is in fact easily explained. They *rest* from their labours, because the time of working is over, their works accompanying them not in a life of activity, but in blessed memory: wherefore not labour, but rest is their lot. Wetst. quotes from Aboth vi. 9, "hora discessus hominis non comitantur eum argentum aut aurum aut lapides pretiosi aut margaritæ, sed lex et opera bona").

14—20.] *The vision of the harvest and the vintage.* 14—16.] *The harvest.* **And I saw, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud** (ἐπί with accus. on first mention, see ch. iv. 2 note), **one sitting like to the Son of man** (i. e. to Christ, see ch. i. 13 note. This clearly is our Lord Himself, as there), **having upon his head a golden crown** (in token of His victory being finally gained: see ch.

αὐτοῦ στέφανον χρυσοῦν καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ [b] δρέπανον [c] ὀξύ. [15] καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ κράζων [d] ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τῷ [z] καθημένῳ [z] ἐπὶ τῆς [z] νεφέλης [e] Πέμψον τὸ [e] δρέπανόν σου καὶ [f] θέρισον, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα [f] θερίσαι, ὅτι [g] ἐξηράνθη ὁ [h] θερισμὸς τῆς γῆς. [16] καὶ [i] ἔβαλεν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν

...επι την a.

b here, &c. (7 times). Mark iv. 29 only. Deut. xvi. 9.
c ch. i. 16 reff.
d ch. v. 2. vv. 7, 9.
e Joel iii. 13 (ἐξαποστέλλω). Mark iv. 29.
f Matt. xxv. 24 al. 1 Kings viii. 12. Jer. xxvii. (l.) 16.
g = here only. (Matt. xxi. 19, 20 al.)
h = Matt. ix. 37, 38. see Matt. xiii. 30, 39.
i ver. 19. see Mark ii. 22. vii. 33 al.

15. κραζων bef εκ του ναου A: om εκ του ναου e: for ναου, ουνου l n 1. aft ναου ins αυτου ℵ. rec μεγαλη bef φωνη, with (1) (30-9. 40-1, e sil) copt: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd arm Andr Areth.—μεγ. τη φ. 1. rec aft ηλθεν ins σοι, with l[1] 16 (39, e sil); σου 1. 17. 36 Andr-a: om AC[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel vss Andr Areth Primas. rec ins του bef θερισαι, with (ℵ) a e h 10-8. 30-3-8. 49. 90 (g k 26. 34-7-9 B[r], e sil): om AC[P] B rel Andr Areth.—(for θερισαι, θερισμου ℵ 38. 41.)

16. rec την νεφελην, with C[P] rel Andr-coisl Areth: τη νεφελη B a b d f l 26. 33. 50. 90: txt Aℵ j 16[1]. 36-8. 47 Andr.—(homœotel in 1, επι to επι.)

xix. 12) **and in His hand a sharp sickle. And another angel** (besides the three angels before mentioned: no inference can be drawn from this that the Sitter on the cloud is a mere angel) **came out of the temple, crying out in a loud voice to him that sat upon the cloud, Put forth** (send = ἀποστέλλειν, ref. Mark. De W.'s objection, that the sitter on the cloud cannot be Christ Himself, because He would not be introduced receiving a command from an angel, may be well answered, as Düsterd., that the angel is only the messenger of the will of God. And I may add what to me makes this reply undoubtedly valid, that the command is one regarding the times and seasons, which the Father hath kept in his own power) **thy sickle** (the whole is a remembrance of our Lord's own saying in ref. Mark: see below) **and reap: because the time to reap is come, because the harvest of the earth** (θερισμός for that which is to be reaped: as in the first ref.) **is dried** (perfectly ripe, so that the stalk is dry = παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός, Mark iv. 29: = also the fields being λευκαὶ πρὸς θερισμὸν ἤδη, John iv. 35: which they can only become by losing their moisture. The distinction in the passages cited by Mr. Elliott from Bernard ("magis siccæ ad ignem quam albæ ad messem"), and Pope Gregory X. ("agerque potius arescere videatur ad ignem, quam albescere inveniatur ad messem") does not seem really to exist. The passage of Hermas, book iii. sim. 3, 4; Luke xxiii. 31; John xv. 6, do not apply; trees, and not grain, being there spoken of). **And he that sat upon the cloud put in** (reff.) **his sickle upon** (into, from above) **the earth, and the earth was reaped** (to what does this harvest refer? Is it the ingathering of the wicked, or of the saints, or of both together? Each of these has examples in Scripture symbolism. The first, in Jer. li. 33, where it is said of Babylon, "It is time to thresh her, yet a little while and the time of her harvest is come:" and as appears, Joel iii. 13, though the reference seems rather there to be to the vintage, and the LXX render קָצִיר τρυγητός: the second, in Matt. ix. 37, 38; Mark iv. 29; Luke x. 2; John iv. 35: the third, in Matt. xiii. 30, 39. The verdict of Commentators is very much divided. There are circumstances in the context which tell both ways. The parallelism with the vintage, which follows, seems to favour a harvest of the wicked: but then on the other hand, if so, what is the distinction between the two ingatherings? And why do we read of the casting into the winepress of God's wrath in the second case, and of no corresponding feature in the other? Again, why is the agency so different—the Son of man on the white cloud with the golden crown in the one case, the mere angel in the other? Besides, the two gatherings seem quite distinct. The former is over before the other begins. On the whole then, though I would not pronounce decidedly, I must incline to think that the harvest is the ingathering of the saints, God's harvest, reaped from the earth: described here thus generally, before the vintage of wrath which follows. And thus we have at least these two visions in harmony with the character of this section, which contains the mingled agency and fortunes of the Church and of its enemies; thus this harvest answers to the great preaching of the everlasting gospel above, vv. 6, 7, while the following vintage fulfils the denuncia-

γῆν, καὶ [f] ἐθερίσθη ἡ γῆ. [17] Καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἔχων καὶ αὐτὸς [b] δρέπανον [c] ὀξύ. [18] καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ [k] θυσιαστηρίου, ὁ ἔχων ἐξουσίαν [l] ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός, καὶ ἐφώνησεν [mn] κραυγῇ [m] μεγάλῃ τῷ ἔχοντι τὸ [b] δρέπανον τὸ [c] ὀξὺ λέγων [o] Πέμψον σου τὸ [bo] δρέπανον τὸ [c] ὀξύ, καὶ [p] τρύγησον τοὺς [q] βότρυας τῆς ἀμπέλου τῆς γῆς, ὅτι [r] ἤκμασαν αἱ [s] σταφυλαὶ αὐτῆς. [19] καὶ [t] ἔβαλεν ὁ ἄγγελος τὸ [t] δρέπανον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ [p] ἐτρύγησεν τὴν ἄμπελον τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν [u] ληνὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν.

k = ch. viii. 3 reff.
l usage aft. ἐξουσ., see ch. ii. 26 reff.
m = Acts xxiii. 6. 1 Kings iv. 6 al.
n as above (m). Matt. xxv. 6. Eph. iv. 31. Heb. v. 7. ch. xxi. 4 only.
o ver. 15.
p here bis. Luke vi. 44 only. Deut. xxiv. 21.
q here only. Gen. xl. 10.
r here only †. Zech. xi. 6 Symm. = Thucyd. ii. 19 al.
s Matt. vii. 16. Luke vi. 44 only. Gen. xl. 10, 11.
t ver. 16 (reff.).
u here &c. ch. xix. 15. Matt. xxi. 33 only. Isa. lxiii. 2.

17. εξηλθεν . . . . ουνω bef αγγελος 1. for εξηλθεν, ηλθεν B. om τω C.
18. om εξηλθεν A am(with fuld &c, agst demid tol lipss &c) Ansb Ruf: ins C[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth. rec om ὁ, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: ins AC, *qui habet* vulg. for κραυγη, φωνη Aℵ B c g 38 vulg æth: txt C[P] rel. for λεγων, λεγω ℵ[1]: om f. 2nd το δρεπανον bef σου ℵ: σου in both places (?) e. Steph om της αμπελου, with 1: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Areth. ηκμασεν η σταφυλη B rel æth Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ l n 1(εκμ.) 10-6-7-8. 36-9 (a g h 37-8. 47-9 B[r], e sil) vulg Andr Jer. for αυτης, της γης B rel syr-dd Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ n 1. 10-7-8-9. 36 (a g h 37-8 B[r], e sil) vulg Andr-p Jer.
19. for εις την γην, επι της γης ℵ j 38. for last του, σου (but corrd) ℵ[1]. rec (for τον μεγαν) την μεγαλην, with ℵ rel Andr; μεγαλην, omg την, 33: την μεγαν 30: του μεγαλου 36: om 34 æth Vict: txt (A)C[P] B b *to* f h j k 1. 10. 38. 40-1-2-8-9. 50-1. 90 B[r], τον μεγα A. (of these b j k 1. 49[2] B[r] have τον ληνον; AC[P] B &c την λ. and τον μεγ.)—τον θυμον b.

tions of wrath on those who worship the image or receive the mark of the beast, vv. 8, 11. And thus too we bring this description into harmony with our Lord's important parable in Mark iv. 29, where the very words are used of the agency of Christ Himself when the work of grace is ripe, whether in the individual or in the church. But while thus inclined, I will not deny that the other view, and that which unites both, have very much to be said for them).

17—20.] *The vintage of wrath.* **And another angel** (the **ἄλλος** may perhaps refer to the three angels who have already appeared in this vision: or, which is more probable, referring to the last-mentioned Agent, may be a general term, not necessarily implying that He was a mere angel) **came out from the temple which was in heaven** (from which come forth God's judgments: see ch. xi. 19), **having himself also** (as well as that other: but the καὶ αὐτός rather raises a distinction between the two personages than sets them on an equality: there is some slight degree of strangeness, after what has gone before, in this angel having a sickle) **a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar** (viz. that elsewhere several times mentioned, ch. vi. 9, viii. 3, xvi. 7, in connexion with the fulfilment of God's judgments in answer to the prayers of His saints), **he who hath power over the fire** (viz. that on the altar; the same angel who is introduced ch. viii. 3—5 as presenting the prayers of the saints, and casting some of the fire of the altar to the earth as introductory to the judgments of the trumpets), **and he cried with a great cry to him who had the sharp sickle** (it is to be observed that the whole description of this angel, coming from the altar of vengeance, differs widely from any thing in the former part of the vision, and favours the idea that this vintage is of a different nature from that harvest), **saying, Put in thy sharp sickle, and gather the bunches of the vine of the earth, because her grapes are ripe. And the angel** (no such expression is used above, ver. 16. There it is ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης. All these signs of difference are worthy of notice) **put in** (reff.) **his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, and cast** (viz. what he had gathered) **into the great winepress of the wrath of God** (the curious combination, τὴν ληνὸν . . . τὸν μέγαν, is only to be accounted for by an uncertainty in the gender of the substantive (it is masc. Gen. xxx. 38, 41 ed. Rom. See Winer, edn. 6, § 59. 4, b),

20 καὶ [vw] ἐπατήθη ἡ [uv] ληνὸς [x] ἔξωθεν τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν αἷμα ἐκ τῆς [u] ληνοῦ [y] ἄχρι τῶν [z] χαλινῶν τῶν ἵππων, [a] ἀπὸ [b] σταδίων χιλίων ἑξακοσίων.

XV. 1 Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο [c] σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ μέγα καὶ [d] θαυμαστόν, ἀγγέλους ἑπτὰ ἔχοντας [ef] πληγὰς ἑπτὰ τὰς [f] ἐσχάτας, ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς [g] ἐτελέσθη ὁ θυμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. 2 Καὶ εἶδον [h] ὡς θάλασσαν [i] ὑαλίνην [k] μεμιγμένην πυρί,

v ch. xix. 15. Lam. i. 15. see Isa. as above. w ch. xi. 2 reff. x constr., Mark vii. 15. y = ch. xviii. 5. Acts xi. 5 1. z James iii. 3 only. Zech. xiv. 20. a = John xi. 18. xxi. 8 (b) only. b = Luke xxiv. 13. John vi. 19. xi. 18. ch. xxi. 16 (1 Cor. ix. 24) only †. 2 Macc. xi. 5 B. xii. 9 al3. c = ch. xii. 1, 3. d Matt. xxi. 42 ∥ Mk. (from Ps. cxvii. 23). John ix. 30. 1 Pet. ii. 9. ver. 3 only. e = ch. ix. 20 reff. f ch. xxi. 9. g = ch. x. 7 reff. h ch. i. 10 al. fr. i here bis. ch. iv. 6 only †. (-λος, ch. xxi. 18.) k ch. viii. 7 reff.

20. for επατηθη, ετιθη 1. rec (for εξωθεν) εξω, with ℵ n 1 (37, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P] B rel-Andr-coisl. διακοσιων ℵ[1] 26.

and perhaps a tendency, when emphatically subjoining an epithet describing greatness, to substitute the worthier gender. Any thing corresponding to this feature is entirely wanting in the previous description of the harvest. See on it, ch. xix. 15, and the prophetic passages in reff. especially Isa. from which the symbolism comes). **And the winepress was trodden** (reff.) **outside the city** (see below), **and blood** (so Isa. lxiii. 3) **came forth from the winepress as far as to the bits of the horses, to the distance** (ref.) **of a thousand six hundred stadii** (it is exceedingly difficult to say what the meaning is, further than that the idea of a tremendous final act of vengeance is denoted. *The city* evidently = ἡ πόλις ἡ ἔξωθεν of ch. xi. 2 (not that of ib. 8, see note there), viz. *Jerusalem*, where the scene has been tacitly laid, with occasional express allusions such as that in our ver. 1. The blood coming forth from the treading of the winepress is in accordance with the O. T. prophecy alluded to, Isa. lxiii. 3. It is in the depth, and the distance indicated, that the principal difficulty lies. The number of stadii is supposed by some to be the length of the Holy Land as given by Jerome (Ep. (cxxix.) ad Dard., 4, vol. i. p. 971) at 160 Roman miles. But the great objection to this is, that 160 miles = 1280, not 1600 stadii. Another view has been, that 1600 has been chosen as a square number, = 40 × 40, or 4 × 400, or 4 × 4 × 100. Victorinus explains it "per omnes mundi quatuor partes: quaternitas enim est conquaternata, sicut in quatuor faciebus et quadriformibus et rotis quadratis." He gives a very curious interpretation of the depth, —"usque ad principes populorum." We may fairly say, either that the number is assigned simply to signify completeness and magnitude (in which case some other apocalyptic numbers which have been much insisted on will fall perhaps under the same canon of interpretation), or else this is one of the riddles of the Apocalypse to which not even a proximate solution has ever yet been given).

CH. XV., XVI. THE SEVEN VIALS. And herein, XV. 1—8.] PREFATORY: *the description of the vision*, ver. 1: *the song of triumph of the saints victorious over the beast*, vv. 2—4: *the coming forth of the seven angels and delivering to them of the seven vials*, vv. 5—8.

And I saw another sign in heaven great and marvellous, seven angels having seven plagues which are the last (**plagues**), **because in them is completed the wrath of God** (I have adopted an unusual arrangement to throw the ὅτι into connexion with ἐσχάτας, for which epithet it renders a reason. It is to be observed 1) that this verse is evidently only a compendious description of the following vision: for the angels themselves are not seen till ver. 6, and do not receive the vials containing the plagues till after they are seen: 2) that the whole of God's wrath in *final judgment* is not exhausted by these vials, but only the whole of His wrath in sending plagues on the earth *previous to the judgment*. After these there are no more plagues: they are concluded with the destruction of Babylon. Then the Lord Himself appears, ch. xix. 11 ff.). **And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire** (see ch. iv. 6 and note: not merely *glassy*: the ὡς indicates the likeness: it was as it were *made of glass*. The addition μεμιγμένην πυρί is probably made as bringing into the previous celestial imagery an element belonging to this portion of the prophecy, of which *judgment* is the prevailing complexion. The fact, that the personages of the former heavenly vision are still present, ver. 7, seems to remove all doubt of this being *the same* sea of glass as that

καὶ τοὺς [lm] νικῶντας [m] ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου καὶ [m] ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ καὶ [m] ἐκ τοῦ [n] ἀριθμοῦ τοῦ [n] ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ ἑστῶτας ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν [l] ὑαλίνην, ἔχοντας [o] κιθάρας τοῦ [p] θεοῦ. [3] καὶ [q] ᾄδουσιν τὴν [qr] ᾠδὴν [s] Μωυσέως τοῦ [s] δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν [q] ᾠδὴν τοῦ ἀρνίου λέγοντες Μεγάλα καὶ [t] θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου, [u] κύριε ὁ [u] θεὸς ὁ [u] παντοκράτωρ. [v] δίκαιαι καὶ [vw] ἀληθιναὶ αἱ [x] ὁδοί σου, ὁ [y] βασιλεὺς τῶν * ἐθνῶν. [4] τίς οὐ μὴ [y] φοβηθῇ, κύριε, καὶ [z] δοξάσει τὸ

l pres. part., see note. m constr., here only. so Livy viii. 8 (fin.), 'victoriam ferre ex aliquo.' n ch. xiii. 17. o 1 Cor. xiv. 7. ch. v. 8. xiv. 2 only. Ps. xxxii. 2. p 1 Thess. iv. 16. 1 Chron. xvi. 42. q ch. v. 9 reff. r Exod. xv. 1 ff. s Josh. xiv. 7 A. Ps. civ. 26. t Exod. xv. 11. Sir. xi. 4. ver. 1 reff. u ch. i. 8 reff. v ch. xvi. 7. xix. 2. see Ps. xviii. 10. w = John vii. 28. Deut. xxxii. 4. x Acts xiii. 10. Rom. xi. 33. Heb. iii. 10. Ps. xvii. 21. cxliv. 17. Deut. l. c. y Jer. x. 7 F. compl. &c. (not in ABℵ.) z John xii. 28. Psa. lxxxv. 9 (12).

ACPℵ

Chap. XV. 2. νικουντας C. εκ της εικονος και εκ του θηριου B b fo g j (k) 2. 4. 6. 13. 26-7. 33(-9). 40-1-2-8. 50: om 2nd εκ ℵ k l 16. 38-9. rec (aft 4th και) adds εκ του χαραγματος αυτου, with 1. 17. 33. 47 (m n 34-5-6-9, e sil) Andr Areth, m n 1 add και also: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Haymo Ruf. ins τας bef κιθαρας (*repetition of termn of precedg word*) B b d e j l m 13-6. 26-7. 35-8. 48. 50-1. 90. ins κῡ bef του θῡ ℵ.

3. homœotel in C, from θεου ver 2 to θεου ver 3. αδοντας ℵ. rec om 1st του, with B rel: ins A[P]ℵ h n 1. 10. 37-8. 51 Br. λεγοντος 1. βασιλευ, omg ὁ, ℵ[1]. rec αγιων: * αἰώνων Cℵ[1] g 18 vulg syr-dd arm-ed-marg lat-ff: *cœlorum* am: εθνων A[P]ℵ[3a](but altered again to αιων.) B rel copt æth Andr Areth Cypr.

4. rec aft φοβηθῃ ins σε, with rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P] B f 1. 36. 47 am(with demid fuld tol) æth arm Andr Cypr Primas.—for ου μη, σε ου ℵ g. rec δοξαση, with ℵ rel Andr: txt AC[P] B g m n 6. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 32-9. 47-8. 50-1. 90

before described ch. iv. 6, in immediate connexion with which the four living-beings were mentioned), **and the conquerors** (the pres. part. has the force of simple designation, as so often in this book) **of** (see ref.: they have come victorious *out of* the strife: cf. Thuc. i. 120, ἀγαθῶν δέ, ἀδικουμένους ἐκ μὲν εἰρήνης πολεμεῖν, εὖ δὲ παρασχόν, ἐκ πολέμου πάλιν ξυμβῆναι) **the beast and of his image and of the number of his name** (i. e. of the temptation to worship his image and to receive the mark consisting of the number of his name, ch. xiii. 17, 18), **standing on** (does ἐπί import actually "*upon*," so that they stood *on the surface* of the sea, or merely *on the shore of*? On every account the latter seems the more probable: as better suiting the heavenly imagery of ch. iv., and as according with the situation of the children of Israel when they sung the song to which allusion is presently made. The sense may be constructionally justified by ch. iii. 20, and viii. 3: the fact of ἐπί having a genitive in the latter place not setting it aside as a precedent) **the sea of glass, having harps of God** (sacred harps, part of the instruments of heaven used solely for the praise of God. We have had them before mentioned in ch. v. 8, xiv. 2). **And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God** (i. e. a song similar to that song of triumph which Moses and the children of Israel sung when delivered from the Red Sea and from the Egyptians, Exod. xv. In Exod. xiv. 31, Moses is called, as here, the servant (θεράποντι, LXX, as also in Heb. iii. 5) of God (see also Num. xii. 7; Josh. xxii. 5 (ὁ παῖς κυρίου)): and this song is formed on the model of parts of that one: see below) **and the song of the Lamb** (it is not meant that there are two distinct songs: the song is one and the same; and the expression which characterizes it betokens, as do so many other notices and symbols in this book, the unity of the Old and New Test. churches. Their songs of triumph have become ours: the song of Moses is the song of the Lamb. In this great victory all the triumphs of God's people are included, and find their fulfilment), **saying** (the song is a reproduction of several portions of the O. T. songs of praise), **Great and wonderful are thy works** (Ps. cx. 2, cxxxviii. 14, LXX), **Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways** (Ps. cxliv. 17; Deut. xxxii. 4 in Moses' song), **thou King of the nations** (or, of the ages (see 1 Tim. i. 17 reff. and note). The confusion has apparently arisen from the similarity of ΑΙΘΝΩΝ (ἐθνῶν) and ΑΙΩΝΩΝ: but which was the original, it is impossible, in the conflict of authorities, to decide): **who can but fear (Thee), O Lord** (these two clauses are

[a] ὄνομά σου; ὅτι μόνος [a] ὅσιος, ὅτι πάντα τὰ [b] ἔθνη [bc] ἥξουσιν καὶ [bc] προςκυνήσουσιν [c] ἐνώπιόν σου, ὅτι τὰ [d] δικαιώματά σου [e] ἐφανερώθησαν. [5] Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἠνοίγη ὁ ναὸς τῆς [f] σκηνῆς τοῦ [f] μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. [6] καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι [οἱ] ἔχοντες τὰς ἑπτὰ [g] πληγὰς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, [h] ἐνδεδυμένοι [i] λίνον καθαρὸν [k] λαμπρόν, καὶ [h] περιεζωσμένοι περὶ τὰ [l] στήθη [h] ζώνας [h] χρυσᾶς. [7] καὶ ἓν ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλοις ἑπτὰ

a = Heb. vii. 26 reff. (see note.)
b Psa. l. c.
c ch. iii. 9.
d = Rom. v. 18 only. Baruch ii. 19. see note.
e = Rom. iii. 21 al. ‡ (Jer. xl. [xxxiii.] 6 only.) plur., ch. i. 19 reff.
f Acts vii. 44 only. Exod. xxvii. 21 al. freq.
g ver. 1.
h ch. i. 13 (reff.).
i Matt. xii. 20 (from Isa. xlii. 3) only. Prov. xxxi. 13.
k = ch. xix. 8 reff.
l Luke xviii. 13. xxiii. 48. (plur., so Job xxxix. 20. see ch. i. 13.) John xiii. 25. xxi. 20 only. Dan. ii. 32.

Areth. for οσιος, αγιος B rel Andr: *sanctus et pius* demid, simly syr-dd: txt AC[P]ℵ n 1. 36-8. 47 Andr-a Areth. for παντα τα εθνη, παντες B rel Andr-coisl: παντα (alone) g: txt AC[P]ℵ n 10-7. 36. 49 (b 1. 37-8 B^r, e sil) vss Andr Cypr Primas. (d def.) for τα δικ., δικαιωματα ενωπιον ℵ.

5. for μετα ταυτα, μετ αυτα C 1. rec ins ιδου bef ανοιγη, with vulg copt Primas: om AC[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd æth Andr Areth. (d def.)

6. εξηλθαν C. rec [aft αγγελοι] om οι, with ℵ B (b d e 1. 48, e sil) Andr-a: ins AC[P] rel Andr Areth. (οι αγγ. οι επτα οι εχ. 9.) om εκ του ναου B rel Andr-coisl Areth: εκ τ. ν. bef οι εχ. τ. ε. π. b: ins AC[P]ℵ (h 10) 17. 36. 47-9 (g l n 1. 37-9. 41 B^r, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas Tich.—for ναου, οὐνου h 10.—om εχοντες . . . . ναου e. καθαρους λινους λαμπρους ℵ: for λινον, λιθον AC 38-marg 48 (mss mentd by Andr Bede) am(with demid fulg lipss): om æth[: txt P B(-νουν) rel vss Andr Areth Primas.] rec aft καθαρον ins και, with 32 (2 B^r, e sil) vulg-ed Primas: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth. om last και 1. om περι 1.

7. om ἐν ℵ[1] l 1. 12-6. om 2nd επτα ℵ.

from Jer. x. 7, but not in the LXX [ABℵ]. The title "King of nations" is especially appropriate, as it is God's judgments on the nations, and their effects on them, which are the theme of the Church's praise), **and shall glorify** (the construction is a mixed one, compounded of τίς οὐ μὴ δοξάσῃ and τίς οὐ δοξάσει) **thy Name? because Thou only art holy** (ὅσιος is only used of God here and ch. xvi. 5: hence the var. ἅγιος. Düsterd. quotes from the Schol. in Eurip. Hec. 788, τὸ πρὸς θεοὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον δίκαιον ὅσιον καλοῦμεν. This first ὅτι grounds the τίς οὐ μὴ in the *attributes of God*): **because all the nations shall come and worship before thee** (so it is declared in reff. LXX. This second ὅτι grounds the τίς οὐ μὴ in *matter of fact*): **because Thy righteous acts** (= Thy judgments: thy deeds of righteousness acted out towards the nations, both in the publication of the Gospel and in the destruction of Thine enemies) **have been made manifest** (the aor. as so often lately, looking back over the past and regarding it as matter of history, simply as the past. This third ὅτι grounds the πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἥξ. in its immediately exciting cause—the manifestation of God's judgments). **And after these things I saw, and there was opened the temple of the tabernacle of witness in heaven** (see on ch. xi. 19, xvi. 17. The ναός is the holy place of the tabernacle, to which latter the appellation τοῦ μαρτυρίου is here peculiarly appropriate, seeing that the witness and covenant of God are about to receive their great fulfilment): **and there came forth the seven angels** (viz. who were before mentioned: the οἱ does not point out any particular seven, such as the archangels. On the other hand, if we omit the second οἱ, we must not violate the force of the anarthrous participle by saying "the seven angels *who had*," οἱ ἔχοντες. The E. V. here is strictly correct) **which had** (or, "*having*." This was their office: but they *had* them not yet) **the seven plagues out of the temple** (cf. ch. xiv. 15, 17), **clad in linen** (the remarkable reading λίθον can hardly be genuine, though strongly attested: see digest. There is a precedent for λίθον ἐνδεδυμένοι in Ezek. xxviii. 13) **pure (and) glistening** (the well-known clothing of angels and heavenly beings, see Acts x. 30 (i. 10), ch. xix. 8; Matt. xvii. 2 ||, xxviii. 3), **and girt round their breasts with golden girdles** (being in this like our Lord Himself as seen in vision, ch. i. 13). **And one from among the four living-beings** (appropriately to the symbolic meaning of these ζῶα as the representatives of *creation*, see notes on ch. iv. 7, 11, inasmuch

m ch. v. 8 reff. n ch. iv. 6, 8 reff. w. ἐκ, Matt. xxiii. 25. o ch. vii. 2 reff. p ch. viii. 5 (reff.) only. q ch. viii. 4 reff. Isa. vi. 4. r ch. xxi. 11, 23. Exod. xl. 28, 29 (34, 35). 3 Kings viii. 11. s ch. vii. 3 reff. t ver. 1.

[m] φιάλας χρυσᾶς, [n] γεμούσας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ [o] θεοῦ [o] τοῦ ζῶντος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. [8] καὶ [p] ἐγεμίσθη ὁ ναὸς [q] καπνοῦ [p] ἐκ τῆς [r] δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [p] ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο εἰςελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ναὸν, [s] ἄχρι [t] τελεσθῶσιν αἱ ἑπτὰ [t] πληγαὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων.

XVI. [1] Καὶ ἤκουσα μεγάλης φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ

at end add αμην ℵ n 12. 46.

8. ins εκ του bef καπνου B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: του b: om AC[P]ℵ g n 1. 10-7-8 (h l 37-8-9. 47-9, e sil) vulg copt Andr Primas. (εδυνατο, so AC a to e j k l 2. 6. 9. 17. 26-7. 30-2-8. 48. 50-1. 90 Areth.) εις τον ναον bef εισελθειν ℵ. for εις τ. ναον, εν τω ναω 1. for αχρι, αχρις ου C. om επτα (bef αγγελων) [P] 1.

Chap. XVI. 1. rec φωνης bef μεγαλης, with [P]ℵ rel vulg Andr Primas: txt AC B b c d f g j 4. 13-9. 27. 41-2-8. 50. 82 copt Areth. om εκ του ναου B rel syr-dd Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ g h n 10-3. 34-8. 49 (m 1. 35-6. 40 B[r], e sil) vulg Andr.—(for ναου,

as the coming plagues are to be inflicted on the objects of creation) **gave to the seven angels seven golden vials** (the φιάλη was a shallow bowl or cup, usually without a stand or foot, in which they drew out of the κρητήρ or goblet: so Plato, Crito p. 120 a, χρυσαῖς φιάλαις ἐκ τοῦ κρητῆρος ἀρυττόμενοι. The Schol. on Il. ψ. 270 explains it οὐ τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν ποτήριον, ἀλλὰ γένος τι λέβητος ἐκπέταλον ἐκ παντὸς μέρους δυνάμενον ἔχειν. Cf. Eurip. Ion 1181 ff.; Xen. Cyr. v. 2. 7), **full of the wrath of God who liveth for ever and ever** (this addition serves, as in ch. i. 8, to give solemnity to the fact related). **And the temple was filled with smoke from** (arising from) **the glory of God and from His might** (i. e. from His presence, in which His glory and His might were displayed. The description calls to mind similar ones in the O. T., e. g. Ps. xviii. 8 f.; Isa. lxv. 5. See also below), **and no one was able to enter into the temple** (cf. 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; Exod. xl. 34, 35) **until the seven plagues of the seven angels should be finished** (the passages above referred to give the reason: because of the unapproachableness of God, when immediately present and working, by any created being. See Exod. xix. 21. When these judgments should be completed, then the wrathful presence and agency of God being withdrawn, He might again be approached. Many other meanings more or less far-fetched have been given, but where Scripture analogy is so plain, the simplest is the best).

Ch. XVI. 1—21.] The seven vials. See the general remarks on ch. viii. 1 for all questions common to the three great series of visions. The following special particulars are here to be noticed: 1) In the description, ch. xv. 1, which first introduces these plagues, they are plainly called τὰς ἑπτὰ πληγὰς τὰς ἐσχάτας. There can then be no doubt here, not only that the series reaches on to the time of the end, but that the whole of it is to be placed close to the same time. And this is borne out by the particulars evolved in the course of the visions themselves For we find that they do not in point of time go back, but at once take up the events of the former visions, and occur during the times of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, when the mystery of God should be finished. 2) As in the seals and in the trumpets, so here again, there is a marked distinction between the first four and the following three. As there, so here, the objects of the first four are the earth, the sea, the springs of waters, and the sun. After this the objects become more particularized: the throne of the beast, the river Euphrates, with the reservation of that peculiar and vague character for the *seventh*, which seems to belong to it in all the three series. 3) As before, so now, there is a compendious and anticipatory character about several of the vials, leading us to believe that those of which this is not so plain, partake of this character also. For example, under the *third* vial we find an acknowledgment of the divine justice in making those drink blood who shed the blood of saints and prophets. This, there can be little doubt, points on to the judgment on Babylon, in whom, ch. xviii. 24, was found the blood of saints and prophets, and of all that had been slain on the earth. Again, under the *sixth* we have the same great gathering to battle which is described in detail, ch. xix. 17—21. And finally, under the *seventh*, we

λεγούσης τοῖς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλοις Ὑπάγετε καὶ [u] ἐκχέετε τὰς ἑπτὰ [m] φιάλας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν.

[2] Καὶ [v] ἀπῆλθεν ὁ πρῶτος καὶ [u] ἐξέχεεν τὴν [m] φιάλην αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν· καὶ ἐγένετο [w] ἕλκος κακὸν καὶ [x] πονηρὸν [y] ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς ἔχοντας τὸ [z] χάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ.

[3] Καὶ ὁ δεύτερος [u] ἐξέχεεν τὴν [m] φιάλην αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν

u = here, &c., 8 times only. (Matt. ix. 17 al.)
v = ch. x. 9. xii. 17 al. Matt. xiv. 28.
w Luke xvi. 21. ver. 11 only. Exod. ix. 9, &c. Deut. xxviii. 35.
x = Deut. l. c. Job ii. 7. πασέων νούσων ἐστὶ πονηρότατον, Theognis 274. see Matt. vi. 23. vii. 17, 18.
y = Luke i. 65. iii. 2.
z ch. xiii. 17 reff.

ουρανου 13.) om και bef εκχ. 1. rec εκχεατε, with B rel: εκκεχετε f(appy): txt AC[P]ℵ f 1. 12. rec om 2nd επτα, with [P] h n 1. 10-7. 34. 49 (35-7 Br, e sil) syr-dd copt: ins ACℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas. om του θεου 1.

2. om 1st clause (*hom*) ℵ[1]. rec (for εις) επι, with h n 1. 10-7. 34 (35-7. 49 Br, e sil) copt Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas. (d illeg.) ελκον ℵ[1]. πονηρον και κακον ℵ: om κακον A. rec (for επι) εις, with h n 1. 10-7. 34 (35-7. 49 Br, e sil) vulg copt Andr: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas. om τους εχ. τ. χαρ. τ. θηρ. 1(Del). rec τη εικονι αυτου bef προσκυνουντας, with (16. 41, e sil) syr-dd copt: txt AC[P](ℵ) B rel vulg arm Andr Areth Primas.—την εικονα προσκυνουντας αυτου 1: προσκ. την εικονα αυτου ℵ.

3. rec aft δευτερος ins αγγελος, with B rel vss Andr Areth: om AC[P]ℵ[3a] g 18 am (with demid fuld tol lipss) æth Primas.—for κ. ο δευτ. εξεχ., εις ℵ[1].

have a compendious anticipatory notice of the judgment of Babylon, hereafter, ch. xvii., xviii., to be described in detail,—and of the great day itself in ver. 20, also hereafter (ch. xx. 11—15) to be resumed at more length. 4) As we might expect in the *final* plagues, we have no longer, as in the trumpets, a portion of each element affected, but the whole. 5) While in the first four vials the main features of the first four trumpets are reproduced, there is one notable distinction in the case of the *fourth*. While by the plague of the fourth trumpet, the sun, moon, and stars are partially darkened, by that of the fourth vial the power of the sun is *increased*, and the darkening of the Kingdom of the beast is reserved for the *fifth*.

The minor special features will be noticed as we proceed. On the whole, the series of the vials seems to bear a less general character than the other two. It takes up a particular point in the prophecy, and deals with symbols and persons previously described. It belongs, by its very conditions, exclusively to the time of, or to days approaching very near to the time of, the end: including in itself the subsequent details as far as the end of ch. xx.: without however noticing most important features and considerable prophetic periods.

1.] *Introductory.* **And I heard a great voice out of the temple** (from the fact ch. xv. 8, that the divine Presence is filling the temple, and that none might enter into it, this voice can be no other than the divine voice. The words ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ may have been erased (as in var. readd.) from the difficulty presented by τοῦ θεοῦ below, none being able to enter during the pouring out of the vials) **saying to the seven angels, Go and pour out the seven vials of the wrath of God into the earth** (so, previous to the series of trumpets, the angel casts the fire from the altar into the earth, ch. viii. 5).

2.] **And the first departed** (each angel, as his turn comes, leaves the heavenly scene, and from the space between heaven and earth, empties his vial on the appointed object) **and poured out his vial into the earth** (the γῆ, which before in ver. 1 was general, is now particular, and correlative with the objects of the other vials, cf. vv. 2, 3, εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, εἰς τοὺς ποταμούς): **and there came** (took place: *fell*, as E. V.) **an evil** (κακόν, in itself) **and painful** (πονηρόν, to the sufferers, ἐπίπονον, Suidas. See reff.) **sore upon the men that had the mark of the beast and that worshipped his image** (see above ch. xiii. 15—17, xiv. 9, 10. The allegorical and historical interpretations have been very various: see them in Elliott, vol. iv. Notice the parallel with the sixth Egyptian plague, Exod. ix. 8 ff. Cf. Deut. xxviii. 27, 35).

3.] **And the second poured out his vial into the sea: and it** (*the sea*, cf. ch. viii. 8, 11: not, "*there was*," as De Wette: for the question would arise, where? the analogy of the Egyptian plague is surely decisive) **became blood as of a dead man**

θάλασσαν· καὶ [a] ἐγένετο [a] αἷμα [b] ὡς νεκροῦ, καὶ πᾶσα [c] ψυχὴ [c] ζωῆς ἀπέθανεν, τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ.

[4] Καὶ ὁ τρίτος [u] ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς ποταμοὺς καὶ τὰς [d] πηγὰς τῶν [d] ὑδάτων· καὶ [a] ἐγένετο [a] αἷμα. [5] καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ [e] ἀγγέλου τῶν [e] ὑδάτων λέγοντος Δίκαιος εἶ, [f] ὁ ὢν καὶ [f] ὁ ἦν [g] ὅσιος, ὅτι [h] ταῦτα [h] ἔκρινας· [6] ὅτι [i] αἷμα [k] ἁγίων καὶ [k] προφητῶν [i] ἐξέχεαν, καὶ [l] αἷμα

a ch. viii. 8. Exod vii 19.
b = ch. i 10 al. fr.
c Gen. i. 30. see Gen. vii. 21, 22. Levit. xi. 10. ψ. ζ. = נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה
d ch xiv. 7 reff.
e see note and ch. vii. 1. xiv. 18.
f ch. i. 4 reff.
g ch. xv. 4. Heb. vii. 26 reff.
h constr., Luke xii. 57. John vii. 24. Job xxxvii. 23.
i = Matt. xxiii. 35. Rom. iii. 15, from Isa. lix. 7. Ps. lxxviii. 3.
k ch. xi. 18 (reff.).
l Isa. xlix. 26.

for ως, ωσι ℵ: om 1. 46. ψυχης A. rec (for ζωης) ζωσα, with [P]ℵ B h l n 1. 10-7. 36-8. 49 (16. 37-9. 41-2 Br, e sil) Andr Areth, *vivens* vulg copt: om rel Andr-coisl Primas: txt AC g syr-dd. rec om τα, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: ins AC syr-dd. for εν τη θαλ., επι της θαλασσης ℵ.

4. rec aft τριτος ins αγγελος, with h m 1. 10. 34-8 (n 35-6. 49 Br, e sil) lips-4 syr-dd copt Andr: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg(with am fuld al) æth Areth Primas. for εις, επι ℵ c. rec ins εις bef τας πηγας, with B rel Andr Areth; επι c 18: om AC[P]ℵ g h 10. 49 Br Primas Ansb. εγενοντο A g 36 syr-dd copt Primas: txt C[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth.

5. for 1st του, των(but corrd) ℵ[1]. om των υδατων 1. rec ins κυριε bef ει, with (41, e sil) æth: om AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with demid fuld tol lips-5, agst lips5) syr copt Andr Areth Primas. for ὁ ἦν, ος ην B a d e f k 2. 4. 26. 30. 40-1-2-8. rec aft ην ins και, with 1. 32-4. 51 (g 36, e sil): om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth. rec ins ὁ bef οσιος, with [P]ℵ b c h n 1. 6. 10(sic) 17-8. 27. 34-5-6. 47-9. 51 Br Andr Areth: om AC B rel Andr-coisl.

6. for 1st αιμα, αιματα ℵ 39. εδωκας bef αυτοις ℵ.

(blood as when a dead corpse lies in its blood: loathsome and corrupting): **and every soul of life** (living soul, ref. Gen.: ψυχή in its physical sense of animal soul) **died, (all) the things in the sea** (τά is in apposition with and exegetical of πᾶσα ψ. ζωῆς).

4—7.] And the third poured out his vial into the rivers and the fountains of the waters: and they became (it is quite impossible, in the lax construction of the Apocalyptic Greek, to maintain here a distinction, as Düsterd. has done, from the previous ἐγένετο, and to render here, "there came blood." Analogy must be our guide: and the account to be given of the singular is either that it belongs to τὰ ὕδατα, or that the rivers and fountains are taken together, and regarded as neuter in sense though not in construction) **blood** (that the fact was so, is testified by what follows, in which it is assumed that the sources of ordinary drink have become blood). **And I heard the angel of the waters** (i. e. the angel who was set over the waters; see reff.: not as Grot., "vocatur angelus aquarum quia in aquas immisit phialam." Schöttgen, h. l., p. 1131 f., gives examples of angels of the earth and of the sea: see also Wolf, h. l. This is more probable than Düsterd.'s idea that the analogy to be followed is that of the four living-beings, and that the angel *symbolized* the waters) **saying, Thou art righteous who art and wast** (as in ch. xi. 17, the καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος is omitted. For the construction, see reff.) **holy** (I incline against Düsterd., to the usual connexion, viz. the making ὅσιος belong to ὁ ὢν κ. ὁ ἦν, and not in apposition with δίκαιος. And that which moves me to it is, 1) the extreme improbability of two epithets, δίκαιος and ὅσιος, both being predicated in such an acknowledgment of an act of justice: and 2) that as I have taken it, it best agrees with the ὅσιος in ch. xv. 4, where it is predicated of God not as the result of any manifested acts of His, but as an essential attribute confined to Him alone), **because Thou didst judge thus** (lit., "these things:" viz. the issue mentioned in ver. 4; the turning the drinking-water into blood: "Thou didst inflict this judgment"): **because** (this ὅτι repeats the former ὅτι, καί following being "*and:*" not, as it might be taken, "*because they, &c., Thou hast also*") **they shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou hast given them blood to drink** (on the form of the inf., πεῖν, see Winer, edn. 6, § 15, and Anthol. xi. 140. 3, οἷς οὐ σκῶμμα λέγειν, οὐ πεῖν φίλον): **they are worthy** (these words are made stronger by their asyndetous character). **And I heard the altar saying** (certainly the simplest understanding of these words

αὐτοῖς δέδωκας [l] *πεῖν·* [m] *ἄξιοί εἰσιν.* 7 *καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος* Ναί, [n] Κύριε *ὁ* [n] *θεὸς ὁ* [n] *παντοκράτωρ,* [o] *ἀληθιναὶ καὶ* [op] *δίκαιαι αἱ* [p] *κρίσεις σου.*

8 Καὶ *ὁ τέταρτος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ* [q] *ἐδόθη αὐτῷ* [r] *καυματίσαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους* [s] *ἐν πυρί.* 9 *καὶ* [rt] *ἐκαυματίσθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι* [tu] *καῦμα μέγα, καὶ* [v] *ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸ* [v] *ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἔχοντος ἐξουσίαν* [w] *ἐπὶ τὰς πληγὰς ταύτας, καὶ οὐ* [x] *μετενόησαν* [xy] *δοῦναι αὐτῷ* [y] *δόξαν.*

10 Καὶ *ὁ πέμπτος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τοῦ θηρίου· καὶ* [z] *ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ* [a] *ἐσκο-*

m = ch. iii. 4. iv. 11 al. fr. Wisd. xviii. 4.
n ch. i. 8 reff.
o ch. xv. 3 reff.
p ch. xix. 2. 2 Thess. i. 5. John v. 30. vii. 24. Isa. lviii. 2. 2 Macc. ix. 18.
q constr., ch. ii. 7 reff.
r here bis. Matt. xiii. 6 ‖ Mk. only +.
s ch. xiv. 10 al. see ch. vi. 8 reff.
t constr., Luke ii. 8. John vii. 24. 1 Tim. i. 18. ch. xvii. 6. Xen. Mem. i. 5. 6.
u ch. vii. 16 only. Isa. xviii. 4.
v ch. xiii. 6 reff.
w usage aft. ἐξουσ., ch. ii. 26 reff.
x constr., here only. infin., Col iv. 6. 2 Pet. iii. 2. ver. 19. 1 Kings xvi. 1.
y ch. xi. 13 reff.
z constr., Mark i. 4. ix 3, 7. 2 Cor. vi. 14. Col. i. 18. Heb. v. 12. ch. iii. 2. Josh. ix. 12. see Winer, edn. 6, § 45. 5.
a ch. ix. 2. Eph. iv. 18 only. Jer. xiv. 2.

rec (for δεδ.) *εδωκας*, with [P]ℵ B rel: txt AC. rec (for *πειν*) *πιειν*, with [P]ℵ B rel: *ποιειν* f k 30: txt AC. rec aft *αξιοι* ins *γαρ*, with (92?) vulg-ed Areth: om AC[P](ℵ) B rel fuld(with lips-4 tol) Andr.—*οπερ αξιοι* ℵ: *οτι αξιοι* 16 copt; *ut digni* vulg.

7. rec ins *αλλου εκ* bef *του θυσιαστηριου*; *εκ* B 1 Andr-a; *φωνην εκ* 36: om AC[P]ℵ 34(Del) rel fuld(and tol) syr-dd copt Bede.

8. rec aft *τεταρτος* ins *αγγελος*, with ℵ rel copt Andr Primas: om AC[P] B a d e f g j k l 4. 13-6-9. 26-7. 30-2-7. 48. 50 am(with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd æth Areth. *εν πυρι* bef *τους ανθρωπους* B a b c e j k l m 2. 4. 6. 18-9. 26-7. 34(-5, e sil)-9. 40-1-2-7-8. 50-1. 90: om *εν* ℵ: om *εν πυρι* 18.

9. aft *εβλασφημησαν* ins *οι ανθρωποι* B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P]ℵ g 1. 18². 36-8. 50¹ (n, e sil) vulg copt Andr Primas. for *το ονομα*, *ενωπιον* A. (*του θεου του*, so ℵ³ᶜ(?): ℵ¹ illegible.) ins *την* bef *εξουσιαν* A[P]ℵ h 10. 36-7. 49 Bʳ Andr-p: om C B rel Andr Areth. for *ου*, *ουχι* C.

10. rec aft *πεμπτος* ins *αγγελος*, with h m n (1) 10-7. 34 (35-6-7. 49 Bʳ, e sil) copt Andr Areth Primas: om AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd æth Tich Bede. —for *πεμπτος*, *αγγελος* 1.

is, that they involve a personification of the altar. On the altar are the prayers of the saints, offered before God: beneath the altar are the souls of the martyrs crying for vengeance: when therefore the altar speaks, it is the concentrated testimony of these which speaks by it), **Even so, Lord God Almighty: true** (reff.) **and just are Thy judgments.**

8, 9.] **And the fourth poured out his vial upon** (no longer *εἰς*) **the sun: and it was given to it** (the sun: not "*to him*," the angel, as, strangely enough, Bengel and Hengstb., and Elliott, iii. 361. The angels throughout this vision are simply the pourers out of the vials, not the executors of the plagues. Besides which, the verb *καυματίζω*, in a sentence where the sun is mentioned, can have but one reference: see reff.) **to scorch men** (the *τούς* is probably generic merely. If it is to be assigned a meaning, it may be, the men who have received the mark and number of the beast. But the other is more likely) **with** (the *ἐν* of investiture: the element in which the scorching takes place) **fire** (not, as Hengstb., understanding *αὐτῷ* of the angel, some fire other than the sun: but the glowing increased heat of the sun itself), **and men were scorched with great heat** (on the accus. after the passive verb which takes a double accus. in active, see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 32. 5), **and blasphemed the name of God who hath power over these plagues, and did not repent to give Him glory** (on the inf. epexegetic, see Winer, edn. 6, § 44. 1).

10, 11.] **And the fifth poured out his vial upon the throne of the beast** (given to it by the dragon, ch. xiii. 2. That is, on the spot where the power and presence of the beast had its proper residence): **and his kingdom** (those lands which owned his rule) **became darkened** (as in the ninth Egyptian plague, Exod. x. 21 ff., the darkness is specially sent over the land, not occasioned by any failure of the lights of heaven). **And they** (the inhabitants: the subjects of the beast. They

b here only. Job xxx. 4 (8) only. τὰ δέρματα τῶν θυρεῶν ἀποδέροντες ἐμασσῶντο, Jos. B. J. v. 3. 3.
c = ch. viii. 11 reff. = ἀπό, Matt. xiv. 26 al. fr.
d here bis. ch. xxi. 4. Col. iv. 13 only. Isa. i. 5. lxv. 14.
e ver. 21 only. see ver. 9. Tit. ii. 5. 4 Kings xix. 6 A.
f ch. xi. 3 reff.
g ver. 2.
h ch. ii. 21, 22. ix. 20, 21 only.
i ch. ix. 14. Gen. xv. 18 al.
k = Mark v. 29 only. Gen. viii. 7. Zech. x. 11.
l Matt. iii. 3 (from Isa. xl. 3). Luke i. 76 only.
m ch. vii. 2 reff.
n 1 John iv. 1 reff. Rev., ch. xix. 20. xx. 10 only.

τωμένη, καὶ [b] ἐμασῶντο τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν [c] ἐκ τοῦ [d] πόνου, [11] καὶ [e] ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν [ef] θεὸν τοῦ [f] οὐρανοῦ [c] ἐκ τῶν [d] πόνων αὐτῶν καὶ [c] ἐκ τῶν [g] ἑλκῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐ [h] μετενόησαν [h] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν.

[12] Καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν [i] ποταμὸν τὸν [i] μέγαν τὸν Εὐφράτην· καὶ [k] ἐξηράνθη τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα [l] ἑτοιμασθῇ ἡ [l] ὁδὸς τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ἀπὸ [m] ἀνατολῆς [m] ἡλίου.

[13] Καὶ εἶδον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ [n] ψευδο-

εσκοτισμενη ℵ[3c] B e n 16. rec εμασσωντο, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ a b d f g h k l 1. 2. 6. 9. 10-3-6-7-8-9. 37. 50. (εμασοντο l: εμασων 16.) for εκ, απο ℵ.

11. om εκ των ελκων αυτων (*hom*) ℵ. om εκ των εργων αυτων ℵ.

12. rec aft εκτος ins αγγελος, with h m n 10-7. 34 (35-6-7-9. 49 B[r], e sil) copt Andr Areth Primas Tich: om AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd æth. for μεγαν, μεγα 1. om τον (bef ευφρατην) [P]ℵ B rel Areth: ins AC f g m n 18. 34. 47. 51 (1. 35?) Andr. (d def.) om 2nd αυτου 1. 12. 36. rec ανατολων, with A h n 10-7. 38. 49 (1. 37 B[r], e sil) copt Andr: txt Cℵ B rel Areth.

13. for ειδον, εδοθη ℵ. homœotel in C 9. 27, στοματος 1st to 2nd: in ℵ[1] 1st to 3rd.

are by and by identified with those who had received his mark) **chewed their tongues** (the word μασάομαι is confined to the comedians and later Gr. prose. ἡ τῶν γλωσσῶν μάσησις τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ὀδύνης δηλοῖ, says Andreas) **from** (ἐκ, of the source of the action: see reff.) **their pain** (viz. under which they were previously suffering: not, that occasioned by the darkness, which would not of itself occasion pain: see below), **and blasphemed the God of heaven** (see ch. xi. 13) **by reason of** (ἐκ as above) **their pains and their sores** (these words bind on this judgment to that of the first and following vials, and shew that they are cumulative, not simply successive. The sores, and pains before mentioned, are still in force), **and repented not of** (see ch. ix. 20, 21) **their works.**

12.] **And the sixth poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates: and its water was dried up, that the way of the kings which come from the rising of the sun might be prepared** (notice, but not to be blindly led by it, the analogy of the sixth trumpet, also having reference to the river Euphrates. In order to understand what we here read, we must carefully bear in mind the context. From what follows under this same vial, we learn that the kings of the whole earth are about to be gathered together to the great battle against God, in which He shall be victorious, and they shall utterly perish. The time is now come for this gathering: and by the drying up of the Euphrates, the way of those kings who are to come to it from the East is made ready. This is the only understanding of these words which will suit the context, or the requirements of this series of prophecies. For to suppose the conversion of Eastern nations, or the gathering together of Christian princes, to be meant, or to regard the words as relating to any auspicious event, is to introduce a totally incongruous feature into the series of vials, which confessedly represent the "seven last *plagues*." Andreas explains it as above: and so Bleek, Ewald, De Wette, Düsterd., al.).

13—16.] **And I saw** (notice the curious reading of ℵ, which derives some interest from the absence of any participle to signify "*going forth*") **out of the mouth of the dragon** (who is still in the prophetic scene, giving his power to the beast, ch. xiii. 2) **and out of the mouth of the beast and out of the mouth of the false prophet** (viz. the second beast of ch. xiii. 11 ff. Cf. ch. xix. 20, xx. 10) **three unclean spirits like frogs** (in shape and character. In the entire absence of Scripture symbolism,—for the only mention of frogs besides this is in, or in regard to, the relation of the plague in Egypt,—we can only explain the similitude from the uncleanness, and the pertinacious noise, of the frog. Daubuz quotes from Philo, De Sacr. Abel

προφήτου [o] πνεύματα τρία [o] ἀκάθαρτα [p] ὡς [q] βάτραχοι· [14] εἰσὶν γὰρ [r] πνεύματα [s] δαιμονίων [t] ποιοῦντα [t] σημεῖα, ἃ [u] ἐκπορεύεται [v] ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς [w] οἰκουμένης [w] ὅλης, [x] συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς [x] εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς [y] ἡμέρας τῆς [y] μεγάλης τοῦ [z] θεοῦ τοῦ [z] παντοκράτορος. [15] Ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι [a] ὡς [a] κλέπτης· μακάριος ὁ [b] γρηγορῶν καὶ [c] τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ γυμνὸς περιπατῇ καὶ [d] βλέπωσιν τὴν [e] ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτοῦ. [16] καὶ [x] συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς [x] εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον [f] Ἑβραϊστὶ Ἁρμαγεδών.

..ακα- ...ap. C. ...AN B a ...o n, 1. 2. ...6. 9. ...0-3. 16 ...o 19. 26- ...30-2. ...4 to 42. ...7 to 51. ...0 Br.

o ch. xviii. 2. Matt. x. 1 al. fr. Zech. xiii. 2. p ch. i. 10. xv. 2 al. fr. q here only. Exod. viii. 2, 7 al. constr., ch. iv. 1 al. fr. r Luke iv. 33. s ch. ix. 20. Gospp., passim. Acts xviii. 18. 1 Cor. x. 20 (bis), 21 (bis). 1 Tim. iv. 1. James ii. 19. Ps. cv. 37. t ch. xiii. 13 reff. u Zech. vi. 6, 8. v Matt. iii. 7. John xix. 33. w ch. iii. 10 reff. x John xi. 52. ch. xix. 17. xx. 8. 2 Kings xxiii. 9. y = ch. vi. 17 reff. z ch. i. 8 reff. a ch. iii. 3 reff. b ch. iii. 2, 3. c = Eph. iv. 3. 2 Tim. iv 7. Jude 6 Prov. iv. 23. d plur. impers., see ch. xii. 6. xiii. 16. Luke xii. 20. e Rom. i. 27 only. = Exod. xx. 26. f ch. ix. 11 reff.

ακαθαρτα bef *τρια* B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om *ακαθαρτα* 49: txt ACℵ g h l n 10-7-8. 36-8 (1. 2. 16. 37-9 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas. rec (for *ως βατραχοι*) *ομοια βατραχοις*, with 1²: *ως βατραχους* j 18. 36-8 Areth: *ειωσει βατραχους* (but 1st ει erased) ℵ¹: *ωσει βατραχοι* ℵ³ᵃ: om 1¹: txt A B rel Andr.

14. rec (for *δαιμονιων*) *δαιμονων*, with h n 1. 10-6¹-7-8. 34-8 (35-6-7. 49 Br, e sil) Andr: txt Aℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. Steph (for *α εκ.*) *εκπορευεσθαι*, with ℵ¹ g 18 Andr-a: *εκπορευονται* ℵ³ᵃ B l 16. 36-9: txt A rel Andr Areth.—1 has *εκπορευεσθαι*, but with *α* written over by an ancient hand. for *επι*, *εις* ℵ. rec ins *γης και της* bef *οικουμενης*, with 1-corr Andr-a: *γης* 1¹: om Aℵ B rel syr-dd Andr Areth. rec om *τον* (bef *πολεμον*), with 1. 34(-5-6?): ins Aℵ B rel Andr Areth. rec (aft *ημερας*) ins *εκεινης*, with B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Promiss Primas: om Aℵ f g 38 vulg copt Tich.

15. *ερχεται* ℵ¹(but corrd eadem manu?) 38. 47 Primas. aft *ὁ* ins *τε* ℵ¹. *βλεπουσιν* 1.

16. *συνηγαγον* ℵ. om 1st *τον* ℵ. for *τοπον*, *ποταμον* A. for *αρμαγεδων*, *μαγεδων* B rel vulg(some mss) Tich-ms: txt Aℵ¹ g h l m 1. 10-3-6-7-8. 34(-5-6?)-7-8-9. 47-9 Br, *αρμεγ.* (but corrd) ℵ³ᵃ: *ἁρμαγ.* g m 1(Treg, not Del). 47 al, *hermag.* am Tich.—rec *-γεδδων*, with B f 17 syr-dd Primas: txt Aℵ rel vulg.

et Cain, 19, vol. i. p. 176, ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀψύχοις δόξαις, λέγω δὲ βατράχοις πιεσθεὶς, ἦχον καὶ ψόφον ἔρημον πραγμάτων ἀποτελοῦσι: from Cicero ad Att., xv. 15, "ranæ ῥητορεύουσι:" and from Artemidorus ii. 15, βάτραχοι δὲ ἄνδρας γόητας κ. βωμολόχους προσημαίνουσι), for (γάρ gives a reason for ὡς βάτραχοι) **they are spirits of devils doing miracles** (this is a plain declaration of the interpretation of these three, and by it the limits of interpretation are clearly set, and must not be overpassed. The explanation of these as any men, or sects of men, is therefore clearly wrong) **which go forth over the kings of the whole earth** (it is the uniform testimony of the prophetic Scriptures that the antichristian power shall work signs and wonders as means of deceiving mankind: see Matt. xxiv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 9) **to gather them together to the war of the great day of Almighty God** (that day viz. which is explained in detail in the subsequent part of the prophecy, ch. xix. 17 ff. This great gathering of the beast and the kings of the earth against God and the Lamb, is the signal for the immediate and glorious appearing of the Lord. And therefore follows an exhortation to be ready, and clad in the garments of righteousness, when He shall come). **Behold, I come** (the Seer speaks in the name of Christ) **as a thief** (that personal advent shall happen when many least expect it, when the world is secure in the ungodliness of ages): **blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked and they** (men) **see his shame** (the figure is that of one apprehending the thief's coming, and therefore keeping watch in his clothes, not undressing. In the spiritual sense, the garments are the robe of righteousness put on by faith in Him who is our Righteousness: and the walking naked is that destitution of these garments which will at that day bring shame before assembled men and angels). **And they** (the unclean spirits, as is evident from συνήγαγεν being merely a recital of the συναγαγεῖν before: not, the angel of the sixth vial, as Bengel; nor God, as Hengst. and Ebrard) **gathered them to-**

[17] καὶ ὁ ἕβδομος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν g ch ix 2 reff. [g] ἀέρα· καὶ ἐξῆλθεν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου λέ-

17. for ο εβδομος, οτε ℵ[1] : ο ζ ℵ[3a]. rec aft εβδομος ins αγγελος, with ℵ[3a] h m n 1. 10-7. 34 (35-6-7. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr Areth Primas: om A(ℵ[1]) B rel am(with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd. rec (for επι) εις, with c f h n 1. 10-7. 49. 51 (37 B[r], e sil) Andr: txt Aℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec aft φωνη ins μεγαλη, with ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth Primas: om A 1. 12. 46 Cassiod. rec (for εκ) απο, with B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt Aℵ g 1. 12-8. 36-8. 46 Andr. rec aft του ναου ins του ουρανου, with B 10(sic) rel vss Andr Areth: for ναου, ουνου n 1. 12-8. 36. 47 Andr-a: txt A(ℵ) f g vulg syr-dd copt Primas. for απο του θρονου, του θεου ℵ. και απο του θρονου του θεου b.

gether to the place which is called in Hebrew Harmagedon (it is evidently in the meaning of the Hebrew name of this place that its appropriate significance lies. For otherwise why should ἑβραϊστί be prefixed to it? When St. John does this in his Gospel, in the cases of Bethesda, v. 2, Gabbatha, xix. 13, Golgotha, xix. 17, and in this book in the case of Abaddon, ch. ix. 11, it is each time not without such reference: see the notes in those places. But this circumstance does not deprive the name of geographical reality: and it is most probable on every account that such reality exists here. The words τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον would surely not be used except of a real place habitually so named, or by a name very like this. Nor need we search far for the place pointed out. הַר־מְגִדּוֹ, the mountain of Megiddo, designates at least the neighbourhood where the Canaanitish kings were overthrown by Barak, Judg. v. 19; an occasion which gave rise to one of the two triumphal songs of Israel recorded in the O. T., and therefore one well worthy of symbolizing the great final overthrow of the Kings of the Earth leagued against Christ. That the name slightly differs from that given in the O. T. where it is the plain (2 Chron. xxxv. 22) or the waters (Judg. l. c.) of Megiddo, is of slight consequence, and may be owing to a reason which I shall dwell on below. The LXX in both places adopt the form which we have here, Μαγεδώ -δών or -δδώ. Nor must it be forgotten, that Megiddo was connected with another overthrow and slaughter, viz. that of Josiah by Pharaoh-Necho (2 Kings xxiii. 29; 2 Chron. ubi supra), which though not analogous to this predicted battle in its issue, yet served to keep up the character of the place as one of overthrow and calamity: cf. also Zech. xii. 11, and the striking description, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, of the ordinance of lamentation for Josiah. At Megiddo also another Jewish King, Ahaziah, died of the wounds received from Jehu, 2 Kings ix. 27. The prefix Har, signifying "mountain," has its local propriety, see Stanley's description of the plain of Esdraelon, in the opening of his Sinai and Palestine, ch. ix. And to the fisherman of the lake of Galilee, who would know Megiddo as he saw its background of highland lit up by the morning or evening sun across the plain from his native hills, the name would doubtless be a familiar one. Still there may have been a deeper reason which led to, or at all events justified the prefix. As the name now stands, it has a meaning ominous of the great overthrow which is to take place on the spot. Drusius, believing the word to be merely a mystic one, explains it to be חרמא גדודן, "internecio exercitus eorum," the overthrow of their army. But, conceding and maintaining the geographical reality, must not we suppose that such a name, with such a sound, so associated with the past, bore to a Hebrew ear, when used of the future, its ominous significance of overthrow? It is remarkable that in Zech. xii. 11, where the mourning for Josiah is alluded to, the LXX render not in the plain of Megiddo, but ἐν πεδίῳ ἐκκοπτομένου: and this agrees with the interpretation of Andreas here, who supposes the name equivalent to διακοπή).

17—21.] **And the seventh poured out his vial upon the air** (the consequences are presently seen), **and there came forth a voice out of the temple from the throne** (the voice, as in ver. 1, of God Himself. This is rendered even more certain here by the addition of ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου) **saying, It is done** (the limitation of the meaning of γέγονεν to "that is done which was commanded," viz. the outpouring of the seven vials, is in fact no limitation: for the plagues are the *last* plagues: if therefore they are done, all is done. But the declaration is of course proleptically made, and imports that the outpouring of the seventh vial had done that which should accomplish all and bring in

γουσα [h] Γέγονεν. [18] καὶ [i] ἐγένοντο [i] ἀστραπαὶ καὶ [i] φωναὶ καὶ [i] βρονταί, καὶ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας, [k] οἷος οὐκ [k] ἐγένετο ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [l] τηλικοῦτος σεισμὸς οὕτως μέγας. [19] καὶ [m] ἐγένετο ἡ [n] πόλις ἡ [n] μεγάλη [m] εἰς τρία μέρη, καὶ αἱ πόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν ἔπεσαν. καὶ [o] Βαβυλὼν ἡ [o] μεγάλη [p] ἐμνήσθη ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ [q] δοῦναι αὐτῇ τὸ [r] ποτήριον τοῦ [r] οἴνου τοῦ [r] θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ. [20] καὶ πᾶσα νῆσος ἔφυγεν, καὶ [s] ὄρη οὐχ [t] εὑρέθησαν.

h = Luke xiv. 22. [ch. xxi. 6.] i ch. viii. 5. xi. 19 al k = Matt. xxiv. 21 al. Dan. xii. 1. l 2 Cor. i. 10. Heb. ii. 3. James iii. 4 only †. 2 Macc. xii. 3. m ch. viii. 11 reff. n = ch. xi. 8. xvii. 18. xviii. 10, &c. o ch. xiv. 8 reff. p pass., Acts x. 31 only. Ezek. xviii. 22. q infin, ver. 9. r ch. xiv. 8, 10. s ch. vi. 14. t ch. xviii. 21, 22. Ps. xxxvi. 36. plur., ch. i. 19 reff.

18. rec *φωναι* and *βρονται* bef *αστραπαι*, with 1: *βρονται* bef *φωναι* rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: txt A (ℵ B) g n 2. 6. 13. 26. 36. 40.—om *και βρονται* B: ℵ[1] has *βρονται* in both the 1st and 4th places, ℵ[3a] disapproving the latter, but not *και* precedg. om 1st *εγενετο* B rel fuld Andr Areth: ins Aℵ f g h n 10-7. 36 (1. 37. 42-9. 51 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a Tich. for *οιος*, *οις* ℵ[1]. for 2nd *εγενετο*, *εγενοντο* ℵ[1]. rec *οι ανθρωποι εγενοντο*, with (ℵ B) rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Tich: txt A c copt arm, *εγενετο ανθρωπος* 38.—om *οἱ* ℵ B f g 17.

19. rec *επεσον*, with rel Andr Areth: *-σαν* in the line, *ο* above 10[1]: txt Aℵ[3a] B d h[2] j l n 16-7. 27. 38. 42-9. (4 uncert. *η πολις . . . επεσεν* ℵ[1].) ins *του* bef *δουναι* ℵ. om *το*, *του* (bef *οινου*), and *αυτου* ℵ.

20. om 1st *και* 1.

the end. One who had fired a train would say, "It is done," though the explosion had not yet taken place). **And there were lightnings and voices and thunders** (the usual accompaniments of the close of each series of visions, see ch. viii. 5, xi. 19. But, as before remarked, these phænomena occur here in rather a different connexion from that in the other two places. Here, they are more the result of the outpouring of the last vial, and they do not conclude, but only begin its effects, which do not cease until the destruction of Babylon and the great overthrow of the antichristian hosts): **and there was a great earthquake** (this may perhaps be not without connexion with the pouring out of the vial into the air: in the descriptions of earthquakes we read of the darkened and lurid appearance of the air preceding the shock) **such as was not from the time when there was a man** (not, "since man was:" the generic meaning would more probably be expressed by *οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐγένοντο*, as altered in rec.) **upon the earth, such** (on **τηλικοῦτος**, see note on ref. Heb.) **an earthquake so great. And the great city** (Rome: cf. ch. xi. 8 and note, xiv. 8, xvii. 18, xviii. 10, 16, 18, &c., 21) **became into** (i.e. was divided or split, scil. by the earthquake) **three parts** (see ch. xi. 13, where a similar judgment takes place at the end of the episode of the two witnesses. The *three* parts are supposed by Düsterd. to refer to the three arch-enemies just now mentioned. But this is very uncertain: see on the tripartite division at ch. viii. 7), **and the cities of the nations fell** (not only the greatest city, but other great capitals of nations fell, from the violence and extent of the earthquake. We have its further consequences presently): **and Babylon the great** (mentioned specially, although really the same (see the places referred to above) with *ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη*, because of her special adulterous character to be hereafter described. The destruction of the material city of Rome is but the beginning of the execution of vengeance on the mystic Babylon) **was remembered before God** (reff.), **to give her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath** (so E. V. for *τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς*; "excandescentia iræ," Vitringa. *θυμός* (*θύω*) is the outbreak, *ὀργή* the temper of mind. See on Rom. ii. 8: and on the figure of the cup, ch. xiv. 8, note. The sense is, that all these material judgments were but prefatory; the divine intent, in the midst of them, being to make Babylon drink the cup of His wrath in her judgment which follows): **and every island fled** (the effects of the earthquake are resumed, the mention of Babylon coming into remembrance being parenthetical, and suggested by the great city having been split into three parts. On the sense, as belonging to the imagery of the great day, see ch. vi. 14), **and there were**

21 καὶ [u] χάλαζα μεγάλη ὡς [v] ταλαντιαία [w] καταβαίνει ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· καὶ [x] ἐβλασφήμησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸν [x] θεὸν [x] ἐκ τῆς [y] πληγῆς τῆς [u] χαλάζης, ὅτι μεγάλη ἐστὶν ἡ [y] πληγὴ αὐτῆς [z] σφόδρα.

XVII. 1 Καὶ ἦλθεν εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐχόντων τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας, καὶ ἐλάλησεν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ λέγων [a] Δεῦρο, δείξω σοι τὸ [b] κρῖμα τῆς [c] πορνης τῆς μεγάλης τῆς καθημένης ἐπὶ [τῶν] [d] ὑδάτων [τῶν] πολλῶν, 2 μεθ᾽ ἧς [e] ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, καὶ [f] ἐμεθύσθησαν οἱ [g] κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς.

u here bis. ch. viii. 7. xi. 19 only. Exod. ix. 24. v here only †. Jos. B. J. v. 6. 3, ταλαντιαῖοι ... οἱ βαλλόμενοι πετροι. w = Matt. vii. 25, 27. Luke viii. 23. Isa. xxxii. 19. x ver. 11 (reff.). y = ch. ix. 18, 20 reff. z Rev., here only. so Matt. ii. 10. Mark xvi. 4. Luke xviii. 23. Exod. ix. 24. 1 Kings iv. 19.

a = ch. xxi. 9. Matt. xxi. 21 al. Judg. iv. 22. b Rev., ch. xviii. 20. xx. 4 only. = Jude 4 al. fr. c = vv. 5, 15, 16. ch. xix. 2. see Isa. i. 21. Ezek. xvi. 35. d Jer. xxviii. (li.) 13. e ch. ii. 14 reff. Ezek. xvi. 34. f pass., John ii. 10 only. Gen. ix. 21 al. elsw. neut., Matt. xxiv. 49. Acts ii. 15. 1 Cor. xi. 21. 1 Thess. v. 7. ver. 6 only. Jer. xxviii. (li.) 7. (-θύσκεσθαι, Luke xii. 45.) w. ἐκ, ver. 6 only. see ch. xiv. 8. ἀπό, Isa. li. 21. g constr., Acts i. 19 and passim. elsw., Matt. xxiii. 21. Luke xiii. 4 only. Hos. x. 5. 1 Macc. iii. 34.

P ετη-λωσ— … APN … 32 to 42. 47 … 90 F.

21. ως is written over the line by ℵ[1]. for ανθρωπους, ουνους 1.

Chap. XVII. 1. for ηλθεν, εξηλθεν A. om εκ ℵ g n. [τας is written twice in P.] rec aft λεγων ins μοι, with n 1 æth Andr Tich: om Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt arm Andr-coisl. επι υδατων πολλων (sic) A[P]ℵ g m n 1. 34(-5-6) Hip Andr: επι των υδατων των πολλων B rel Areth.

2. for εποργ., εποιησαν πορνιαν ℵ. rec εκ τ. οιν. τ. πορν. αυ. bef οι κατοικουντες την γην, with 1 copt: om εκ τ. οιν. τ. π. α. 40: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd arm Hip Andr Areth Tich.—for οινου, οικου ℵ[1].

found no mountains (not as E. V., "the mountains (τὰ ὄρη) were not found." The expression is far stronger than this: amounting to that in ch. vi. 14, that every mountain was removed out of its place and was looked for in vain), **and a great hail** (see reff. Egypt is again in view) **as of a talent in weight** (i. e. having each hailstone of that weight. Diod. Sic. xix. 45 speaks of hailstones of a mina each in weight as being enormous: *καταῤῥαγόντων ἐξαίφνης μεγάλων ὄμβρων, καὶ χαλάζης ἀπίστου τὸ μέγεθος, μναιαῖαι γὰρ ἔπιπτον, ἔστι δ᾽ ὅτε καὶ μείζους, ὥστε πολλὰς μὲν τῶν οἰκιῶν συμπίπτειν διὰ τὸ βάρος, οὐκ ὀλίγους δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλλυσθαι*: and the talent contained *sixty* minæ. Josephus, in reff., speaks of the stones which were thrown from the machines in the siege of Jerusalem as each of a talent weight) **descendeth from heaven on men** (τοὺς ἀνθρ. must apparently be generic here: it can hardly mean *the men;* for the plague is universal. See above on ver. 9): **and men blasphemed God by reason of the plague of the hail, because great is the plague of it exceedingly** (i. e. mankind in general,—not those who were struck by the hailstones who would instantly die,—so far from repenting at this great and final judgment of God, blasphemed Him and were impenitent. The issue is different from that in ch. xi. 13, where the remnant feared and gave glory to God).

Ch. XVII. 1—XIX. 10.] The Judgment of Babylon. And herein, XVII. 1—6.] *The description of Babylon under the figure of a drunken harlot, riding on the beast.* **And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials** (we are not told which of the seven, and it is idle to enquire. The seventh has been conjectured, because under the outpouring of his vial Babylon was remembered) **and talked with me saying, Hither** (see reff.), **I will shew thee the judgment of the great harlot that sitteth upon [the] many waters, with whom the kings of the earth (have) committed fornication, and they who inhabit the earth have been made drunk from the wine** (ἐκ, the wine having been the source of their drunkenness) **of her fornication** (the figure here used, of a harlot who has committed fornication with secular kings and peoples, is frequent in the prophets, and has one principal meaning and application, viz. to God's church and people that had forsaken Him and attached herself to others. In eighteen places out of twenty-one where the figure occurs, such is its import; viz. in Isa. i. 21; Jer. ii. 20, iii. 1, 6, 8; Ezek. xvi. 15, 16, 28, 31, 35, 41, xxiii. 5, 19, 44; Hosea ii. 5, iii. 3, iv. 15 (Micah i. 7). In three places only is the word applied to heathen cities: viz. in Isa. xxiii. 15, 16 to Tyre, where, ver. 17,

[3] καὶ [h] ἀπήνεγκέν με εἰς ἔρημον [i] ἐν πνεύματι· καὶ εἶδον γυναῖκα [k] καθημένην [k] ἐπὶ θηρίον [l] κόκκινον, [mn] γέμοντα

h w. εἰς, Luke xvi. 22. 1 Cor. xvi. 3. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 7. ἐπί, ch. xxi. 10. Acts xix. 12. absol., Mark xv. 1 only. i ch. i. 10. iv. 2. xxi. 10. k ch. iv. 2 reff. & note. l here bis. ch. xviii. 12, 16. Matt. xxvii. 28. Heb. ix. 19 only. Exod. xxv. 4. Num. xix. 6. m ch. iv. 6, 8 reff. n constr., ch. iv. 1 al.

3. for ειδον, ιδα A. (So also ver 6.) [κογκινον P:] θηριου κοκινον 1. rec (for γεμοντα) γεμον, with ℵ[3a] B rel Hip Andr Areth : γεμων 1 30-2 : txt (or γεμον τα)

it is also said, "she shall commit fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth:" and in Nahum iii. 4 to Nineveh, which is called the well-favoured harlot, the mistress of witchcrafts, that selleth nations through her whoredoms, and families through her witchcrafts. And there the threat is pronounced of a very similar ruin to that which befalls Babylon here. So that the Scripture analogy, while it points to unfaithfulness and treachery against God's covenant, also brings to mind extensive empire and wide-spread rule over the kingdoms of the earth. It is true, that as far as *the image itself* is concerned, pagan Rome as well fulfils its requirements as Tyre and Nineveh. It will depend on subsequent features in the description, whether we are to bound our view with her history and overthrow. Still, it will not be desirable to wait for the solution of this question till we arrive at the point where those features appear: for by so doing much of our intermediate exegesis will necessarily be obscured. The decisive test then which may at once be applied to solve the question, is derived from the prophecy of the destruction of Babylon in ch. xviii. 2. It is to be laid utterly waste, and to "become the habitation of devils and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Now no such destruction as this has yet befallen Rome, unless her transfer from pagan to papal rule be such a destruction, and the Pope and his ecclesiastics be described in the above terms. In an eloquent passage of Vitringa, he presses Bossuet with this dilemma. Again, it is said of this harlot, μεθ' ἧς ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς. But we may ask, if this be pagan Rome, who and what are these kings, and what is indicated by her having been the object of their lustful desires? In the days of Imperial Rome, there were no independent kings of the earth except in Parthia and Persia. Rome in her pagan state, as described for the purpose of identification in ver. 18, was not one who intrigued with the kings of the earth, but ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς: she reigned over them with undisputed and crushing sway.

I do not hesitate therefore, induced mainly by these considerations, which will be confirmed as we proceed step by step in the prophecy, to maintain that interpretation which regards papal and not pagan Rome as pointed out by the harlot of this vision. The subject has been amply discussed by many expositors. I would especially mention Vitringa, and Bp. Wordsworth.

The "sitting upon many waters" is said of Babylon in Jer. in reff., but has here a symbolical meaning; see below, ver. 15. On the ἐμεθύσθησαν see ch. xiv. 8. The same thing is said of Babylon in Jer. l. c. But there she herself is the cup in the Lord's hand). **And he** (the angel) **carried me away to the wilderness** (not, as Elliott, al., and even Düsterd., "*a* wilderness." Such inferences from the absence of the art. in this later Greek, never secure, are more than ever unsafe when a preposition precedes: and the usage of the LXX should have prevented any such rendering here. In no fewer than twenty places (see Tromm.) they use the word ἔρημος anarthrously, where there can be no question that "*the wilderness*" is the only rendering. In fact it may be questioned whether the expressly indefinite rendering, "*a* wilderness," is ever justifiable, except in case of predication, or junction with an adjective, without some further indication than the mere omission of the definite article after a preposition. Had it been intended here, we may safely say that εἰς τόπον ἔρημον, or εἰς τόπον τινὰ ἔρημον would have been used. The most natural way of accounting for the Seer being taken into the wilderness here, is that he was to be shewn Babylon, which was in the wilderness, and the overthrow of which, in the prophecy from which come the very words ἔπεσεν (πέπτωκεν, LXX) Βαβυλών (Isa. xxi. 9), is headed τὸ ὅραμα τῆς ἐρήμου. So that by the analogy of prophecy, the journey to witness the fall of Babylon would be εἰς ἔρημον. The question of the identity of this woman with the woman in ch. xii. is not affected by that of the identity of this wilderness with that) **in the spirit** (see reff., and note on ch. i. 10): **and I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet**

ᵒᵖ ὀνόματα ᵖ βλασφημίας, ⁿ ἔχοντα ᵖ κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ ᵖ κέρατα δέκα. ⁴ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἦν ᑫ περιβεβλημένη ʳ πορφύρουν καὶ ˡ κόκκινον [καὶ] ˢ κεχρυσωμένη ᵗ χρυσίῳ καὶ ᵘ λίθῳ ᵘ τιμίῳ

o constr. acc., here bis. Phil. i. 11. Col i. 9. Ps. xv. 11 A (not BN F). p ch. xiii. 1. q ch. vii. 9 reff. r John xix 2, 5. ch xviii. 16 only (elsw. -ρα, ch. xviii. 12 al.). Num. iv. 13. s ch. xviii. 16 only. Exod. xxvi. 32, 37. t ch. iii 18 al. u 1 Cor. iii. 12. ch. xviii. 12, 16. xxi 11, 19. Ps. xviii. 10. Dan. xi. 38 Theod.

A[P]ℵ¹ 9. rec ονοματων, with c h m n 1. 10. 34-5-6-7. 49-corr (48. 51 Br, e sil) Hip Andr Areth: A[P]ℵ B rel. rec (for εχοντα) εχον, with B rel: εχων A l m n 30-2: txt Pℵ. om κεφαλας επτα και 1. [at end P adds ver 18, repeating it in its own place, writing πολης both times, and here insg την bef βασιλειαν.]

4. rec (for ἦν) ἡ, with 1 copt: txt A[P]ℵ B(Tischdf) rel vulg syr-dd æth arm Hip Andr Areth Cypr. (Only the ν exists in A and there is room for η ην or the like.) rec πορφυρα: πορφυραν h (k?) n 1. 4. 6. 10-7-8. 34-5 7. 48-9 Br Andr Areth: txt A[P]ℵ B rel Hip. rec κοκκινω: txt A [P(κογκ.)] ℵ B 1(κοκιν., so elsw) rel Hip Andr Areth. om 3rd και [P] B rel Hip Andr Areth: ins Aℵ 1. 18. 33-38 (1 2. 35-6-9. 42, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a lat-ff. rec (for χρυσιω) χρυσω, with [P]ℵ g h n 1. 33(-6-7, e sil)-8. 49: txt A B rel.

beast (this beast is introduced as if a new appearance: but its identity with that mentioned before, ch. xiii. 1 ff., is plain as the description goes onward. For not to mention the features which the two have in common, this beast, as soon as described, is ever after mentioned as τὸ θηρίον: and in ch. xix. 19, 20 the identity is expressly established. For there we read, ver. 19, that the beast and the kings of the earth make war against the Lamb, which beast can be no other than this on which the woman rides, cf. our vv. 12—14:—and in the next verse, ch. xix. 20, we read that *the beast was taken, and the false prophet who did miracles before him*, which beast can be no other than that of ch. xiii. See ver. 14 there. The identity of the two is therefore matter not of opinion, but of demonstration. The differences in appearance doubtless are significant. That with which we are now concerned, the scarlet colour, is to be understood as belonging not to a covering on the beast, but to the beast itself. It is akin to the colour of the dragon (πυῤῥός), but as that is the redness of fire (see however ch. vi. 4), so is this of blood, with which both the beast and its rider are dyed. It was the colour, see ref. Heb., of the wool to be used in sprinkling the blood of sacrifice. There may be an allusion to the Roman imperial purple: for the robe which was put on our Lord in mockery was κόκκινος, ref. Matt. But this is more probably conveyed by its own proper word in the next verse. By the woman *sitting* on the wild-beast, is signified that superintending and guiding power which the rider possesses over his beast: than which nothing could be chosen more apt to represent the superiority claimed and exercised by the See of Rome over the secular kingdoms of Christendom), **full of names of blasphemy** (for the construction with accus., see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 32. 5. The names of blasphemy, which were found before on the heads of the beast only, have now spread over its whole surface. As ridden and guided by the harlot, it is tenfold more blasphemous in its titles and assumptions than before. The heathen world had but its Divi in the Cæsars, as in other deified men of note: but Christendom has its "most Christian" and "most faithful" Kings, such as Louis XIV. and Philip II.; its "Defenders of the faith," such as Charles II. and James II.; its society of unprincipled intriguers called after the sacred name of our Lord, and working Satan's work "ad majorem Dei gloriam;" its "holy office" of the Inquisition, with its dens of darkest cruelty; finally its "patrimony of St. Peter," and its "holy Roman Empire;" all of them, and many more, new names of blasphemy, with which the woman has invested the beast. Go where we will and look where we will in Papal Christendom, names of blasphemy meet us. The taverns, the shops, the titles of men and of places, the very insurance badges on the houses, are full of them), **having seven heads and ten horns** (as in its former appearance, ch. xiii. 1; inherited from the dragon, ch. xii. 3. These are presently interpreted: we now return to the description of the woman herself). **And the woman was clothed in purple** (St. John's own word, even to its peculiar form, see reff., for the mock-imperial robe placed on our Lord: and therefore bearing probably here the same signification; but not in mockery, as Bede, "fucus simulati regiminis:" for the empire is real) **and scarlet** (see above. This very colour is

καὶ [v] μαργαρίταις, ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσοῦν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς [m] γέμον [w] βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ [ox] ἀκάθαρτα τῆς [y] πορνείας αὐτῆς, [5] καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ [z] μέτωπον αὐτῆς [a] ὄνομα [a] γεγραμμένον [b] Μυστήριον, [c] Βαβυλὼν ἡ [c] μεγάλη, ἡ μήτηρ τῶν [d] πορνῶν καὶ τῶν [w] βδελυγμάτων τῆς γῆς. [6] καὶ εἶδα τὴν γυναῖκα [e] μεθύουσαν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν [f] ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν [g] μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ. καὶ [h] ἐθαύμασα ἰδὼν αὐτὴν [hi] θαῦμα μέγα. [7] καὶ εἶπέν μοι ὁ

...της n. A P ℵ B a to m, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

v ch. xviii. 12, 16. xxi. 21 (bis) +. Matt. vii. 6. xiii. 45, 46. 1 Tim. ii. 9 only. w here bis. ch. xxi. 27. Matt. xxiv. 15 ‖ Mk. (from Dan. ix. 27). Luke xvi. 15. Isa. ii. 8. (-κτός, Tit. i. 16. -ύσσεσθαι, ch. xxi. 8.) x = Acts x. 14. 1 Cor. vii. 14. 2 Cor. vi. 17. ch. xviii. 2. Eph. v. 32 al. y ch. ii. 21. z ch. vii. 3 reff. a ch. xiv. 1 reff. b ch. i. 20. c ch. xiv. 8 reff. d ver. 1 reff. e ver. 2 reff. f ch. xv. 8 reff. g ch. ii. 13 reff. h constr., ch. xvi. 9 reff. i 2 Cor. xi. 14 only. Job xvii. 8. xviii. 20 only.

[om from εχουσα to end of ver P.] rec χρυσουν bef ποτηριον, with h n 1. 10. 17-8. 36 (37. 49 Br, e sil) Andr: om χρ. e: txt Aℵ(χρουσ., but corrd) B rel syr-dd copt æth arm Hip Andr-coisl Areth lat-ff. γεμων ℵ[1] b[1] f (?) 1 30-2: γεμουσα k. rec (for τα ακαθαρτα της) ακαθαρτητος (with 42, e sil): τα ακαθαρτα 33 (sic, Del): txt Aℵ B rel Hip Andr. for αυτης, της γης B rel syr-dd copt Hip Areth, *totius terræ* Cypr Primas Promiss: αυτης και της γης ℵ: txt A c[1] g h l m n 1. 6. 10-7-8. 34 *to* 38. 47-9. 51 (Br, e sil) vulg Andr.

6. (ειδα, so A(ιδα) ℵ.) om 1st εκ [P]ℵ[3a] B a b d e f j k 2. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 30[1]. 41-7-9. 51 Andr-coisl Areth Promiss.—τω αιματι ℵ[1] 38. om 2nd και B rel Andr-coisl Areth: ins A[P]ℵ 17-8 (c f g h l 1. 6. 27. 32-7-8. 40-2-7-9. 51 Br, e sil) vulg Andr. μαρτυριων A. om ιησου 1. 36. θαυμα μεγα bef ειδων(*sic*) αυτην ℵ 38.

not without its significance: witness the Cardinals, at the same time the guiding council of the Church and princes of the State), [and] **gilded with gold and with** (the κεχρυσωμένη is zeugmatically carried on) **precious stone and with pearls** (this description needs no illustration for any who have witnessed, or even read of, the pomp of Papal Rome: which, found as it is every where, is concentrated in the city itself), **holding a cup of gold in her hand full of abominations and of the impure things** (the change of construction is remarkable: for such it must be accounted, and not, with Düsterd., the accus. governed by ἔχουσα. It seems to be made, not to avoid an accumulation of genitives, as Hengstb., but to mark a difference between the more abstract designation of the contents of the cup as βδελύγματα, and the specification of them in the concrete as τὰ ἀκάθαρτα κ.τ.λ.) **of her fornication** (this cup is best taken altogether symbolically, and not as the cup in the Mass, which, however degraded by her blasphemous fiction of transubstantiation, could hardly be called by this name, and moreover is *not given*, but *denied* by her to the nations of the earth. That she should have represented herself in her medals as holding forth this cup (with the remarkable inscription, "sedet super universam;" see Elliott, vol. iv. p. 30, plate), is a judicial coincidence rather than a direct fulfilment), **and (having) upon her forehead a name written** (as was customary with harlots: so Seneca, Controv. i. 2, in Wetst.: "Statisti puella in lupanari: . . . . nomen tuum pependit a fronte: pretia stupri accepisti:" and Juv. Sat. vi. 123 of Messallina, "Tunc nuda papillis Constitit auratis, titulum mentita Lyciscæ"), **Mystery** (is this word part of the name, or not? On the whole it seems more probable that it is. For though no such word would in the nature of things be attached to her forehead as part of her designation, so neither would the description which follows Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, to which the word μυστήριον seems partly to refer. But whether part of the name or not, the meaning will be the same: viz. that the title following is to be taken in a spiritual and an enigmatical sense; compare ch. i. 20, and 2 Thess. ii. 7), **Babylon the great, the mother of the harlots and of the abominations of the earth** (i. e. not only first and greatest of these, but herself the progenitress and origin of the rest. All spiritual fornication and corruption are owing to her, and to her example and teaching). **And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus** (as the Seer contemplates the woman, he perceives that she is drunken: and from what is revealed to him, and from her symbolic colour of blood, he assigns the cause of that intoxication. Wetst. quotes Plin. H. N. xiv. 28, "quo facile intelligitur ebrius jam sanguine civium, et tanto magis eum sitiens"). **And I wondered,**

k Acts xxi. 38. Rom. xi. 18. 4 Kings xviii. 14. Sir. vi. 25 (Bel & Dr. 36 Theod.) only.
l ch. ix. 1, 2 reff.
m ver. 11. John xvii. 12. Acts viii. 20. Rom. ix. 22. Phil. iii. 19. 2 Thess. ii. 3. Heb. x. 39. 2 Pet. ii. 1. iii. 3, 7 al. Isa. xiv. 23. xli. 23. lii. 15.

ἄγγελος Διὰ τί ἐθαύμασας; ἐγὼ ἐρῶ σοι τὸ ...
τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ k βαστάζοντος ...
ἔχοντος τὰς p ἑπτὰ κεφαλὰς καὶ τὰ p δέκα κέρ...
θηρίον ὃ εἶδες ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ μέλλει ἀνα...
τῆς l ἀβύσσου, καὶ εἰς m ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει ...

7. rec σοι bef ερω, with [P]ℵ f h 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 Br, e sil) ... Andr Primas: txt A B rel vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr-coisl Areth Pr... bef του εχοντος 1.

8. rec (at beg) om το (with k 34, e sil): ins A[P]ℵ B(Tischdf) ... Andr Areth. for ην, η A. rec (for υπαγει) υπαγειν, with [P]ℵ B ... Promiss: txt A 12 Andr-p Areth Iren-int Primas. om 4th ... 1.

when I saw her, with great wonder (what was the ground of the Seer's astonishment? One doubtless might be assigned, which would at once account for any degree of such emotion. If this woman is the same as he before saw, who fled into the wilderness from the face of the dragon, "the faithful city become an harlot" (Isa. i. 21), he might well wonder. And certainly there is much in favour of such a supposition. It has been taken up by some considerable expositors, such as Auberlen (Der Prophet Daniel, pp. 278 ff.), who has argued earnestly but soberly for it. There is one objection to it, which has been made more of in this place than perhaps it deserves. It is, that in the Angel's replication to St. John's wonder, no allusion is made to this circumstance as its principal ground. But, it may well be replied, this would be just what we might expect, if the fact of identity were patent. The Seer, versed in the history of man's weakness and depravity, full of O. T. prophetic thoughts and sayings, would need no solution of the fact itself: this would lie at the ground of his wonder, and of the angel's explanation of the consequences which were to follow from it. Auberlen very properly lays stress on the fact, that the joint symbolism of the wilderness and the woman could not fail to call up in the mind of the Seer the last occasion when the two occurred together: and insists that this symbol must be continuous throughout. Without going so far as to pronounce the two identical, I think we cannot and ought not to lose sight of the identity of symbolism in the two cases. It is surely meant to lie beneath the surface, and to teach us an instructive lesson. We may see from it two prophetic truths: first, that the church on earth in the main will become apostate and faithless, cf. Luke xviii. 8: and secondly, that while this shall be so, the ... not embrace the whole church ... second woman in the ... should be *absolutely* iden... first. The identity is, in the ... be questioned: in formal str... to be pressed. This being ... rather regard St. John's aston... a compound feeling, occasioned ... the enormity of the sight ... him, partly also by the iden... symbolism with that which ha... vehicle of a former and altoget... vision).

7—18.] *Explanation by* ... *the mystery of the woman an... beast.* And first, 7—14. ... **And the angel said to me, W... didst thou wonder? I will t... the mystery** (which, be it no... one) **of the woman and of the b... that carrieth her, which hath t... heads and the ten horns. Th... which thou sawest, was, and is ... shall come up out of the abyss an... to perdition** (these words hav... very battle-field for apocalyptic c... whose principal differing inter... are far too long to be given at al... bly here, but will be seen best in t... works, and compendiously but fa... in the notices in Mr. Elliott's ... volume. What is here required ... I should give a consistent accou... solution which I have been mys... adopt. 1) It will not be suppos... the general view which I have t... the beast as the secular persecuting ... that I am prepared to accede t... line of interpretation which ma... whole vision merely descriptive ... Seer's own time, and of the Rom... perors then past, present, and exp... Against such a view it seems to ... whole imagery and diction of the ... protest: and this it will be my ende...

ᵒ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ
ἐπὶ τὸ ᵖᵠ βιβλίον τῆς ᵖᵠ ζωῆς ἀπὸ ᵠ καταβολῆς
βλεπόντων τὸ θηρίον ʳ ὅτι ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ
ι. ⁹ ˢ ὧδε ὁ νοῦς ὁ ᵘ ἔχων ᵘ σοφίαν. αἱ ἑπτὰ
ἑπτὰ ὄρη εἰσίν, ᵛ ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ᵛ ἐπ' αὐτῶν.

o ch. iii. 10 reff. p see ch. iii. 5 reff. q see ch. xiii. 8 (reff.). r constr., 1 Cor. iii. 20. xvi. 15. Gal. i. 11 al. s = John vii. 6. t ch. xiii. 10 reff. u see ch. xiii. 18. v constr., ch. iii. 8 reff.

.. for επι της γης, την γην B a b e f j k m 2. 9. 13-6-9. 26-7. 30-3-
-7. 50-1. 90 vulg Hip Primas. for ου γεγραπται, ουκ εγεγραπται A:
το 9 Hip. rec τα ονοματα, with [P]ℵ c l 1. 4. 10-7-9 (h n 6. 32 Bʳ,
Andr Areth Primas: txt A B rel syr-dd copt Hip. for το βιβλιον,
ν B rel (Andr-p): txt A[P]ℵ c 1. 4. 10-7. 34-6 (g h n 6. 32-7. 40-1-8-9 Bʳ,
Areth. rec βλεποντες, with h 1. 10-7. 33-6. 49 (37. 41 Bʳ, e sil)
eth: txt A[P]ℵ B rel Andr. οτι ην bef το θηριον B rel Andr-coisl
A[P]ℵ g h 1. 10-7-8. 36-8. 49 (37. 41 Bʳ, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr
rec (for και παρεσται) καιπερ εστιν: και παρεστιν ℵ³ᵃ 1. 11-2-6. 36. 48-7
:t A[P](ℵ¹) B 33(sic, Del) rel Hip Andr Areth.—ins παλιν bef παρ. ℵ¹.
η εισιν bef επτα, with 1. 51 (40-1, e sil): om επτα f: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg
; Hip Andr Areth Primas Promiss.

s each of their details comes notice. If, as universally ac-d, our prophecy be a taking up uation of that of Daniel, then ling with larger matters and on ale than such a limited inter- would imply. 2) Nor again, neaning assigned above to the l her title, will it be expected uld agree with those who take ording to the letter of our ver. y confined in meaning to the ty of Rome. She *is* that city: also μυστήριον. She is herself n apostate and faithless church; also a *mother*: from her spring, ure partake, with her shall be all the fornications and abo- of the earth, though they be not hough they be not called by her igh in outward semblance they ith and oppose her. 3) The arks will lead their intelligent expect, that the present words , which are in the main repro- the imagery of ch. xiii. 1—4, terpreted as those were inter- t of mere passing events and t of world-wide and world-long d changes. 4) Having thus in- e line of interpretation which I v, I reserve the details for ver. they necessarily come before **they shall wonder who dwell earth, of whom the name is not pon** (the accus. as so often in **the book of life from the foun- the world** (these latter words, dinary N. T. Greek, would be- γραπται, and the art. τό would to connect them with τὸ βιβ-λίον τῆς ζωῆς. But it is by no means certain, in the loose Greek of the Apocalypse, whether these accuracies must be insisted on. Judging by the analogy of ch. xiii. 8 (see note there), ἀπὸ κατ. κόσμου belongs to that which immediately precedes it: as indeed it does in every place where it occurs in which its connexion might be ambiguous. I prefer therefore to follow analogy, rather than to insist on philological accuracy in a book where its rules are manifestly not observed), **seeing** (the reader expects βλέποντες, to agree with οἱ κατοικοῦντες: but instead, we have βλεπόντων, agreeing with ὧν by attraction) **the beast that he was and is not and shall come again** (see for full explanation, below on vv. 9, 10). **Here (is) the mind that hath wisdom** (by these words, as in ch. xiii. 18, attention is bespoken, and spiritual discernment challenged, for that which follows). **The seven heads are seven mountains, where** (= ἐφ' ὧν, on which) **the woman sitteth (upon them)** (ἐπ' αὐτῶν, the well-known Hebraistic redundancy of construction after ἐφ' ὧν, here expressed by ὅπου.

By these words, no less plainly than by ver. 18, Rome is pointed out. Propertius, iii. 11. 57, by a remarkable coincidence, unites both descriptions in one line: "Septem urbs alta jugis, toto quæ præsidet orbi." The more remarkable out of the very many testimonies to Rome being thus known, are those of Horace, Carmen Seculare, 7, "Di quibus septem placuere colles:" Virg. Æn. vi. 782, "Illa inclyta Roma Imperium terris, animos æquabit Olympo, Septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces:" where Servius annotates, "alii dicunt breves septem colliculos a

w = (Job xiv. 10) Dan. viii. 10 Theod. see ch. xiv. 8. xviii. 2.

10 καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτά εἰσιν· οἱ πέντε w ἔπεσαν, ὁ εἷς ἐστίν,

10. επτα bef βασιλεις ℵ: εισιν bef επτα B rel 9 Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P] g h 10-7-8. 33-6 (1. 6. 16. 34-7-8-9. 41-7-9. 51 B[r], e sil) vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Primas Promiss. rec ins και bef ὁ εἷς, with 1. 33 (48, e sil) lips-4: om A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Promiss.—ὁ δὲ εἷς h.

Romulo inclusos, qui tamen aliis nominibus appellabantur: alii volunt hos ipsos qui nunc sunt a Romulo inclusos, hoc est Palatinum, Quirinalem, Aventinum, Cœlium, Viminalem, Æsquilinum, et Janicularem." See also Georg. ii. 534: Cicero, ad Att. vi. 5, ἐξ ἄστεος ἑπταλόφου: Martial iv. 64, speaking of Julius Martial's gardens on the Janiculum, "Hinc septem dominos videre montes, Et totam licet æstimare Romam:" Varro de L. L. iv., "Dies Septimontium nominatus ab his septem montibus in queis sita Roma est:"—and so Plutarch, Probl. Rom. p. 280 D, τὸ Σεπτιμούντιον ἄγουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν ἕβδομον λόφον τῇ πόλει προσκατανεμηθῆναι, καὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἑπτάλοφον γενέσθαι. See very many more in Wetst., and a copious catena of citations in Bp. Wordsworth's Letters to M. Gondon on the Church of Rome, Let. xi. Also the coin of Vespasian figured in Elliott, vol. iv. p. 30): **and they are seven kings** (let us weigh well the significance of this indication furnished by the angel. The seven heads have a reference to the *woman*, who sits upon the beast to whom they belong: and, as far as *this reference* is concerned, they are *hills, on which she sits*. But they have also another reference—to the beast, of which they are the heads: and as far as this other reference is concerned, they are *kings*. Not, be it noticed, kings over the woman, nor kings of the city symbolized by her: but kings in a totally different relation, viz. that to the beast, of which they are heads. So that to interpret these kings as *emperors of Rome*, or as successive *forms of government over Rome*, is to miss the propriety of the symbolism and to introduce utter confusion. They belong to the *beast*, which is not Rome, nor the Roman Empire, but a general symbol of secular antichristian power. They are in substance the same seven crowned heads which we saw on the dragon in ch. xii. 3: the same which we saw, with names of blasphemy on them, on the beast of ch. xiii. 1, to whom the dragon gave his power and his throne). **The five** (i. e. the first five out of the seven) **fell** (Angl., "are fallen." Of whom is this word used? Is it one likely to be chosen to describe the mere passing away of king after king in an empire more or less settled? One appropriate to Augustus and Tiberius, who died in their beds? Or again is it one which could well be predicated of the government by consuls, which had been absorbed into the imperial power, or of that by dictators, which had merely ceased *ad tempus sumi*, because it had become perpetual in the person of one man? Had Roman emperors been meant by the seven kings, or successive stages of government over Rome (even supposing these last made out, which they never have been), we should in vain have sought any precedent, or any appropriate meaning, for this ἔπεσαν: "have passed away" would be its constrained and unexampled sense. But let the analogy of Scripture and of this book itself guide us, and our way will be clear enough. Ἔπεσεν is the cry over Babylon herself. πίπτω is used in the LXX constantly, and by Theod. in ref. Dan., of the violent fall, the overthrow, either of kings or of kingdoms: it is a word belonging to domination overthrown, to glory ruined, to empire superseded. If I understand these five of individual successive kings, if I understand them of forms of government adopted and laid down on occasion, I can give no account of this verb: but if I understand them of forms of empire, one after another heading the antichristian secular power, one after another violently overthrown and done away, I have this verb in its right place and appropriate sense. *Egypt* is fallen, the first head of the beast that persecuted God's people, Ezek. xxix., xxx.: *Nineveh* is fallen, the bloody city, Nahum iii. 1—19: *Babylon* is fallen, the great enemy of Israel, Isa. xxi. 9; Jer. l., li., al.: *Persia* is fallen, Dan. x. 13, xi. 2: *Græcia* is fallen, Dan. xi. 3, 4. Thus, and as it seems to me thus only, can we do justice to the expression. Nor is any force done thus to βασιλεῖς, but on the contrary it is kept to its strict prophetic import, and to the analogy of that portion of prophecy which is here especially in view. For in Dan. vii. 17 we read these great beasts which are four are four kings, מַלְכִין; not βασιλεῖαι, as LXX and Theodotion), **the one is** (the *Roman*), **the other** (required to complete the seven)

ὁ ἄλλος οὔπω ἦλθεν, καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ [x] ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ μεῖναι. [11] καὶ τὸ θηρίον ὃ ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ * αὐτὸς ὄγδοός ἐστιν, καὶ [y] ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν, καὶ εἰς [z] ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει. [12] καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσιν, [a] οἵτινες [b] βασιλείαν οὔπω [b] ἔλαβον, ἀλλὰ ἐξουσίαν ὡς βασιλεῖς μίαν ὥραν λαμβάνουσιν μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου.

x = Mark vi. 31. 1 Pet. i. 6. v. 10. Ps. xxxvi. 10. see ch. xii. 12. Acts xiv. 28.
y = Phil. iii. 5.
z ver. 8.
a = ch. i. 7 reff.
b Luke xix. 12, 15. see Heb. xii. 28. Dan. v. 31.

δει bef αυτον B a to e j k l m 2. 4. 13-6-8-9. 26-7. 30-2-4-6-8-9. 40-2-7-8. 50. 90 Andr-coisl Areth, *oportet illum* vulg Primas. μινε (sic) bef δει ℵ(ζει ℵ[1]).

11. om 3rd και ℵ. *ουτος ℵ B(Mai) rel syr-dd: τουτο 40: αυτο 36: αυτος A[P] B(Tischdf) c f h 4. 10-7. 32-4 (1. 37. 47-8-9. 51 B[r], e sil) vulg copt Hip Andr Areth Primas Promiss. ins ο bef ογδοος ℵ 41-2.

12. for ουπω, ουκ A fuld: om k: txt [P] ℵ(ουτω ℵ[1]) B 1 rel? (αλλα, so Aℵ f g.) εξουσιν ℵ[1]. aft βασιλεις ℵ[1] wrote βα, but marked it for erasure.

is not yet come (I agree with Auberlen, der Prophet Daniel, pp. 304 ff., in regarding this seventh as the *Christian empire* beginning with Constantine; during whose time the beast in his proper essence, in his fulness of opposition to God and His saints, ceases to be), **and when he shall come he must remain a little time** (certainly the impression we derive from these words is not as Düsterd., al., that his empire is to be of very short continuance, but the ὀλίγον, as in ref. 1 Pet., gives the idea of some space not assigned, but vaguely thus stated as "some little time." The idea given is rather that of duration than of non-duration. Herodotus, iv. 81, says of the river Exampæus, τοῦ καὶ ὀλίγον τι πρότερον τούτων μνήμην εἶχον, but it was twenty-nine chapters back. See for the usage of this book itself, ch. ii. 14, iii. 4; not xii. 12, where the context decides ὀλίγον to be emphatic. Here, the stress is on δεῖ μεῖναι, and not on ὀλίγον: on the fact of *some* endurance, not on its being but short). **And the beast, which was and is not** (as in ver. 8, whose peculiar power and essence seem suspended while the empire is Christian by profession. But observe, the seventh is for all that a veritable head, and like the others carries names of blasphemy. The beast is not actually put out of existence, but has only received a deadly wound which is again healed, see ch. xiii. 3, notes), **he himself** (or, **this**) **also is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth unto perdition** (this eighth, the last and worst phase of the beast, is not represented as any one of his heads, but as being *the beast himself* in actual embodiment. He is ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά, —not, "*one of* the seven," but, the successor and result of the seven, following and springing out of them. And he εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει—does not fall like the others, but goes on and meets his own destruction at the hand of the Lord Himself. There can be little doubt in the mind of the student of prophecy, *who* is thus described: that it is the ultimate antichristian power, prefigured by the little horn in Daniel, and expressly announced by St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff., as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας,—as ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ). **And the ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings** (not necessarily personal kings: see on ver. 10 above: but kingdoms, regarded as summed up in their kings) **which** (οἵτινες, kings of that kind who) **have not yet received a kingdom, but receive power as kings** (the ὡς βασιλεῖς is somewhat enigmatical. Auberlen suggests, whether the kingly power itself may not have passed away from these realms in the days of antichristian misrule, and thus their power be only ὡς βασιλεῖς. But this seems inconsistent with their being *called* βασιλεῖς. Rather I would say the ὡς represents the reservation of their kingly rights in their alliance with the beast) **one hour** (i. e. during the space of one hour: just as ἡμίωρον in ch. viii. 1 is during the space of half an hour. Some, e. g. Vitringa and Elliott, have upheld the meaning, for μίαν ὥραν μετά, of "at one and the same time with." From the use of ποίαν ὥραν in ch. iii. 3, we might concede such usage to be within the bare limits of possibility; though even thus the μίαν μετά, for "one and the same with," is a hard saying. But we are not to enquire in our exegesis, what *may* possibly *be*, but what probably *is*. And I venture to say that but for a preconceived opinion, no one would ever have thought of any other meaning for

c = 1 Cor. i. 10. (var. 17 (b).) d ch. ii. 16 reff. e (Dan. ii. 47.) ch. xix. 16. see 1 Tim. vi. 15. f ch. xix. 20 reff. g Rom. i. 7. 1 Cor. i. 2. Jude 1 al. h Rev., here only. 2 John 1, 13. Matt. xxiv. 31 al. freq. Ps. lxxxviii. 4. i ver. 1 reff. k plur., ch. vii. 9 reff. l ch. v. 9 reff.

13 οὗτοι μίαν c γνώμην ἔχουσιν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν αὐτῶν τῷ θηρίῳ διδόασιν. 14 οὗτοι μετὰ τοῦ ἀρνίου d πολεμήσουσιν, καὶ τὸ ἀρνίον νικήσει αὐτούς, ὅτι e κύριος κυρίων ἐστὶν καὶ e βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, καὶ οἱ f μετ' αὐτοῦ g κλητοὶ καὶ h ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί. 15 καὶ λέγει μοι Τὰ ὕδατα ἃ εἶδες, οὗ ἡ i πόρνη κάθηται, kl λαοὶ καὶ ὄχλοι εἰσὶν καὶ l ἔθνη καὶ l γλῶσσαι. 16 καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες, καὶ τὸ θηρίον, οὗτοι μισήσουσιν τὴν i πόρνην, καὶ

13. εχουσιν bef γνωμην B rel Andr-coisl: εχουσιν γυναικα (sic: om και) k: txt A[P]ℵ g h 1. 10-7-8. 36 (16. 37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg Hip. rec ins την bef εξουσιαν, with [P]ℵ rel Hip Andr: om A B a c f g k l 2. 4. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 30-2-3-4-8-9. 41-2. 47 to 51 Andr-coisl Areth. (d def.) rec εαυτων, with 1. 33 (40-2, e sil): txt A[P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr Areth. rec (for διδοασιν) διαδιδωσουσιν, with vulg copt Tich Primas: δωσουσιν 18 Andr-a: txt A[P]ℵ B 1(δῖασιν with δο written over) 33(sic, Del) rel am syr-dd arm Andr Areth Iren-int.

14. for και (aft κλητοι) οτι 1.

15. for λεγει, ειπεν A; *dixit* vulg lat-ff. for τα υδατα, ταυτα ℵ1: ταυτα τα υδατα ℵ3c. om η ℵ1(ins ℵ3a). ins και bef λαοι ℵ.

16. rec (for 2nd και) επι, with (34, e sil) Areth: txt A[P]ℵ B 33(sic, Del) rel am(with demid fuld lips-5) syr-dd Hip Andr Primas.

these words than the ordinary one, "for the space of one hour." And thus accordingly we will take them, as signifying some definite space, unknown to us, thus designated: analogous in position to the ὀλίγον above) **together with** (i. e. in conjunction with, allied with: their power will be associated with his power) **the beast** (who are these? The answer seems to be furnished us in Dan. vii. 23 ff. They are ten kingdoms which shall arise out of the fourth great kingdom there: ten European powers, which in the last time, in concert with and subjection to the antichristian power, shall make war against Christ. In the precise number and form here indicated, they have not yet arisen. It would not be difficult to point out the elements and already consolidating shapes of most of them: but in precise number we have them not as yet. What changes in Europe may bring them into the required tale and form, it is not for us to say). **These have** (the present is used in describing them, though they have not yet arisen) **one mind** (one and the same view and intent and consent), **and give their might and their power to the beast** (becoming his allies and moving at his beck). **These shall war with the Lamb** (in concert with the beast, ch. xix. 19), **and the Lamb shall conquer them, because He is Lord of lords and King of kings, and they who are with Him** (νικήσουσιν αὐτούς also: the verb is implied in νικήσει above) **called and chosen** (all the called are not chosen, Matt. (xx. 16,) xxii. 14: but all that are chosen are first called, 2 Pet. i. 10) **and faithful** (this way of taking this clause is far better than with Bengel to make κλ. κ. ἐκλ. κ. πιστοί into predicate, "and they that are with him are called and chosen and faithful." For 1) it can clearly be no co-ordinate reason with the other assigned for the Lamb's victory, that *His followers are*, &c., and 2) the arrangement of the sentence seems against this view, seeing that in the former case the predicate is put forward, and in this we should have expected it also: καὶ κλ. κ. ἐκλεκτ. κ. πιστοὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ).

15—18.] *Explanation of various particulars regarding the harlot, and of the harlot herself.* **And he saith to me, The waters which thou sawest, where** (οὗ, like ὅπου in ver. 9, = ἐφ' ὧν) **the harlot sitteth, are peoples and multitudes and nations and languages** (so in Isa. viii. 7, the king of Assyria and his invading people are compared to the waters of the river, strong and many. There is also doubtless an impious parody intended in the position of the harlot to that of Him who sitteth above the water-flood and remaineth King for ever, Ps. xxix. 10). **And the ten horns which thou sawest, and the beast** (viz. in that compact and alliance just now mentioned), **these shall hate the harlot** (we now enter upon prophetic particulars other than those revealed in the vision, where the harlot

[m] ἠρημωμένην [n] ποιήσουσιν αὐτὴν καὶ γυμνήν, καὶ τὰς [o] σάρκας αὐτῆς [op] φάγονται, καὶ αὐτὴν [qr] κατακαύσουσιν [ἐν] [r] πυρί. 17 ὁ γὰρ θεὸς [s] ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν ποιῆσαι τὴν [t] γνώμην αὐτοῦ [καὶ ποιῆσαι [u] γνώμην μίαν,] καὶ δοῦναι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν τῷ θηρίῳ, [v] ἄχρι [w] τελεσθήσονται οἱ λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ. 18 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἣν εἶδες ἔστιν ἡ [x] πόλις ἡ [x] μεγάλη ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς.

m Matt. xii. 25 ‖ L. ch. xviii. 16, 19 only. Ezek. xxvi. 19. xxxvi. 10 al.
n = ch. xii. 15. Gen. xxxiv. 30.
o ch. xix. 18. Levit. xxvi. 29.
p James v. 3 reff. & note.
q ch. viii. 7 reff.
r [ch. xviii. 8. Jer. vii. 31, w. ἐν] Matt. iii. 12 ‖ L.
s = 1 Thess. iv. 8. Heb. viii. 10, from Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 33. Neh. vii. 5.
t = here only. Ezra vii. 23.
u = ver. 13.
v w. fut. ind., here only. [see Luke xiii. 35.]
w = ch. x. 7 reff.
x ch. xvi. 19 reff.

ερημωμενην 1. om και γυμνην B-txt(Tischdf) c j 1. 50-txt.—aft γυμνην ins ποιησουσιν αυτην B-marg rel Andr-coisl Areth: om A[P]א g 32 (16-8. 38, e sil) Andr-coisl Areth. καυσουσιν [for κατακ.] 1. om εν [P]א B m Andr-coisl.

17. for 1st αυτων, αυτου א[1]. for αυτου, αυτων א[3a]. om και ποιησαι γνωμην μιαν A vulg Andr-a Tich: א[3a] would om και ποιησαι.—rec μιαν bef γνωμην, with [P]א 1. 17 Andr-p: μιαν γνωμην αυτων g: γνωμην αυτων m: γνωμην μιαν B rel Andr-coisl Areth. for 2nd αυτων, αυτω A: αυτου B f: txt [P]א g rel. rec τελεσθη (for -θησονται): τελεσθωσιν B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]א h 1. 10-7-9. 27. 37. 49. 51 B[r] Hip Andr. rec (for οι λογοι) τα ρηματα: txt A[P]א B rel Hip Andr Areth.

18. om last η א b g: for η εχ., μη εχουσαν f. for βασιλεων, βασιλειων א. ins επι bef της γης B-corr a b d e k l 2. 9. 13-9. 26-7. 30-3. 40-1-2. 50: των επι 16. 39.

was sitting on the beast. Previous to these things coming to pass, she must be cast down from her proud position), **and shall make her deserted and naked** (contrast to ver. 4. Her former lovers shall no longer frequent her nor answer to her call: her rich adornments shall be stripped off. She shall lose, at the hands of those whom she formerly seduced with her cup of fornication, both her spiritual power over them and her temporal power to adorn herself), **and shall eat her flesh** (batten upon her spoils; confiscate her possessions: or perhaps, as the same expression, Ps. xxvii. 2; Micah iii. 2 ff., where it is used to indicate the extreme vengeance of keen hostility. So Xen. Hell. iii. 3. 6, says of the hatred between the Helots, Periœci, &c., and the pure Spartans, ὅπου γὰρ ἐν τούτοις (the Helots, &c.) τις λόγος γένοιτο περὶ Σπαρτιατῶν, οὐδένα δύνασθαι κρύπτειν τὸ μὴ οὐχ ἡδέως ἂν καὶ ὠμῶν ἐσθίειν αὐτῶν), **and shall consume her with** (or, in) **fire** (Düsterd. remarks that in the former clause the figure of a *woman* is kept: in this latter the thing signified, a *city*. But this need not absolutely be; the woman may be here also intended: and all the more probably, because the very words ἐν πυρὶ κατακαύσουσιν are quoted from the legal formula of the condemnation of those who had committed abominable fornications: cf. Levit. xx. 14, xxi. 9. The burning of the city would be a signal fulfilment: but we cannot positively say that that, and nothing else, is intended). **For God put it** (reff.: the aor. is proleptic) **into their hearts to do His mind,** [**and to make one mind** (ποιῆσαι is in the same sense each time—to put in practice: this they do in regard both to God's mind and their own common mind, the two being the same. The identity is not asserted, which would require τὴν μίαν γνώμην αὐτῶν, but implied),] **and to give their kingdom** (i.e., as above, the authority of their respective kingdoms) **to the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled** (the prophetic words or discourses,—not ῥήματα, but λόγοι,—respecting the destruction of Babylon). **And the woman whom thou sawest, is the great city, which hath kingdom over the kings of the earth** (every thing here is plain. The "septem urbs alta jugis toto quæ præsidet orbi," Propert., can be but one, and that one Rome. The pres. part., ἡ ἔχουσα, points to the time when the words were uttered, and to the dominion then subsisting. It has already been seen, that the prophecy regards Rome pagan and papal, but, from the figure of an harlot and the very nature of the predictions themselves, more the latter than the former. I may observe in passing, that the view maintained recently by Düsterd., after many others, that the whole of these prophecies regard Pagan Rome only, receives no countenance from the words of

XVIII. [1] Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην. καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐφωτίσθη ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. [2] καὶ ἔκραξεν ⌜ἐν⌝ ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ λέγων Ἔπεσεν ⌜ἔπεσεν⌝ Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, καὶ ἐγένετο κατοικητήριον δαιμονίων καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς ὀρ-

CHAP. XVIII. 1. rec at beg ins και, with h l m 1. 10-7. 34-5-6 (37-8. 49 B^r, e sil) vulg Andr Primas: om A [P] ℵ B rel syr-dd copt Hip Andr-p Areth Tich Cassiod. rec om αλλον, with f 1. 33-4: ins A [P] ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth arm Hip Andr Areth lat-ff.—αγγελον bef αλλον c 2. 4. 17 8-9. 32. 48-9 lips-6 Andr-coisl Areth: αγγελον ετερον B^r.

2. εκεκραξεν A. om εν ℵ B b c d f g j l m 1. 2. 9 (16). 26-7. 32-3-4-5-8-9. 40-1-7-8. 50 Hip Andr-a Areth Primas. rec (for ισχυρα) ισχυι, with Andr-b, and aft φωνη ins μεγαλη, with 1: txt A [P] ℵ B rel am(with fuld lipss) syr-dd copt arm Andr-p. —ισχυραν φωνην a c k 16. 39. 40-7. 50-1. [om λεγων P.] om 2nd επεσεν ℵ B rel copt æth Andr-coisl Areth Primas: ins A [P(adding a third)] g h 10-7. 36 (1. 37. 41-7-9, e sil) vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Tich. ins η bef βαβυλων B f. rec δαιμονων (for -νιων), with [P] rel Hip Andr Areth: txt Aℵ B g. aft 1st ακαθαρτου ins και μεμισημενου A 16. om 4th to 5th και (homœotel) [P] 1. 48, and to end of ver c f l. for ορνεου, θηριου A.

this verse, which this school of Commentators are fond of appealing to as decisive for them. Rather may we say that this verse, taken in connexion with what has gone before, stultifies their view entirely. If the woman, as these Commentators insist, represents merely the stone-walls and houses of the city, what need is there for μυστήριον on her brow,—what appropriateness in the use of all the Scripture imagery, long familiar to God's people, of spiritual fornication? And if this were so, where is the contest with the Lamb,—where the fulfilment of any the least portion of the prophecy? If we understand it thus, nothing is left for us but to say, as indeed some of this school are not afraid to say, that only the Seer's wish dictated his words, and that history has not verified them. So that this view has one merit: it brings us at once face to face with the dilemma of accepting or rejecting the book: and thereby, for us, who accept it as the word of God, becomes impossible. For us, who believe the prophecy is to be fulfilled, what was Rome then, is Rome now. Her fornications and abominations, as well as her power and pride, are matter of history and of present fact: and we look for her destruction to come, as we believe it is rapidly coming, by the means and in the manner here foretold).

CH. XVIII. 1—XIX. 10.] THE DESTRUCTION OF BABYLON. And herein, XVIII. 1—3.] *Announcement of the destruction.* The Seer does not see the act of destruction: it is prophesied to him in ch. xvii., and now announced, as indeed it had been by anticipation before, ch. xiv. 8, as having taken place. **After these things I saw another angel** (another besides the one who shewed him the vision in the last chapter: or, perhaps, as it is natural to join the ἄλλον in some measure with the participle following,—another besides the last who came down from heaven, ch. x. 1) **coming down out of heaven** (the Seer is still on the earth) **having great power** (possibly, as Elliott suggests, as the executor of the judgment that he announced. If so, the announcement is still anticipatory, see ver. 21), **and the earth was lighted up by his glory** (ἐκ, as the source of the brightness): **and he cried with** (or, in) **a mighty voice saying, Babylon the great is fallen** ⌜**is fallen**⌝, **and is become an habitation of dæmons** (see especially LXX, Isa. xxxiv. 14 ff.), **and a hold** (a place of detention: as it were an appointed prison) **of every unclean spirit, and a hold of every unclean and hated bird** (see the prophecy respecting Babylon, Jer. l. 39): **because by** (out of, as source: or, according to the other reading, of) **the wrath of her fornication all the nations have fallen** (or, according to the other reading, **drunk**: see on ch. xiv. 8. The use of the θυμός is even more remarkable here: **of** (or, by) **that wine**

καυθήσεται· ὅτι [r] ἰσχυρὸς [κύριος] ὁ θεὸς ὁ [s] κρίνας
[9] Καὶ * κλαύσουσιν καὶ [t] κόψονται [t] ἐπ' αὐτὴν οἱ
εῖς τῆς γῆς οἱ μετ' αὐτῆς [u] πορνεύσαντες καὶ [v] στρη-
ντες, ὅταν βλέπωσιν τὸν [w] καπνὸν τῆς [x] πυρώσεως
[10] [y] ἀπὸ [y] μακρόθεν ἑστηκότες διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ
ινισμοῦ αὐτῆς, λέγοντες Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ ἡ [a] πόλις ἡ
λη, Βαβυλὼν ἡ πόλις ἡ [b] ἰσχυρά, ὅτι [c] μιᾷ ὥρᾳ
ἡ [d] κρίσις σου. [11] καὶ οἱ [e] ἔμποροι τῆς γῆς [f] κλαί-
καὶ [f] πενθοῦσιν [g] ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὅτι τὸν [h] γόμον αὐτῶν

r = ch. v. 2. x. 1. ver. 21. Deut. x. 17. s = John xvi. 11. Acts vii. 7. 1 Cor. v. 13. ch. xix. 2 al. Ps. v. 10. t ch. i. 7 reff. u ch. ii. 14 reff. v ver. 7. w ch. viii. 4 reff. x ver. 18. 1 Pet. iv. 12 only. Prov. xxvii. 21. (-ροῦν, ch. i. 15.) y Rev., vv. 15, 17 only. Matt. xxvi. 58. xxvii. 55 al. Ps. xxxvii. 12 AN[a]. z ver. 7. a ch. xvi. 19 reff. b = 1 Cor. i. 27. Ezek. xxvi. 17 A. c vv. 16, 19. d John xii. 31. Jer. xxxi. (xlviii.) 21. ver. 3. f Mark xvi. 10. Luke vi. 25. James iv. 9. vv. 15, 19. Neh. i. 4. g = ver. 9. ch. i. 7. Hos. x. 5. h here bis. Acts xxi. 3 only. Exod. xxiii. 5 only.

θανατου B. om κυριος A g vulg æth: ins C[P]ℵ[3a] B rel syr-dd Hip Andr Cypr. (ο θ̄ς ο κ̄ς ℵ[1]: om ὁ θεος c k 6 Areth Primas.) rec κρινων, with 1. 4. 18. 33 (26-7. 30-2. 48, e sil) Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ[1] B rel Hip Andr-p. tful.)

rec κλαύσονται, with Aℵ 1. 36. 51. 90 Hip Andr-p: κλαυσουσιν C[P] B r Areth. rec adds αυτην, with [P] 1. 17-8. 35; ταυτην 36: om ACℵ B rel copt Hip Andr-coisl Areth Cypr. (om from αυτην ver 8 to επ' αυτην in this 33.) rec επ αυτη, with A g j 1. 38 Andr-a: om f: αυτων 16: txt C[P]ℵ B rel Hip oisl Areth. om και στρηνιασαντες (hom) ℵ[1]: ins ℵ[3a]: ℵ[3c] adds further ναξωσιν. for βλεπ., ιδωσιν ℵ. for καπνον, καρπον 1. πτωσεως ℵ[1]. rec ins εν bef μια ωρα, with 1. 88 syr-dd copt Andr Areth: om C[P]ℵ B rel vulg dr-coisl Tich Primas.—μιαν ωραν A. ft γης ins σου ℵ. κλαυσουσιν and πενθησουσιν B rel vss Hip Andr-coisl Primas: txt AC[P]ℵ 1. 10-7 (g h 37. 49 B[r], e sil) Andr. rec επ' αυτη, el: επ' αυτης m: επ' αυτους B: εφ' εαυτους 38: εν εαυτοις 1: εν αυτη A: txt 16[2]-8. 32-9 Hip.

nce): **and with fire shall she be** (the punishment of the fornicatress; xvii. 16 note. Whether this is to erstood of the literal destruction of *y of Rome* by fire, Elliott iv. 43, is doubtful, considering the mystical ter of the whole prophecy): **be- strong is [the Lord] God who hath . her** (a warrant for the severity of ıdgment which shall befall her). **9—20.**] *The mourning over her:* st, **9, 10**, *by the kings of the earth.* **here shall weep and mourn over** hen the catalogue of mourners has begin, the fact of mourning is ı forward by the verbs being placed but below, ver. 11, when we come second member, the persons, as the ature, are put forward before the ἐπ' αὐτήν, as the direction and ging of their lamentation) **the of the earth, who committed forni- and luxuriated** (see above, ver. 7) **her, when they see the smoke r burning, standing afar off on ıt of their fear of her torment** eature in the prophecy is an objec- o the literal understanding of its details. It can hardly be imagined that the kings should bodily stand and look as described, seeing that no combination of events contemplated in the prophecy has brought them together as yet), **saying, Woe, woe, the great city, Babylon the strong city, because in one hour has come thy judgment.** **11—16.**] *Lamentation of the merchants.* **And the merchants of the earth weep and lament** (the construction passes into the graphic present, but resumes the future again below, ver. 15, in speaking of the same thing) **over her, because no one any longer buys their cargo** (reff.: so Eustath. in Wetst.: φόρτος νηός, ὃ καὶ γόμος. The description which follows is perhaps drawn, in its poetic and descriptive features, from the relation of Rome to the world which then was, rather than from its relation at the future time depicted in the prophecy. But it must not for a moment be denied, that the character of this lamentation throws a shade of obscurity over the interpretation, otherwise so plain from the explanation given in ch. xvii. ult. The difficulty is however not confined to the application of the pro-

οὐρανοῦ, καὶ [v] ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ [w] ἀδικήματα αὐτῆς. 6 [x] ἀπόδοτε αὐτῇ ὡς καὶ αὐτὴ [x] ἀπέδωκεν καὶ [y] διπλώσατε [τὰ] [z] διπλᾶ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς· ἐν τῷ [a] ποτηρίῳ [b] ᾧ [c] ἐκέρασεν [c] κεράσατε αὐτῇ [z] διπλοῦν. 7 [de] ὅσα [f] ἐδόξασεν αὐτὴν καὶ [g] ἐστρηνίασεν, [e] τοσοῦτον [h] δότε αὐτῇ [i] βασανισμὸν καὶ [k] πένθος, ὅτι [l] ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς λέγει ὅτι [m] κάθημαι [n] βασίλισσα καὶ [o] χήρα οὐκ εἰμὶ καὶ [k] πένθος οὐ μὴ ἴδω. 8 διὰ τοῦτο ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἥξουσιν αἱ [p] πληγαὶ αὐτῆς, θάνατος καὶ [k] πένθος καὶ λιμός· καὶ [q] ἐν [q] πυρὶ

v acc., Matt. xvi. 9. 1 Thess. ii. 9. 1 Chron. xvi. 12.
w Acts xviii. 14. xxiv. 20 only. 1 Kings xxvi. 18.
x Matt. vi. 4 al. fr. [Psa. cxxxvi. 8.] see Jer. xxvii. (l.) 15.
y here only †.
z here bis. Matt. xxiii. 15. 1 Tim. v. 17 only. Isa. xl. 2. Jer. xvi. 18. Zech. ix. 12.
a ch. xiv. 10. b attr., 1 John iii. 24 reff. c ver. 10. ch. xiv. 10 only. Prov. ix. 2. d constr acc., Rom. vi. 10. Gal. ii. 20. e Heb. i. 4. vii. 20, 22. x. 25. f Heb. v. 5 reff. g ver. [illegible] only †. see ver. 3 reff. h = 2 Thess. i. 8. i ch. ix. 5. xiv. 11. vv. 10, 15 only †. k [illegible] 3ce. ch. xxi. 4. James iv. 9 only. Gen. l. 4. (-θεῖν, ver. 11.) l Isa. xlvii. 8. Zeph. ii. 15. Ps. xi[illegible] m = (-ίζειν) Isa. l. c. see Virg. Æn. i. 50. n = Matt. xii. 42 ||. Acts viii. 27 only. Jer. xxxvi. (xxix. [illegible] o James i. 27 al. = Isa. l. c. p ver. 4. q here [ch. xvii. 16 (reff.)] only.

6. rec (aft απεδωκεν) ins υμιν, with c h 1. 4. 10-7. 36 (47-8-9 Br, e sil) Areth Primas: ημιν arm Andr: om AC[P]ℵ B rel am(with tol al, agst lipss al) syr-dd copt æth Hip Andr-coisl Tich spec. om 2nd και ℵ. rec aft διπλωσατε ins αυτη, with [P] rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth: om ACℵ B a b d e f g j k 2. 9. 19 Andr Areth.—rec om τα, with A[P] B rel Andr Areth: ins Cℵ a b d e f j k 26-7. 30-3. 42. 50. 90 Hip.—αυτα διπλα 38. aft διπλα ins ως και αυτη και B a b d e (f) j k 2. 9. 19. 26-7. 30. 51. (homœotel in m, τα εργα αυτης 1st and 2nd.) aft ποτηριω ins αυτης ℵ B rel copt: om AC[P] g h 10 (c 4. 17-8. 27. 32, e sil). κερασετε 1(Del: -σατε Treg). for αυτη, αυτην B.

7. rec (for αυτην) εαυτην, with ℵ[3c] rel Hip Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B(supplied by corr) a b e j l 2. 9. 16. 27. 30-3. 49. 50-1. 90, αυτη 41-2. for τοσουτον δοτε, κερασατε 1. om και πενθος 1[1](ins marg). 10-2. 37. 49. for 1st οτι, και 1. rec om 2nd οτι, with 1 (l 16-7. 39, e sil) vulg Hip Andr-p Tich: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth Primas. for καθημαι, καθιω B f: ειμι καθως b: καθως a d e k 2. 9. 19. 26-7. 40-1-2. 50-1. 82(Del). 90: καθως καθημαι 30-3.

8. om 1st και B a b d e j k m 2. 4. 6. 9. 26-7. 30[1]-3-4-5-8. 40-1-7-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-

have), share in her punishment.⌋ ⌈It was through lingering fondness that Lot's wife became a sharer in the destruction of Sodom)⌋: **because her sins** (not as De W. the *cry* of her sins: but the idea is of a heap: see below) **have reached** (κολλᾶσθαι is put here after the analogy of the Heb. דָּבַק, which, see Gesen. Lex. p. 312, is used for *assecutus est, proxime accessit ad,* Gen. xix. 19; Jer. xlii. 16, al. Gesenius compares *hærere in terga hostium,* Liv. i. 14; *in tergis,* Tacit. hist. iv. 19; Curt. iv. 15. Bengel gives it well, *accumulata pervenerunt*) **as far as heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Repay to her** (the words are now addressed to the executioners of judgment) **as she also repaid** (cf. ref. Jer., καθὼς ἐποίησε, ποιήσατε αὐτῇ. The latter ἀπέδωκεν is used, not in its strict propriety, but as corresponding to the other. Hers was a giving, this is a giving back: we have exactly the same construction, which was probably in mind here, used also of Babylon, in ref. Ps., μακάριος ὃς ἀνταποδώσει σοι τὸ ἀνταπόδομά σου, ὃ ἀνταπέδωκας ἡμῖν), **and double [the] double according to her works** (so in reff. Isa. and Jer.). **In the cup** (see above, ch. xvii. 4, also xiv. 8, and our ver. 3) **which she mixed, mix for her double** (see ch. xiv. 10: a double portion of the deadly wine of God's wrath): **in proportion as** (lit., in as many things as) **she glorified her** (self: possibly ruled into this form αὐτήν by the continual recurrence of the various cases of αὐτή in the context), **and luxuriated** (see above, ver. 3, and ref. 1 Tim. note), **so much torment and grief give to her. Because in her heart she saith** (that) **I sit a queen** (see ref. Isa., from which the sense and even the single words come, being there also said of Babylon. Similarly also Ezek. xxvii. 1 ff., of Tyre), **and am not a widow** (ref. as above), **and shall never see sorrow** (= οὐδὲ γνώσομαι ὀρφανίαν, Isa. l. c.). **For this cause in one day shall come her plagues, death and mourning and famine** (from Isa. xlvii. 9, where however we have ἀτεκνία καὶ χηρεία. The judgments here are more fearful: death, for her scorn of the prospect of widowhood; mourning, for her inordinate revelling; famine, for her

[q] *κατακαυθήσεται· ὅτι* [r] *ἰσχυρὸς* [κύριος] *ὁ θεὸς ὁ* [s] *κρίνας αὐτήν.* [9] Καὶ * *κλαύσουσιν καὶ* [t] *κόψονται* [t] *ἐπ' αὐτὴν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς οἱ μετ' αὐτῆς* [u] *πορνεύσαντες καὶ* [v] *στρηνιάσαντες, ὅταν βλέπωσιν τὸν* [w] *καπνὸν τῆς* [x] *πυρώσεως αὐτῆς,* [10] [y] *ἀπὸ* [y] *μακρόθεν ἑστηκότες διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ* [z] *βασανισμοῦ αὐτῆς, λέγοντες* Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ *ἡ* [a] *πόλις ἡ* [a] *μεγάλη,* Βαβυλὼν *ἡ πόλις ἡ* [b] *ἰσχυρά, ὅτι* [c] *μιᾷ ὥρᾳ ἦλθεν ἡ* [d] *κρίσις σου.* [11] *καὶ οἱ* [e] *ἔμποροι τῆς γῆς* [f] *κλαίουσιν καὶ* [f] *πενθοῦσιν* [g] *ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὅτι τὸν* [h] *γόμον αὐτῶν*

r = ch. v. 2. x. 1. ver. 21. Deut. x. 17.
s = John xvi. 11. Acts vii. 7. 1 Cor. v. 13. ch. xix. 2 al. Ps. v. 10.
t ch. i. 7 reff.
u ch. ii. 14 reff.
v ver. 7.
w ch. viii. 4 reff.
x ver. 18. 1 Pet. iv. 12 only. Prov. xxvii. 21. (-ροῦν, ch. i. 15.)
y Rev., vv. 15, 17 only. Matt. xxvi. 58. xxvii. 55 al. Ps. xxxvii. 12 Aℵ[3a].
z ver. 7.
a ch. xvi. 19 reff.
b = 1 Cor. i. 27. Ezek. xxvi. 17 A.
c vv. 16, 19.
d John xii. 31. Jer. xxxi. (xlviii.) 21.
e ver. 3.
f Mark xvi. 10. Luke vi. 25. James iv. 9. vv. 15, 19. Neh. i. 4.
g = ver. 9. ch. i. 7. Hos. x. 5.
h here bis. Acts xxi. 3 only. Exod. xxiii. 5 only.

..ηλθεν .. 33. ACPℵ B .. to m, 1. .4. 6. 9. 0. 16 o 19. 26- . 30-2. 4 to 42. 7 to 51. 0 Br.

coisl.—*θανατου* B. om *κυριος* A g vulg æth: ins C[P]ℵ[3a] B rel syr-dd Hip Andr Areth Cypr. (*ο θς ο κς* ℵ[1]: om *ὁ θεος* c k 6 Areth Primas.) rec *κρινων*, with ℵ[3a] c 1. 4. 18. 33 (26-7. 30-2. 48, e sil) Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ[1] B rel Hip Andr-p. (g doubtful.)

9. * rec *κλαύσονται*, with Aℵ 1. 36. 51. 90 Hip Andr-p: *κλαυσουσιν* C[P] B rel Andr Areth. rec adds *αυτην*, with [P] 1. 17-8. 35; *ταυτην* 36: om ACℵ B rel syr-dd copt Hip Andr-coisl Areth Cypr. (om from *αυτην* ver 8 to *επ' αυτην* in this 33.) rec *επ αυτη*, with A g j 1. 38 Andr-a: om f: *αυτων* 16: txt C[P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth. om *και στρηνιασαντες* (*hom*) ℵ[1]: ins ℵ[3a]: ℵ[3c*] adds further *και στεναξωσιν*. for *βλεπ.*, *ιδωσιν* ℵ. for *καπνον*, *καρπον* 1. *πτωσεως* ℵ[1].

10. rec ins *εν* bef *μια ωρα*, with 1. 38 syr-dd copt Andr Areth: om C[P]ℵ B rel vulg Hip Andr-coisl Tich Primas.—*μιαν ωραν* A.

11. aft *γης* ins *σου* ℵ. *κλαυσουσιν* and *πενθησουσιν* B rel vss Hip Andr-coisl Areth Primas: txt AC[P]ℵ 1. 10-7 (g h 37. 49 Br, e sil) Andr. rec *επ' αυτη*, with rel: *επ' αυτης* m: *επ' αυτους* B: *εφ' εαυτους* [illegible]: *εν εαυτοις* 1: *εν αυτη* A: txt C[P]ℵ 16[2]-8. 32-9 Hip.

abundance): **and with fire shall she be burnt** (the punishment of the fornicatress; see ch. xvii. 16 note. Whether this is to be understood of the literal destruction of the *city of Rome* by fire, Elliott iv. 43, is surely doubtful, considering the mystical character of the whole prophecy): **because strong is [the Lord] God who hath judged her** (a warrant for the severity of the judgment which shall befall her).

9—20.] *The mourning over her:* and first, 9, 10, *by the kings of the earth.* **And there shall weep and mourn over her** (when the catalogue of mourners has yet to begin, the fact of mourning is thrown forward by the verbs being placed first: but below, ver. 11, when we come to the second member, the persons, as the new feature, are put forward before the verbs. *ἐπ' αὐτήν*, as the direction and converging of their lamentation) **the kings of the earth, who committed fornication and luxuriated** (see above, ver. 7) **with her, when they see the smoke of her burning, standing afar off on account of their fear of her torment** (this feature in the prophecy is an objection to the literal understanding of its details. It can hardly be imagined that the kings should bodily stand and look as described, seeing that no combination of events contemplated in the prophecy has brought them together as yet), **saying, Woe, woe, the great city, Babylon the strong city, because in one hour has come thy judgment.**

11—16.] *Lamentation of the merchants.* **And the merchants of the earth weep and lament** (the construction passes into the graphic present, but resumes the future again below, ver. 15, in speaking of the same thing) **over her, because no one any longer buys their cargo** (reff.: so Eustath. in Wetst.: *φόρτος νηός, ὃ καὶ γόμος*. The description which follows is perhaps drawn, in its poetic and descriptive features, from the relation of Rome to the world which then was, rather than from its relation at the future time depicted in the prophecy. But it must not for a moment be denied, that the character of this lamentation throws a shade of obscurity over the interpretation, otherwise so plain from the explanation given in ch. xvii. ult. The difficulty is however not confined to the application of the pro-

οὐδεὶς ἀγοράζει οὐκέτι, 12 [h]γόμον χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ [i]λίθου [i]τιμίου καὶ [i]μαργαριτῶν καὶ [k]βυσσίνου καὶ [l]πορφύρας καὶ [m]σηρικοῦ καὶ [n]κοκκίνου καὶ πᾶν ξύλον [o]θύϊνον καὶ πᾶν [p]σκεῦος [q]ἐλεφάντινον καὶ πᾶν [p]σκεῦος ἐκ [r]ξύλου [s]τιμιωτάτου καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου καὶ [u]μαρμάρου, 13 καὶ [v]κιννάμωμον καὶ [w]ἄμωμον καὶ [x]θυμιάματα

i ch. xvii. 4 (reff.). k ver. 16. ch. xix. 8 (bis), 14 only. l 1 Chron. xv. 27. Esth. i. 6. (-σσος, Luke xvi. 19.) l Mark xv. 17, 20. Luke xvi. 19 only. (-ροῦς, ch. xvii. 4.) Exod. xxv. 4. m here only †. n ch. xvii. 3, 4 reff. o here only †. 3 Kings x. 11 Symm. p ch. ii. 27 reff. q here only. Ezek. xxvii. 15 al. r here only †. s superl., ch. xxi. 11 only †. Wisd. xii. 7 only. u here only †. Epist. Jer. 72. (-ρινος, Cant. v. 15.) v here only. Exod. xxx. 23 al. w here only †. x ch. v. 8 reff.

12. *γομον χρυσουν και αργυρουν και λιθους τιμιους και μαργαριτας* C[P].—rec *μαργαριτου*, with B rel: *μαργαριταις* A: txt ℵ g m. for 3rd *και*, *ουτε* 1. rec (for *βυσσινου*) *βυσσου*, with h 1. 10-7-8. 36. 49 (37 B[r], e sil) Hip Andr: txt AC[P] B rel Andr-coisl Areth, *βυσσινων* ℵ. *και πορφυρου* B rel Andr-p Areth: om A Ansb: txt C[P]ℵ g m 16-8. 34 (35-6-9 B[r], e sil) Hip Andr. om *και σηρικου* 1. for *ξυλον*, *σκευος* A [*ξυλινον* P]. om *εκ* C 18. for *ξυλου*, *λιθου* A vulg æth. om *και μαρμαρου* ℵ 1.

13. rec (for *κινναμωμον*) *κιναμ.*, with k m 10: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel.—*-μωμου* B a b c e j[2] k l Hip. rec om *και αμωμον*, with ℵ[3a] rel copt Andr Areth Primas: ins AC[P]ℵ[1] c m 6. 11-2-7. 34-5-6 am(with fuld tol lips) syr-dd æth Hip Andr-coisl. *θυμιαμα* [for *-ματα*] 1: *-ματος* f.

phecy to Rome papal, but extends over the application of it to Rome *at all*, which last is determined for us by the solution given ch. xvii. ult. For Rome never has been, and from its very position never could be, a great commercial city. I leave this difficulty unsolved, merely requesting the student to bear in mind its true limits, and not to charge it exclusively on that interpretation which only shares it with any other possible one. The main features of the description are taken from that of the destruction of and lamentation over Tyre in Ezek. xxvii., to which city they were strictly applicable. And possibly it may be said that they are also applicable to the church which has wedded herself to the pride of the earth and its luxuries. But certainly, as has been observed, the details of this mercantile lamentation far more nearly suit London, than Rome at any assignable period of her history), **a cargo of gold, and of silver, and of precious stone, and of pearls, and of fine linen manufacture** (*βυσσίνου* is the neut. adj. from *βύσσος*), **and of purple, and of silken stuff** (in describing Vespasian's triumph, Jos., B. J. vii. 5. 4, says, *κἀκεῖνοι χωρὶς ὅπλων ἦσαν ἐσθήσεσι σηρικαῖς, ἐστεφανωμένοι δάφναις*) **and of scarlet stuff, and** (the accusative is now taken up instead of the genitive governed by *γόμον*, which latter is however resumed below at *ἵππων*, and again dropped at *ψυχάς*) **all citron wood** (the wood of the *θύον*, *θύα*, or *θυΐα*, the citrus of the Romans (Plin. iii. 29), probably the cupressus thyioides, or the thyia articulata. Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. v. 5, thus describes it: *τὸ δὲ θύϊον, οἱ δὲ θυΐαν καλοῦσι, παρ' Ἀμμωνίδι γίνεται, καὶ ἐν τῇ Κυρηναίᾳ· τὴν μὲν μορφὴν ὅμοιον κυπαρίττῳ καὶ τοῖς κλάδοις καὶ τοῖς φύλλοις καὶ τῷ στελέχει καὶ τῷ καρπῷ* . . . . *ἀσαπὴς* . . . . *ὅλως τὸ ξύλον, οὐλότατον δὲ τὴν ῥίζαν ἐστί, καὶ ἐκ ταύτης τὰ σπουδαιότατα ποιεῖται τῶν ἔργων.* It was used for costly doors, with fittings of ivory, Ath. v. 205 B, 207 F, and for tables, Strabo iv. 310 A. It had a sweet smell, Plin. ut supra, "Nota etiam Homero fuit; *θύον* Græce vocatur, ab aliis thya. Hanc igitur inter odores uri tradit in deliciis Circes . . . magno errore eorum qui odoramenta in eo vocabulo accipiunt, cum præsertim eodem versu cedrum laricemque una tradat: in quo manifestum est de arboribus tantum locutum." But Pliny is clearly wrong: for Homer's words are *πῦρ μὲν ἐπ' ἐσχαρόφιν μέγα καίετο, τηλόθι δ' ὀδμὴ Κέδρου τ' εὐκεάτοιο θύου τ' ἀνὰ νῆσον ὀδώδει Δαιομένων*, Od. ε. 60. See Wetst. for more illustrations, and Winer, Realw. art. Thinenholz), **and every article of ivory, and every article of most costly wood, and of brass, and of iron, and of marble; and cinnamon** (it is not certain, whether the *κιννάμωμον* or *κίνναμον*, קִנָּמוֹן, of the ancients was the same as our cinnamon. Various accounts are given of its origin (see Winer, Realw. art. Zimmt, and Theophr. plant. ix. 4; Strabo xvi. p. 778; Diod. Sic. ii. 49, iii. 46), but Herodotus, who (iii. 111) ascribes it to the country where

καὶ [y] μύρον καὶ [z] λίβανον καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ [a] σεμίδαλιν καὶ σῖτον καὶ [b] κτήνη καὶ πρόβατα καὶ [c] ἵππων καὶ [d] ῥεδῶν καὶ [e] σωμάτων, καὶ [f] ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων. 14 καὶ ἡ [g] ὀπώρα σου τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ πάντα τὰ [h] λιπαρὰ καὶ [τὰ] [i] λαμπρὰ [j] ἀπώλετο [j] ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ οὐκέτι αὐτὰ οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσιν. 15 οἱ [k] ἔμποροι

y John xi. 2. xii. 3, 5 ... Luke vii. 37, 38, 46. xxiii. 56 only. Exod. xxx. 25.
z Matt. ii. 11 only. Levit. ii. 1, 2, 16 al. (-νωτός, ch. viii. 3.)
a here only. Gen. xviii. 6 al.
b Luke x. 34. Acts xxiii. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 39 only. Num. xx. 4.
c ch. vi. 2 reff.
d here only †.
e = Gen. xxxiv. 29. 2 Macc. viii. 11. Tobit x. 11.
f Ezek. xxvii. 13. 1 Chron. v. 21.
g here only. Jer. xxxi. (xlviii.) 32. xlvii. (xl.) 10, 12 only.
h here only. Neh. ix. 35. Isa. xxx. 23 only.
i = Luke xxiii. 11. James ii. 2, 3. ch. xix. 8 al.† (Wisd. vi. 12 al.)
j Deut. iv. 26 al.
k vv. 3, 11.

om *και μυρον* C. om *και οινον* B a b e (f?) j k l 2. 6. 9. 16-9. 26-7. 30. 50-1. 90.—*κ. ελαιον* bef *κ. οινον* c (f?) 32. *κ. προβατα* bef *κ. κτηνη* B rel-scr 2. 9. 34(-5, e sil) 38 *to* 43. 47-8. 50-1 Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ g h rel Andr-coisl Areth.

14. om ἡ C. rec *τ. επιθυμ. τ. ψυχης* bef *σου*, with B rel vss Hip Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ g 35 am(with fuld tol) Primas. *ριπαρα* ℵ[1]. om 2nd *τα* Cℵ. rec (for *απωλετο*) *απηλθεν*, with 1 Andr-a: *απωλοντο* ℵ d(appy) h l m 10-6. 37-9. 49 B[r]: om 90: txt AC[P] B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Hip Andr-coisl Areth Primas. rec *ου μη ευρ.* bef *αυτα*, with rel syr-dd Andr Areth: *ου μη αυτα ευρ.* Aℵ g 38 Hip: txt C[P] B a b d e f j l 16. 26-7. 30-9. 40-8. 50-1. 90.—rec (for *ευρησουσιν*) *ευρησης*, with 17. 26-7; *ευρησεις* h 1. 10. 37. 49: *ευρης* B rel Hip Andr Areth, *ευρεις* l: txt AC[P]ℵ m 34-5-6. 51. 90 vulg syr-dd æth Andr-coisl

Dionysus was born, i. e. to India, seems to give the right statement, if at least it is the modern cinnamon, which comes from Ceylon. In ref. Exod. it is an ingredient in the holy oil for anointing: in Prov. vii. 17 it is one of the perfumes of the bed of the adulteress: in Cant. iv. 14 it is one of the plants growing in the garden of the beloved) **and amomum** (a precious ointment made from an Asiatic shrub, and used for the hair: see the numerous citations from Ovid, Martial, &c., in Wetst., and Plin. H. N. xii. 13 (28)), **and odours** (for incense), **and ointment, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine meal** (**σεμίδαλις**, the *simila* or *similago* of the Latins, the finest wheaten meal: see Wetst. and Palm and Rost sub voce), **and wheat, and cattle and sheep, and of horses and of chariots** ("Rheda genus vehiculi iv. rotarum," Isidor. xx. 17 in Wetst., who also quotes Lampridius to the effect that Alexander Severus "rhedas senatoribus omnibus ut argentatas haberent permisit: interesse Romanæ dignitatis putans ut his tantæ urbis senatores versarentur." Quintilian, i. 5, ascribes to the word a Gallic origin: "plurima Gallica valuerunt, ut rheda et petorritum, quorum altero Cicero tamen, altero Horatius utitur") **and of bodies** (i. e. slaves. The expression is blamed by the Atticists as not used by the ancients: so Pollux, iii. 78, *σώματα ἁπλῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴποις, ἀλλὰ σώματα δοῦλα*. And so Phrynichus, p. 378, *σώματα ἐπὶ τῶν ὠνίων ἀνδραπόδων, οἷον σώματα πωλεῖται, οὐ χρῶνται οἱ ἀρχαῖοι.* Lobeck, in his note there, shews that Plato and Demosthenes use *σώματα* for any kind of men indefinitely (Plato, Legg. x. 114: Dem. p. 910), and it is the appropriating it to *σώμ. δοῦλα* alone which constitutes the later usage),—**and** (the accus. here comes in after genitives) **persons of men** (so the E. V. for נֶפֶשׁ אָדָם, ref. Ezek. which the LXX render as here, *ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων*. But in Gen. xxxvi. 6, for כָּל־נַפְשׁוֹת בֵּיתוֹ, they have *πάντα τὰ σώματα τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ*, where also E. V. has *persons*. It seems vain to attempt to draw a distinction between the *σώματα* and *ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων*. If any is to be sought, the most obvious is that pointed out by Bengel, and adopted by Ewald, Hengstb., and Düsterd., that the *σωμάτων* expresses such slaves as belong to the horses and chariots, and *ψυχὰς ἀνθρ.* slaves in general). 14.] This verse takes the form of a direct address, and then in the next the merchants are taken up again. From this some have thought that it is not in its right place: e. g. Beza and Vitringa fancied it should be inserted after ver. 23: others, as Ewald, that it was originally a marginal addition by the Writer. But irregular as is the insertion, it need not occasion any real difficulty. It takes up the *κλαίουσιν κ. πενθοῦσιν* of ver. 11, as if *αὐτῶν* after those verbs had been *ἡμῶν*, which is not unnatural in a rhapsodical passage. And *τούτων*, ver. 15, refers very naturally back to *πάντα τὰ λιπαρὰ κ.τ.λ.*, in this verse. **And thy harvest of the desire of thy soul** (i. e. the ingathering

τούτων οἱ [l] πλουτήσαντες [m] ἀπ' αὐτῆς [n] ἀπὸ [n] μακρόθεν στήσονται διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ [o] βασανισμοῦ αὐτῆς [p] κλαίοντες καὶ [p] πενθοῦντες, 16 λέγοντες Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ ἡ [q] πόλις ἡ [q] μεγάλη, ἡ [r] περιβεβλημένη [s] βύσσινον καὶ [t] πορφυροῦν καὶ [s] κόκκινον, καὶ [u] κεχρυσωμένη [ἐν] χρυσίῳ καὶ λίθῳ [s] τιμίῳ καὶ [s] μαργαρίτῃ, ὅτι [v] μιᾷ ὥρᾳ [w] ἠρημώθη ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος. 17 καὶ πᾶς [x] κυβερνήτης καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἐπὶ τόπον [y] πλέων καὶ [z] ναῦται καὶ ὅσοι τὴν θάλασσαν [a] ἐργάζονται, [n] ἀπὸ [n] μακρόθεν ἔστησαν 18 καὶ ἔκραξαν βλέποντες τὸν [b] καπνὸν τῆς [b] πυρώσεως αὐτῆς, λέγοντες [c] Τίς ὁμοία

l w. ἀπό, here only. Sir. xi. 18. ἐκ, vv. 3, 19.
m see Matt. xv. 27.
n ver. 10.
o ver. 7.
p ver. 11.
q ch. xvi. 19 reff.
r ch. vii. 9 reff.
s ver. 12.
t ch. xvii. 4 reff. (-ρα, ver. 12.)
u ch. xvii. 4 only. Exod. xxvi. 32, 37.
v ver. 10.
w ch. xvii. 16 reff.
x Acts xxvii. 11 only. Prov. xxiii. 34. Ezek. xxvii. 8, 27, 28 only. (-νῶν, Prov. xii. 5. -νησις, 1 Cor. xii. 28.)
y Luke viii. 23. Acts xxi. 3. xxvii. 2, 6, 24 only. Jonah i. 3. w. ἐπί, here only.
z Acts xxvii. 27, 30 only †.
a = here only. exx. in Wetst. see Ps. cvi. 23.
b ver. 9.
c ch. xiii. 4.

15. ins και bef κλαιοντες B a *to* f j k l 9.

16. rec at beg ins και, with [P] rel vulg Hip Andr: om ACℵ B a b c d f j 1. 4. 9. 17-8-9. 37-8. 50: om λεγ. also 1. 39: for λεγοντες, λεγουσιν B 26. om 2nd ουαι B a b d e f j k 9. 10-3-6-8. 26-7. 39. 40-2-8. 50-1. 90. ℵ[1] has πολις μενη, omg η μεγαλη η περιβεβλη, which is supplied by ℵ[3a]. om 3rd ἡ A. for βυσσινον, βυσσον B a b e f j k l 2. 6. 10-3-9. 26. 40-1-2-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-p: txt ACℵ rel Hip Andr Areth, [βυσινον P,] βυσσυνον 1. (om -μενη to -μενη 9. 27.) κοκκ. κ. πορφ. κ. βυσσ. A. [πορφυραν P b m 40. om 2nd και P.] om 3rd και 1. κεχρυσωμενον ℵ. om εν A[P] B rel Andr-coisl Areth: ins Cℵ 1. 10-6. 36 (6. 37, e sil) Hip Andr. rec (for χρυσιω) χρυσω, with ℵ 1. 10-7. 36 (f 37. 49, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P] B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth. om τιμιω B. rec μαργαριταις, with B rel vss Hip Andr Areth Tich: txt AC[P]ℵ g Primas. ερημωθη 1 (so ver 19). [om ὁ P g.]

17. rec (for ο επι τοπον πλεων) επι των πλοιων ο ομιλος, with 1 Hip Andr-a: ὁ επι των πλοιων πλεων h 4. 6. 17. 32-6-7. 49 Andr Areth Tich: επι των πλοιων πλεων [P] 10. 34. 48: πλεων επι των πλοιων c: ο επι πλοιων πλεων B[r]: txt AC rel am(with fuld) syr-dd arm Primas, ο επι τον τοπον πλεων ℵ B.

18. rec εκραζον, with ℵ B rel Andr Areth: εκραυγαζον 9. 13. 27: om και εκραξαν 38: txt AC[P] g m 35, *clamaverunt* vulg Tich. rec (for βλεποντες) ορωντες, with 1. 34: txt AC[P] B rel Hip Andr Areth, λεγοντες (but corrd to txt eadem manu) ℵ[1] for καπνον, τοπον A vulg: txt C[P]ℵ B rel. om τις C.

of the dainties and luxuries which thy soul lusted after. It seems better on account of the following genitives to take ὀπώρα thus, than to understand it in the concrete of the fruit itself, though it frequently has this latter sense: see Palm and Rost's Lex. and the reff. here) **has departed from thee, and all (thy) fat things and [thy] splendid things have perished from thee, and they (men) shall never more at all find them.** The next two verses describe, in strict analogy with vv. 9, 10, the attitude and the lamentation of these merchants. **The merchants of these things** (viz. of all those mentioned in vv. 12, 13, which have been just summed up as πάντα τὰ λιπαρὰ κ.τ.λ.) **who gained wealth from her, shall stand afar off by reason of their fear of her torment, weeping and mourning, saying, Woe, woe, the great city, which was clothed in stuff of fine linen and of purple and of scarlet, and bedecked** (lit. *gilded;* the zeugmatic construction carrying on the word to the other substantives besides χρυσίῳ, which we cannot do in English) **in** (or, if ἐν be omitted, *with*) **golden ornament and precious stone and pearl: because** (ὅτι gives a reason for the οὐαὶ οὐαί) **in one hour hath been desolated all that wealth.**

17—19.] *The lamentation of the ship-masters, &c.* **And every pilot and every one who saileth any whither** (the same expression, without the preposition, is found in Acts xxvii. 2. The words here import, all sailors from place to place), **and sailors and as many as make traffic of the sea** (τ. θάλασσαν ἐργάζεσθαι, 'mare exercere,' to live by seafaring, is abundantly illustrated by Wetst. from the classics and later writers), **stood afar off, and cried out when they saw the smoke of her burning, saying, Who is like to**

τῇ [q] πόλει τῇ [q] μεγάλῃ; [19] καὶ [[d] ἐπ]έβαλον [de] χοῦν ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἔκραξαν [p] κλαίοντες καὶ [p] πενθοῦντες, λέγοντες Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ ἡ [q] πόλις ἡ [q] μεγάλη, ἐν ᾗ [f] ἐπλούτησαν πάντες οἱ ἔχοντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ [f] ἐκ τῆς [g] τιμιότητος αὐτῆς, ὅτι [v] μιᾷ ὥρᾳ [w] ἠρημώθη. [20] [h] εὐφραίνου ἐπ' αὐτῇ οὐρανὲ καὶ οἱ [i] ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ [k] ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ [lk] προφῆται, ὅτι [l] ἔκρινεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ [m] κρίμα ὑμῶν [l] ἐξ αὐτῆς.

[21] Καὶ ἦρεν [n] εἷς [o] ἄγγελος [o] ἰσχυρὸς λίθον ὡς [p] μύλινον μέγαν, καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, λέγων Οὕτως [q] ὁρμήματι βληθήσεται Βαβυλὼν ἡ [r] μεγάλη [r] πόλις, καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ ἔτι. [22] καὶ [s] φωνὴ [t] κιθαρῳδῶν καὶ [u] μουσικῶν καὶ [v] αὐλητῶν καὶ [w] σαλπιστῶν οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι, καὶ [x] πᾶς [y] τεχνίτης πάσης [z] τέχνης [x] οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ

d Josh. vii. 6. e Mark vi. 11 only. Isa. iii. 2. f ver. 3. g here only +. h ch. xi. 10 reff. Deut. xxxii. 43. i ch. xi. 18 reff. k Luke xi. 49. (1 Cor. xii. 28, 29.) Eph. ii. 20. iii. 5. iv. 11. 2 Pet. iii. 2. l ch. vi. 10. Ps. xliii. 1. see Ps. cxviii. 84. m ch. xvii. 1 reff. n ch. viii. 13 reff. o ch. v. 2. x. 1. p here only +. (-ικός, Luke xvii. 2 only +.) q here only. Hos. v. 10. (see Jer. xxviii. [li.] 63, 64.)

r ch. xvi. 19 reff. s = 1 Cor. xiv. 7, 8. ch. i. 10 al. Ezek. xxvi. 13. t ch. xiv. 2 only +. u here only. Ezek. l. c. 1 Macc. ix. 41. v Matt. ix. 23 only +. (-λος, 1 Cor. xiv. 7.) w here only +. x 1 John ii. 21 reff. y Acts xix. 24, 38. Heb. xi. 10 only. Deut. xxvii. 15. 1 Chron. xxix. 5. z = Acts xviii. 3 (xvii. 29) only. 1 Chron. xxviii. 21.

aft πολει ins ταυτη C vulg Primas.

19. rec εβαλον, with [P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr Areth, εβαλαν C: επεβαλον A syr-dd, επεβαλλον g. της κεφαλης ℵ. rec εκραζον, with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth, *clamabant* Primas: txt AC 35 Hip, *clamaverunt* vulg. om κλαιοντες και πενθουντες A 1: ins aft λεγοντες 13. 27: λεγ. και πεν. κλαι. 9. aft πενθ. ins και [P] B rel am(with lips-5-6) syr-dd Andr Areth Primas: om ACℵ g m 1. 34 (f 27. 35. 40, e sil) vulg-ed(with demid fuld) copt Hip Andr-a. om 2nd ουαι ℵ e g 37. 40-1-2. rec om τα, with m 1. 4. 17-8. 34 (c 6. 35-6. 48, e sil) Andr Areth: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel Hip Andr-coisl.

20. rec επ' αυτην, with [P] 1. 17. 36. 51 (m 90, e sil) Andr: εν αυτη A k: txt Cℵ B(Tischdf) rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth. rec om 2nd και οι, with C 1. 17: ins A[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld lips-5) syr-dd copt Hip Andr Areth Tich Primas.

21. om ισχυρος A syr-dd Tich: λιθον ισχυρον ℵ[1]: λιθον ισχυρος ℵ[3c]: ισχυρον λιθον 40. rec (for μυλινον) μυλον, with [P] B rel Hip Andr Areth: λιθον ℵ: txt A, μυλικον C, *molarem* vulg. aft λεγων ins οτι ℵ 39. aft ετι ins εν αυτη ℵ B f.

22. om 1st και ℵ 1. σαλπιγγων ℵ m 35. 90. om πασης A copt: om πασης τεχνης ℵ. om last clause (*hom*) ℵ a c k m 38. 40. 90.

the great city? And they cast [on] earth upon their heads (see besides ref. Ezek. xxvii. 30: also 1 Sam. iv. 12; 2 Sam. i. 2, xiii. 19, xv. 32; Job ii. 12; Lam. ii. 10; and the numerous references in Winer, art. Trauer), **and cried out weeping and mourning, saying, Woe, woe, the great city, in** (ἐν is ambiguous at first appearance: but from what follows it cannot be merely local, as E. V. "*wherein*," but must be of the conditional element in which: "*whereby*" would more nearly give it in our idiom) **which all who have their ships in the sea became rich out of her costliness** (her costly treasures: concrete meaning for the abstract term): **for in one hour she hath been laid waste.**

20.] *The angel concludes with calling on the heavens and God's holy ones to rejoice at her fall.* **Rejoice over her thou heaven, and ye saints and ye apostles and ye prophets, for God hath judged your judgment upon her** (hath exacted from her that judgment of vengeance which is due to you: see reff.).

21—23.] *Symbolic proclamation by an angel of Babylon's ruin.* **And one** (or *a*) **strong angel took up a stone great as a millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with a rush shall be thrown down Babylon the great city, and shall never be found any more. And the sound of harpers and musicians and flute-players and trumpeters shall never be heard in thee any more, and every artisan of every art shall never be found in thee any more, and the sound of the millstone** (see Jer. xxv. 10, Heb. and E. V., not

a Matt. xviii. 6. xxiv. 41. Mark ix. 42 only. Exod. xi. 5. (-λινος, ver. 21.)
b Jer. xxv. 10.
c = ch. xxi. 23 reff.
d ver. 3. Isa. xxiii. 8.
e ch. vi. 15 reff.
f ch. xix. 20.
g here only. Exod. vii. 11, 22. viii. 18 B. Wisd. xviii. 13. (-κεία, Gal. v. 20. Isa. xlvii. 9. -κον, ch. ix. 21. -κός, ch. xxi. 8. xxii. 15.)

ἐν σοὶ ἔτι, καὶ [a] φωνὴ [a] μύλου οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι, 23 καὶ [b] φῶς λύχνου οὐ μὴ [c] φανῇ [ἐν] σοὶ ἔτι, καὶ [b] φωνὴ [b] νυμφίου καὶ [b] νύμφης οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι, ὅτι οἱ [d] ἔμποροί σου ἦσαν οἱ· [e] μεγιστᾶνες τῆς γῆς, ὅτι [f] ἐν τῇ [g] φαρμακίᾳ σοῦ [h] ἐπλανήθησαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. 24 καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ αἷμα [i] προφητῶν καὶ [i] ἁγίων εὑρέθη καὶ πάντων τῶν [k] ἐσφαγμένων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

XIX. 1 Μετὰ ταῦτα ἤκουσα [l] ὡς φωνὴν μεγάλην ὄχλου πολλοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λεγόντων [m] Ἀλληλουΐα, ἡ [n] σωτηρία καὶ ἡ [p] δόξα καὶ ἡ [op] δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν,

h = ch. ii. 20 reff. i ch. xi. 18 reff. k ch. v. 6 reff. l ch. i. 10 al. m here, &c. (4 times) only. Psalms only, civ. tit., al[lfl]. n = ch. vii. 10. o so ch. xii. 10. p ch. iv. 11.

for μυλου, μυθου C. for ακουσθη, ευρεθη B.

23. homœotel in A 26. 51, σοι ετι at end of ver 22 to 1st σοι ετι in ver 23. om 1st και B: ins C[P]ℵ rel. om 1st εν C: ins [P]ℵ B rel.—*tibi* am(with demid fuld lipss) Primas. (*in te* vulg-ed.) φωνην ℵ[1]. ins φωνη bef νυμφης C. om οἱ (bef ἔμποροι) A g: ins C[P]ℵ B rel. (om preceding οτι a b e j k 38. 51.) rec φαρμακεια: txt AC[P]ℵ l m.

24. αιματα rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B 1. 38 vulg syr-dd copt Hip.

Chap. XIX. 1. rec at beg ins και, with f[1] h 1. 10-7. 36-8. (37. 49 B[r], e sil) æth Andr: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas. (d def.) Steph om ως, with l 1. 16-8. 47 B[r] syr-dd Andr-p Primas Tich: ins AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg copt Andr Areth.—φω. μεγ. bef ως 36. rec οχλου πολλου bef μεγαλην, with h 10-7-9 (37. 49 (B[r]?), e sil): om μεγαλην 1. 18. 40: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg-mss syr-dd arm Andr-coisl Areth Tich. rec λεγοντος, with 30-4: λεγουσαν d: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. ins[r] το bef αλληλουια 1 Andr-a. η δυναμις και η δοξα B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ[3a] (1) 4. 18. 38 (d, e sil).—om δοξα και η ℵ[1].—for δυν., τιμη 36. rec (aft δοξα) ins και η τιμη, with 1. 6. 19. 35 (10. 26-7, e sil) copt Andr-p Areth: om AC[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd Andr lat-ff. rec (for του θεου) κυριω τω θεω, with 1 Andr-a: κυριω του θεου (sic) 34: τω θεω 36. 47 vulg syr-dd æth arm Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel.

LXX, where the denunciation regards Jerusalem, and is to be performed by the King of Babylon) shall never be heard in thee any more, and the light of a lamp shall never shine in (or *upon*) thee any more (still from Jer. l. c.), and the voice of the bridegroom and the bride shall never be heard in thee any more: because thy merchants were the great men of the earth, because in thy sorcery (on the form φαρμακία (= -κεία) see reff.) all the nations were deceived (see Isa. xlvii. 9—12). And in her (the angel drops the address to the fallen city, and speaks out this last great cause of her overthrow as a fact respecting her) the blood of prophets and of saints was found and of all who have been slain on the earth (i. e. naturally, of all slain for Christ's sake and His word. Compare the declaration of our Lord respecting Jerusalem, Matt. xxiii. 35).

Ch. XIX. 1—8.] *The Church's song of praise at the destruction of Babylon.* As each of the great events and judgments in this book is celebrated by its song of praise in heaven, so this also: but more solemnly and formally than the others, seeing that this is the great accomplishment of God's judgment on the enemy of His Church. Cf. ch. iv. 8 ff., introducing the whole heavenly scenery: v. 9 ff., celebrating the worthiness of the Lamb to open the book: vii. 10 ff.: xi. 15 ff., on the close fulfilment of God's judgments at the sounding of the seventh trumpet: xv. 3, on the introduction of the series of the vials: xvi. 5, on the retributive justice shewn in the pouring out of the third vial.

After these things I heard as it were a great voice of much multitude in heaven, of people saying (λεγόντων is most naturally a second dependent genitive following on ὄχλου) Hallelujah (the word so often found in the Psalter, הַלְלוּ־יָהּ, 'Praise ye Jah,' i.e. Jehovah. Perhaps

[2] ὅτι [q] ἀληθιναὶ καὶ [q] δίκαιαι αἱ [q] κρίσεις αὐτοῦ, ὅτι [r] ἔκρινεν τὴν [s] πόρνην τὴν μεγάλην, [t] ἥτις [u] ἔφθειρεν τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ [v] πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ [w] ἐξεδίκησεν τὸ [w] αἷμα τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ [w] ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῆς. [3] καὶ δεύτερον [x] εἴρηκαν [y] Ἀλληλουΐα, καὶ ὁ [z] καπνὸς αὐτῆς [z] ἀναβαίνει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. [4] καὶ ἔπεσαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες καὶ τὰ τέσσερα ζῶα, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ τῷ [a] καθημένῳ [a] ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ, λέγοντες Ἀμήν, [y] Ἀλληλουΐα. [5] καὶ φωνὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου ἐξῆλθεν λέγουσα [b] Αἰνεῖτε τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν, πάντες οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ [καὶ] οἱ φοβούμενοι αὐτὸν οἱ [c] μικροὶ καὶ οἱ [c] μεγάλοι. [6] καὶ

...αμην a.

...μικροι C.

q ch. xvi. 7.
r = ch. xviii. 8 reff.
s ch. xvii. 1 reff.
t = 1 John i. 2 reff.
u = 1 Cor. iii. 17. Jude 10 (reff.). see ch. xi. 18.
v ch. xiv. 8. xvii. 2. xviii. 3.
w ch. vi. 10 (reff.). Deut. xxxii. 43.
x perf. as aor., ch. v. 7 reff.
y ver. 1.
z ch. viii. 4 reff.
a w. dat., ch. v. 13 reff.
b Luke ii. 13, 20. xix. 37. [xxiv. 53.] Acts ii. 47. iii. 8, 9. Rom. xv. 11 (from Ps. cxvi. 1) only. dat., here only. 2 Chron. xx. 19. Jer. xx. 13 al.
c ch. xi. 18 reff.

2. om αἱ A. διεφθειρεν B rel Andr Areth: εκρινεν A: txt C[P]ℵ g m 36 (1. 47, e sil) Andr-a. for 2nd αυτου, αυτης ℵ[1]. rec ins της bef χειρος, with 1. 16-7. 34 (35-6-9. 47 Br, e sil): om AC[P]ℵ B rel Areth.

3. ειρηκεν B rel copt Areth: ειρηκασιν b f g Andr-p: ειπαν C, ειπον 38: txt A[P]ℵ m. om αυτης 1.

4. (επεσαν, so AC[P]ℵ B[2] h j l 1. 9[1]. 10. 49.) οι εικοσ. τ. πρεσβ. A B b f 1 Br Andr Primas: txt C[P]ℵ rel vulg(with am fuld, agst demid lipss tol) syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth.—rec εικοσι και τεσσαρες: κδ' B a g j k l 1. 10. 49. 50. 90 Br: txt AC[P]ℵ c d e h m 9. 32-8. 47-8. om ζωα ℵ[1]. rec του θρονου, with h j 1. 10-7-8-9. 36-8 (b 37-9. 47-9 Br, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P]ℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

5. φωναι, εξηλθον, λεγουσαι ℵ[1]. εξηλθ. bef εκ τ. θρον. ℵ. rec (for απο) εκ, with [P]ℵ h 1. 4. 10-7-8. 34 (a c f 6. 32-6-7. 47-8-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: txt AC B rel Andr-coisl Areth-comm. for θρονου, ουρανου B f. om λεγουσα 1. 12. 47. rec τον θεον, with rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]ℵ B f 9. 27. 36. 41-2. 51. 79. om 2nd και C[P]ℵ. rec ins και bef οι μικροι, with 1 (m, e sil) Andr-a: om AC[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth arm Andr Areth Primas. (of this ver only οὖνου εξηλθε is *now* left in f: the collators are silent about και, but 92 (the transcript of f) omits it.)

it is hardly justifiable to lay, as Elliott has done, a stress on this Hebrew formula of praise being now first used, and to infer thence that the *Jews* are indicated as bearing a prominent part in the following song. The formula must have passed, with the Psalter, into the Christian Church, being continually found in the LXX: and its use first here may be quite accounted for by the greatness and finality of this triumph), **the salvation and the glory and the might belong to our God: because true and just are His judgments: because He judged** (the aorr. as before are proleptic. In this case they can be rendered by the simple past in English) **the great harlot, which corrupted** (imperf.: whose habit it was to corrupt) **the earth in** (ἐν of the element of the corruption) **her fornication; and He exacted in vengeance the blood of His servants from her hand** (so almost verbatim in 4 Kings ix. 7, καὶ ἐκδικήσεις τὰ αἵματα τῶν δούλων μου τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τὰ αἵματα πάντων τῶν δούλων κυρίου ἐκ χειρὸς Ἰεζάβελ. The vengeance is considered as a penalty exacted, forced, out of the reluctant hand: see also Gen. ix. 5; Ezek. xxxiii. 6, where the verb is ἐκζητεῖν). **And a second time they said Hallelujah; and her smoke** (of her burning, ch. xviii. 9 al.: not, as Ewald, because τῆς πυρώσεως αὐτῆς is not added, of hell in general) **goeth up to the ages of the ages** (this addition gives a reason for the praise, parallel with those introduced by ὅτι before). **And the twenty-four elders and the four living-beings fell down and worshipped God who sitteth upon the throne, saying Amen: Hallelujah** (thereby confirming the general song of praise of the great multitude). **And a voice came forth from the throne** (ἀπό perhaps (De W.) gives more the direction than the actual source of the voice (ἐκ, as rec.). It is useless to conjecture whose voice it is: but we may say that (τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν) it is not that of the Lamb, as Ew. and

d ver. 1.
e ch. i. 15 reff.
f ch. vi. 1. xiv. 2. Ps. lxxvi. 18.
g see Heb. v. 7. ch. v. 2 reff.
h constr., ch. iv. 1.
i ch. xi. 17.
k ch. i. 8 reff.
l Matt. v. 12. 1 Pet. iv. 13. see John viii. 56. 1 Pet. i. 8.
m act., Luke i. 47 only. = John v. 35. viii. 56. 1 Pet. i. 6, 8. iv. 13 al. Ps. cxvii. 24. Isa. lxi. 10.

ἤκουσα [d] ὡς φωνὴν ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ ὡς [e] φωνὴν [e] ὑδάτων [e] πολλῶν καὶ ὡς [f] φωνὴν [f] βροντῶν [g] ἰσχυρῶν, [h] λέγοντες [y] Ἀλληλούϊα, ὅτι [i] ἐβασίλευσεν [k] κύριος ὁ [k] θεὸς ὁ [k] παντοκράτωρ. 7 [l] χαίρωμεν καὶ [lm] ἀγαλλίωμεν, καὶ [n] δώσομεν τὴν [n] δόξαν αὐτῷ, ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ [o] γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ ἡ [p] γυνὴ αὐτοῦ [q] ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν. 8 καὶ [r] ἐδόθη αὐτῇ [r] ἵνα [s] περιβάληται [t] βύσσινον [u] λαμπρὸν καθαρόν, τὸ γὰρ [t] βύσσινον τὰ [v] δικαιώματα τῶν [w] ἁγίων ἐστίν.

n ch. xi. 13 reff. o = Matt. xxii. 2, &c. xxv. 10. Luke xii. 36 al. p = ch. xxi. 9. Matt. i. 20. Deut. xxii. 24. q = ch. xxi. 2. see Gen. xxiv. 14, 44. r constr., John xvii. 4. ch. [vi. 4.] viii. 3. s ch. vii. 9 reff. t ch. xviii. 12 reff. u of clothing, Luke xxiii. 11. Acts x. 30. James ii. 2, 3. ch. xv. 6 (xviii. 14. xxii. 1, 16) †. (Sir. xxix. 22 al.) v = here only. see ch. xv. 4. w = ch. xi. 18 reff.

6. om 1st ως c d(appy) m 1[1]. 6. 12. 35, ins 1-corr: φωνην bef ως 36. om 2nd ως A b 12. Steph λεγοντας, with h 1. 10-6-7-9. 30-7. 47-9 Areth: elz λεγοντων, with A[P] g m 6. 18. 35-6-8 Andr-a, λεγουσων ℵ, *dicentium* vulg Primas: λεγοντες 39: txt B rel Andr-coisl, *dicentes* Tich. aft θεος ins ημων [P]ℵ[3a] B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Tich: om A g 1 (49. 50, e sil) copt.—ο θ̅ς ο κ̅ς ημων ℵ[1]: om κυριος d 1. 12 æth Andr.

7. rec αγαλλιωμεθα, with B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]ℵ g m 1. 12-8. 35-6. rec (for δωσομεν) δωμεν, with ℵ[1] B rel Andr Areth: txt A[P]ℵ[3a] 36 Andr-p. for αυτω, αυτων ℵ[1]: αυτου 1. for γυνη, νυμφη ℵ[3c]. om αυτου l 1. 12-6. 39.

8. rec (for λαμπρον καθαρον) καθαρον και λαμπρον, with 1. 36 Andr: καθαρον λαμπρον 17-8: λαμπρον και καθαρον B rel Andr-coisl: txt A[P]ℵ g l 79 B[r] am(with demid lips-4 lux) syr-dd copt æth Areth Primas. rec εστι bef των αγιων, with 1. 34. 40-1 vulg copt: txt A[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Primas.

Hengstb. Our Lord never spoke thus: cf. John xx. 17, note) **saying, Give praise to our God, all His servants** (cf. Ps. cxxxiv. 1), [**and**] **ye that fear Him, the small and the great** (cf. Ps. cxv. 13). **And I heard as it were the voice of much multitude** (cf. ver. 1), **and as it were the voice of many waters, and as it were the voice of strong thunders, saying** (nom. see ref.], **Hallelujah, because the Lord God Almighty reigneth** (here is a case where we cannot approach the true sense of the aor. ἐβασίλευσεν but by an English present: "*reigned*" would make the word apply to a past event limited in duration: "hath reigned" would even more strongly imply that the reign was over. It is well to note such cases, to shew the inadequacy of our past tenses to reproduce the Greek ones). **Let us rejoice and exult, and we will give the glory to Him: because the marriage of the Lamb is come** (these words introduce to us transitionally a new series of visions respecting the final consummation of the union between Christ and His Church, which brings about the end, ch. xxi. 1 ff.: the solemn opening of which now immediately follows in vv. 11 ff. This series, properly speaking, includes in itself the overthrow of the kings of the earth, the binding of Satan, the thousand years' reign, the loosing of Satan, the final overthrow of the enemy, and the general judgment: but is not consummated except in the entire union of Christ and His with which the book concludes. So that the aorr. ἦλθεν, ἡτοίμασεν, are in a measure proleptic. This figure, of a marriage between the Lord and His people, is too frequent and familiar to need explanation. Cf. in the O. T. Isa. liv. 1—8; Ezek. xvi. 7 ff.; Hos. ii. 19 f.: and in the N. T., Matt. ix. 15 || and note, xxv. 1 ff.; John iii. 29; Eph. v. 25 ff. Indeed it penetrates almost every where the thoughts and language used respecting Christ and the Church), **and his wife hath made herself ready** (is complete in her adornment, as in next verse).

And it was given to her (have we in these words still the voice of the celestial chorus, or are they merely narrative, written in the person of the Seer himself? It seems to me that the latter alternative is rendered necessary by the fact of the explanation, τὸ γὰρ κ.τ.λ., being subjoined. Düsterd. makes the song end at λαμπρόν: but this seems harsh and disjointed. Moreover the ἐδόθη is the regular formula narrandi of the book) **that** (a construction of St. John's, see reff.) **she should be clothed in fine linen raiment, bright**

9 Καὶ λέγει μοι Γράψον [x] Μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ [o] γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου [y] κεκλημένοι. καὶ λέγει μοι Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ [z] ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσιν. 10 καὶ [a] ἔπεσα [a] ἔμπροσθεν τῶν [a] ποδῶν αὐτοῦ [a] προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ. καὶ λέγει μοι [b] Ὅρα μή· [c] σύνδουλός σου εἰμὶ καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν [d] ἐχόντων τὴν [e] μαρτυρίαν [e] Ἰησοῦ· τῷ θεῷ

x Luke xiv. 15.
y = Matt. xxii. 3. John ii. 2 al. Esth. v. 12.
z = ch. xxii. 6. iii. 14.
a here only. see ch. xxii. 8.
b ch. xxii. 9. see Matt. viii. 4. Heb. viii. 5.
c ch. vi. 11 reff.
d ch. vi. 9 reff.
e ch. i. 2 reff.

9. om *γραψον* 1 vulg-ms Andr-a. for *το*, *τον* B 16. om *του γαμου* [P]א[1] 1. om 2nd *και λεγει μοι* א[1] (6?) 88. rec om *οἱ* (aft *λόγοι*), with [P](א[3a]) B rel Andr Areth: for *οι*, *μου* א[1]: txt A 4. 48.—*του θεου* bef *αληθ.* א[3a] g k. rec *εισιν* bef *του θεου*, with א[1] 1. 17 (a h 87-8. 49, e sil) Andr: txt A[P](א[3a]) B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas.

10. (*επεσα*, so A[P]א b h[1] j l m 1. 2. 10-6-7. 26-7. 35-6-9. 42-9. 50 Andr-a. (d def.)) for *εμπροσθεν*, *ενωπιον* B. [for *προσκυνησαι*, *και προσεκυνησα* P.] for *αυτω*, *αυτον* B. om 2nd *σου* א[1] 6. ins *και* bef *των εχοντων* 1. 12. rec ins *του* bef 1st *ιησου*, with 51 (2. 39. 40-7, e sil): om A[P]א B rel Andr Areth.

(and) **pure** ("Vides hic cultum gravem ut matronæ, non pompaticum qualis meretricis ante descriptus." Grot.), **for the fine linen raiment is** (imports, see Matt. xxvi. 26 reff.), **the righteousness of the saints** (i. e. their pure and holy state, attained, as in the parallel description ch. vii. 14, is declared by the elder, by their having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. The plur. -*ματα* is probably distributive, implying not many *δικαιώματα* to each one, as if they were merely good deeds, but one *δικαίωμα* to each of the saints, enveloping him as in a pure white robe of righteousness. Observe that here and every where, the white robe is not Christ's righteousness imputed or put on, but *the saints' righteousness*, by virtue of being washed in His blood. It is *their own;* inherent, not imputed; but their own by their part in and union to Him).

9, 10.] The Bride in this blessed marriage being in fact the *sum of the guests* at its celebration, the discourse passes to *their blessedness, and an assurance of the certainty of that which has been foretold respecting them. The Apostle, moved by these declarations, falls down to worship the angel, but is forbidden.* **And he saith** (who? the only answer ready to our hand is, the angel of ch. xvii. 1. Some, as Ewald and Ebrard, suppose some one angel to have been constantly with St. John throughout the visions: but there seems no reason for this) **to me, Write** (cf. ch. xiv. 13) **Blessed are they who are bidden** (see reff.: and bear in mind, throughout, our Lord's parables on this matter: Matt. xxii. 1 ff., xxv. 1 ff. Our ch. iii. 20 furnishes us with a link binding on the spiritual import to the figure) **to the supper of the marriage of the Lamb. And he saith to me** (the solemn repetition of this formula shews that what follows it is a new and important declaration), **These sayings** (cf. ch. xvii. 17. If we understand that the speaker is the angel of ch. xvii. 1, then *οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι* will most naturally include the prophecies and revelations since then) **are the true** (we should hardly be justified, in a book where *ἀληθινός* has repeatedly occurred in a sense hardly distinguishable from *ἀληθής*, in pressing it here to its more proper meaning of "*genuine*" (as Düsterd.), which would very well suit the sense in this place) (**sayings**) **of God** (are the very truth of God, and shall veritably come to pass). **And I fell down before his feet to worship him** (out of an overweening reverence for one who had imparted to him such great things: see also ch. xxii. 8, where the same again takes place at the end of the whole revelation, and after a similar assurance. The angel who had thus guaranteed to him, in the name of God, the certainty of these great revelations, seems to him worthy of some of that reverence which belongs to God Himself. The reason given by Düsterd., that in both cases John imagined the Lord Himself to be speaking to him, is sufficiently contradicted by the plain assertion, here in ch. xvii. 1, and there in ch. xxii. 8 itself, that it was not a divine Person, but simply an angel): **and he saith to me, Take heed not** (to do it): **I am a fellow-servant of thine, and** (a fellow-servant) **of thy brethren who have the testimony of Jesus** (as in reff.: on the former of which see note): **worship**

f see 1 Cor. xii. 10. 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. 2 Pet. i. 21. g Matt. iii. 16 & L. John i. 52. Acts (vii. 56.) x. 11. Ezek. i. 1. h ch. vi. 2 reff. i ch. iv. 2 reff. and note. j ch. iii. 14 reff. k Acts xvii. 31. Ps. xcv. 13. l ch. ii. 16 reff. m ch. i. 14 (reff.).

προσκύνησον· ἡ γὰρ ᵉ μαρτυρία ᵉ Ἰησοῦ ἐστιν τὸ ... τῆς ᶠ προφητείας.

11 Καὶ εἶδον τὸν ᵍ οὐρανὸν ᵍ ἠνεῳγμένον, και ... πος ʰ λευκός, καὶ ὁ ⁱ καθήμενος ⁱ ἐπ' αὐτὸν [κα... ʲ πιστὸς καὶ ʲ ἀληθινός, καὶ ἐν ᵏ δικαιοσύνῃ ᵏ ... ˡ πολεμεῖ· 12 οἱ δὲ ᵐ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ [ὡς] ᵐ φλὸξ ...

rec ins του bef 2nd ιησου, with rel Andr-coisl: om A[P]ℵ B f g 1. 16. ... —του υιου 48 Areth. (f is now defective from this point, but ... given from old collations made before the loss of the portion xix. 10 to xx...

11. rec ανεωγμενον, with B 1(-νον) rel Orig Andr Areth: txt A ... Andr-p. λευκος 1. om καλουμενος A[P] c 1. 4. 6. 17¹. ... Areth: ins aft πιστος ℵ: txt B rel vss Orig Andr-coisl Iren-int Cypr ...

12. οι is repeated aft δε in ℵ. om ως [P]ℵ B rel arm Hip ...

God (both words are emphatic: let προσκύνησις be reserved for *Him*), for (these words following are those of the *angel*, not of the Apostle, as Düsterd.: ver. 8, and ch. v. 8, where the Apostle gives explanations, are no rule for this place, where the explanation of necessity comes from the speaker, whose reason for prohibiting the offered homage it renders) **the testimony of Jesus** (the gen. Ἰησοῦ is, as before, *objective*: the testimony *borne to* Jesus by these σύνδουλοι, men and angels) **is the spirit of prophecy** (there is no real difficulty in this saying: no reason for destroying its force by making Ἰησοῦ subjective, and ἡ μαρτ. Ἰησ. to mean "the witness which proceeds from Jesus" (Düst.). What the angel says is this: Thou and I and our brethren are all ἔχοντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ (= μάρτυρες Ἰησοῦ, as uniformly in this book); and the way in which we bear this witness, the substance and essence of this testimony, is, the spirit of prophecy; ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν. This Spirit, given to me in that I shew thee these things, given to thee in that thou seest and art to write them, is the token that we are fellow-servants and brethren. Thus Vitringa: "Idem ille Spiritus qui loquitur agitque per eos qui prædicant testimonium Christo, quod agebant Apostoli, idem ipse est, qui per me loquitur, qui missus sum a Domino ut res venturi temporis tibi declararem. Tanta itaque tua quanta mea est dignitas, sumusque adeo conservi ad officia non disparia honoris et gradus a Domino appellati." It does not follow that every one of those ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ has, in the same distinguished degree, the Spirit of prophecy: but every such one *has* the same Spirit, and that one Spirit, and no other, is the Spirit of prophecy).

11—XXII. 5.] The Ex... with *the triumphal com*... *Lord and His saints* to ... 11—16), then proceeding w... *defeat and destruction* of ... *false prophet and kings* of ... 17—21), *the binding of S*... *millennial reign* (ch. xx. 1—... *binding of Satan* and *his* ... *that of the deceived nations* ... *the great general judgment* ... and terminating with *the* ... *heavens and earth*, and *the* ... *new Jerusalem* (xxi. 1—xxii. 5).

11—16.] *The triumphal c*... *of the Lord and His hosts* ... **And I saw heaven opened, a**... **white horse** (the same words ... the five following, as in ch. vi. ... wonderful that this striking ... book where symbolism is so ... itself, has not prevented the ... which have been made in ... that place. This horse and ... (symbolically) the same as t... νικῶν καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ is on the p... completion: the other horses ... riders, dark forms in His g... long procession to victory, will ... ever vanish, and war and fa... pestilence be known no more). ... **that sitteth upon him [called** ... **and true** (see ref.), and in righte... **He judgeth and warreth** (both th... being his concern in his present ... ant progress. Notice that the ... struction with the participles ... and καλούμενος is the same as tha... vi. 2). **His eyes** (the δέ, as often, ... given in English by an asyndeton, ... ing a break in the sense, passing fr... subjective to the objective descr... **[were as] a flame of fire** (ch. i. 1... batim, again beyond question iden...

εφαλὴν αὐτοῦ [n] διαδήματα πολλά, [o] ἔχων [ὀνόματα
ένα, καὶ] [p] ὄνομα [p] γεγραμμένον ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ
13 καὶ [qr] περιβεβλημένος [r] ἱμάτιον [s] βεβαμμένον
αὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ὁ [t] λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.
[u] στρατεύματα [τὰ] ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ
οις [h] λευκοῖς [v] ἐνδεδυμένοι [w] βύσσινον [x] λευκὸν κα-
15 καὶ [y] ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ [y] ἐκπορεύεται [y] ῥομ-
ξεῖα, ἵνα [z] ἐν αὐτῇ [a] πατάξῃ τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ αὐτὸς

n ch. xii. 3 reff. o so particip., ch. i. 16. p ver. 16. ch. xiv. 1. xvii. 5. q ch. vii. 9 reff. r Isa. lix. 17. s Luke xvi. 24. John xiii. 26 (bis) only. Ps. lxvii. 23. (see Isa. lxiii. 2, 3.) Levit. xiv. 6. t John i. 1, see note there. (1 John i. 1.) u ch. ix. 16 reff. see Neh. 6. v ch. i. 13 reff. w ch. xviii. 12 reff. x ch. iii. 4 (reff.). y ch. i. 16 (reff.). . vi. 8 reff. a ch. xi. 6. 1 Kings iv. 8. Zech. xiv. 18.

e sil) vulg Orig Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Cypr. διοθηματα (but corrd) :ec om ονοματα γεγραμμενα και, with A[P] 4 (c l 1. 6. 47-8, e sil) vulg Orig a Areth Iren-int Cypr: ονοματα γεγραμμενα ουδις, omg και ονομα γεγραμμενον, 9: txt B rel.—εχων ονομα οιδεν, omg all the rest, ℵ[1]. for ει, η ℵ[1]. βεβαμ., περιρεραμμενον ℵ[1]: περιρεραντισμενον ℵ[3c]: ερραντισμενον εν 32, νον [P] 36: om βεβαμ. αιματι k. rec (for κεκληται) καλειται, with 1. 4. 51 (c l 6. 16. 36-7-9. 48 B[r], e sil) Andr Areth: txt A[P]ℵ[3a] B rel æth Hip: mg το, ℵ[1].
ph om 2nd τα, with ℵ B c f j l m 1. 6. 16-8. 27. 35-8 Andr-a: ins A[P] rel r-coisl. ηκολουθουν 1. 38. for εφ', επι B rel Orig Andr-coisl Areth: ; g 1. (17) 34-6 (f 16. 38-9. 40, e sil) Andr-a. (ἔφιπποι πολλοί 17. 79 Andr-b., δυμενοις (but corrd) ℵ[1]. rec ins και bef καθαρον, with ℵ 1. 10. 34 (e 35.) Orig Andr Jer: om A[P] B rel am(with demid fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd Andr-h Iren-int Cypr.
διστομος bef οξεια B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Cypr: om A[P]ℵ 36-8. 51 (1, e ith demid fuld) copt Orig Andr-a Iren-int. om ινα 1[1]. rec πατασση 27, e sil): παραταξη 9: txt A[P] B rel Orig Andr Areth, παταξει ℵ.

id **upon His head** (accus.: see note) **many diadems** (probably βασιλεὺς βασιλέων: so Ewald, Hengstb. Certainly these are not is of the ten kings, as Züllig, al., are yet to be overthrown, ver. 19 στέφανος of ch. vi. 2 has become d in the course of the subjection world to Him): **having [names** (if these words are genuine, pro- e meaning is that the names were . on the diadems, signifying the of each), **and] a name written** is not said. From this portion of ription regarding His head, pro- the Brow) **which none knoweth Himself** (what name is indicated? y not that given below, ver. 13; these words mean that He Him- ie knows the mystery latent in ne (so Vitringa, al.). Nor again ay that it is any of the names by our blessed Lord is known to us (so Ewald, al.). But it is the τὸ ον τὸ καινόν of ch. iii. 12: some l glorious name, indicative, as ap- om the context there, of the com- inion between Him and His people, His final triumph. This name the saw written, but knew not its im- port: that, like the contents of the sealed book, being reserved for the day when He shall reveal it): **and clothed in a vesture dipped in blood** (see Isa. lxiii. 2, 3: which is clearly in contemplation here, from our ver. 15 b. This being so, it is better perhaps to avoid the idea of His own blood being in view): **and His name is called, The Word of God** (this title forms so plain a link between the Apocalypse and St. John's writings, where only it occurs, that various attempts have been made by those who reject his authorship, to deprive it of that significance. I have discussed these in the Prolegomena, § i. parr. 110, 111). **And the armies which are in heaven** (not the holy angels only, as De W. and Hengstb., but the glorified saints: the οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ of ch. xvii. 14, who are spoken of in reference to this very triumph, and are said to be κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί) **followed Him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen [raiment] white, pure** (this clothing also speaks for the saints being included in the triumphal procession: see ver. 8, and ch. vi. 11). **And out of His mouth goeth forth a sharp sword** (see ch. i. 16, ii. 12, 16), **that with** (ἐν, as invested in or with) **it he may smite the nations; and He** (there is an

b ch. ii. 27. xii. 5. Psa. ii. 9.
c ch. xiv. 20 (reff.).
d ch. (xiv. 8, 10.) xvi. 19.
e ch. i. 8 reff.
f here only.
Ps. xliv. 3.
g ver. 12.
h ch. xvii. 14. (Dan. ii. 47.) see 1 Tim. vi. 15.
i ch. viii. 13 reff.
k ch. xviii. 2. ver. 21 only. Deut. xiv. 11.
l so (-o-) ch. iv. 7 reff.

[b] ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς [a] ἐν [b] ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ· καὶ αὐτὸς [c] πατεῖ τὴν [c] ληνὸν τοῦ [d] οἴνου τοῦ [d] θυμοῦ [d] τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ [e] θεοῦ τοῦ [e] παντοκράτορος. 16 καὶ ἔχει ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν [f] μηρὸν αὐτοῦ [g] ὄνομα [g] γεγραμμένον [h] Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ Κύριος κυρίων.

17 Καὶ εἶδον [i] ἕνα ἄγγελον ἑστῶτα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ, καὶ ἔκραξεν [ἐν] φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων πᾶσιν τοῖς [k] ὀρνέοις τοῖς [l] πετομένοις ἐν [m] μεσουρανήματι Δεῦτε [n] συνάχθητε [n] εἰς τὸ [o] δεῖπνον τὸ μέγα τοῦ θεοῦ, 18 ἵνα [p] φάγητε [p] σάρκας

m ch. viii. 13. xiv. 6 only†. n ch. xvi. 14, 16 reff. (Ezek. xxxix. 17, 18.) o ver. 9. Luke xiv. 16 al. Dan. i. 16 (v. 1 Theod.) only. p ch. xvii. 16. James v. 3. Levit. xxvi. 29.

rec ins και bef της οργης, with 1 (g, e sil) Andr: om A(ℵ) B rel vulg cop. æth arm Orig Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Tich.—της οργης bef του θυμου ℵ(marks of erasure have been put over της οργης, but removed). om last του 1.

16. om επι το ιματιον και A æth-rom Cassiod. (for ιματιον, μετωπον g.) om 2nd επι ℵ. for τον, των 1. rec ins το bef ονομα, with 1 Andr-a: om A[P]ℵ B rel Orig Andr Areth.

17. for ενα, αλλον ℵ: om B rel syr-dd Andr-a Tich: ενα αλλον m 35 Andr-coisl: txt A[P] g h l 17. 38 (1. 37. 41-7-9 Br, e sil) vulg Andr Areth Primas. εκραξεν B g tol. aft εκραξεν ins εν ℵ B b e f j k l m 2. 13. 26-7. 42. 50-1. 90. om λεγων 1. 12. 36. 49. rec πετωμενοις, with [P] c k l 32 (2. 37-9. 40-1, e sil): txt Aℵ B rel Andr Areth. μεσουρανισματι 1. 33[: μισουρανηματι P]. rec (for συναχθητε) και συναγεσθε: om 1: txt A[P]ℵ B rel am(with demid fuld lipss tol, agst lips-6) syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth. rec (for το μεγα του) του μεγαλου, with 1. 36 (49, e sil) lips-6 Andr-a: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas Tich. (τον μεγα k 4. 6. 16. 26. 34-5-9. 40-1-8. 90: τον μεγαν b c m 32.—τον δειπνον το μεγα d e g h, τον δ. τον μεγαν 38.)

emphasis in this and the following clause on **αὐτός**, which however would be too strongly rendered by "*himself*") **shall rule** (see ch. ii. 27, xii. 5, and note) **them** (masc.; their component members being in the Writer's mind) **with a rod of iron: and He** (and none other, as we know from Isa. lxiii. 3) **treadeth** (it is His office to tread) **the winepress of the wine of the fierceness of the wrath** (of the outbreaking of the anger: see on ch. xvi. 19) **of Almighty God. And He hath upon His vesture and upon His thigh a name written** (i.e. most naturally, written at length, partly on the vesture, partly on the thigh itself; at the part where, in an equestrian figure, the robe drops from the thigh. The usual way of taking the words is to suppose the *καί* epexegetic or definitive of the former words, "on His vesture," and that on the part of it covering His thigh. So De W., Düsterd., al. Others imagine (so Grot., al.) a sword, on the hilt of which the name is inscribed. But there is no trace of this in the text. Wetst. quotes Cicero, Verr. iv. 43, "Signum Apollinis pulcherrimum, cujus in femore literulis minutis argenteis nomen Myronis erat inscriptum:" and Pausanias, Eliac. extr., ἀνάθημα . . . ἀνδρὸς εἰκὼν . . . ἐλεγεῖον δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸ γεγραμμένον ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ μηροῦ, Ζηνὶ θεῶν βασιλεῖ μ' ἀκροθίνιον ἐνθάδ' ἔθηκαν Μενδαῖοι. See also Herod. ii. 106, where the inscription runs across the chest from shoulder to shoulder), **King of Kings, and Lord of Lords** (ch. xvii. 14).

17—21.] *Defeat and destruction of the beast and the false prophet and the kings of the earth:* preceded by (17, 18) an *angelic proclamation*, indicating the vastness of the slaughter.

And I saw an (one) angel standing in the sun (not only as the place of brightness and glory becoming the herald of so great a victory, but also as the central station in mid-heaven for those to whom the call was to be made): **and he cried with a great voice, saying to all the birds which fly in mid-heaven, Come, be gathered together** (see, on the whole of this proclamation, Ezek. xxxix. 17 ff., of which it is a close reproduction; also Matt. xxiv. 28) **to the great banquet of God, that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains of thousands, and the flesh of strong men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit**

βασιλέων καὶ [p] σάρκας [q] χιλιάρχων καὶ [p] σάρκας [r] ἰσχυρῶν καὶ [p] σάρκας ἵππων καὶ τῶν καθημένων ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ [p] σάρκας πάντων [s] ἐλευθέρων τε καὶ [s] δούλων καὶ [t] μικρῶν καὶ [t] μεγάλων. [19] καὶ εἶδον τὸ θηρίον καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ [u] στρατεύματα αὐτῶν [u] συνηγμένα [v] ποιῆσαι τὸν [v] πόλεμον μετὰ τοῦ [w] καθημένου [w] ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ [u] στρατεύματος αὐτοῦ. [20] καὶ [x] ἐπιάσθη τὸ θηρίον, καὶ [[y] οἱ] [y] μετ' αὐτοῦ, ὁ [z] ψευδοπροφήτης ὁ [a] ποιήσας τὰ [a] σημεῖα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, [b] ἐν οἷς [bc] ἐπλάνησεν τοὺς λαβόντας τὸ [d] χάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας τῇ [e] εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ, [f] ζῶντες ἐβλήθησαν οἱ δύο εἰς τὴν [gh] λίμνην τοῦ [g] πυρὸς τῆς [i] καιομένης ἐν [k] θείῳ. [21] καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ [l] ἀπεκτάνθησαν [l] ἐν τῇ [lm] ῥομφαίᾳ

.36. .Pℵ B b › m, 1. . 4. 6. 9. 0-3. 16 › 19. 26- . 30. 2 to 35. 7 to 42. 7 to 51. 0 B[r].

q ch. vi. 15 reff. r = Matt. xii. 29 |. Josh. x. 2. s ch. xiii. 16 reff. t ver. 5. ch. xi. 18. xiii. 16. xx. 12. Ps. cxiii. 13 (21). u ver. 14. v ch. xi. 7 reff. w ch. iv. 2 reff. and note. x = John vii. 30 (xxi. 3, 10) al[5]. Acts xii. 4. (iii. 7.) 2 Cor. xi. 32 only‡. (Cant. ii. 15.) Sir. xxiii. 21 Bℵ F(not A) only. y ch. xvii. 14. Matt. xii. 3, 4. xxvii. 51. Mark i. 36. ii. 25. v. 40. Luke vi. 4. Tit. iii. 15. see John ix. 40 al. z ch. xvi. 13. a ch. xiii. 13 reff. b ch. xviii. 23. c act., ch. ii. 20 (reff.). d ch. xiii. 16, 17 reff. e ch. xiii. 14, 15 reff. Dan. iii. 18. f so Num. xvi. 30, 33. Ps. liv. 16. g ch. xx. 10, 14 (bis), 15. xxi. 8 only. (Dan. vii. 11.) h as above (g). Luke v. 1, 2. viii. 22, 23, 33 only. Ps. cvi. 36. i = ch. xxi. 8. Job xli. 11. see also ch. viii. 8. Heb. xii. 18. pres., John xv. 6. k ch. ix. 17, 18 reff. l ch. vi. 8 (reff.). m see ver. 15. ch. i. 16.

18. om from 1st και to 2nd 1. 49. rec επ' αυτων, with [P] B rel Andr Areth: επ αυτοις ℵ: txt A f. om παντων 1. rec (aft ἐλευθέρων) om τε, with 1 (9. 26?): ins A[P]ℵ B(Tischdf) rel Andr-a-coisl Areth. om και (bef μικρων) B f k 9. 30-6. 47: ins A[P]ℵ rel. aft μικρων ins τε B rel: om A[P]ℵ g m 1. 34-5. 51 (4. 6. 32 48, e sil) Andr Areth. ins των bef μεγαλων ℵ g.

19. for [3rd] και, κατα ℵ[1]. for αυτων, αυτου A c 6. 11: txt [P]ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth Tich Primas. rec om τον (bef πολεμον), with [P] B(Del) rel Synops Andr: ins Aℵ B(Mai) d e f k l 9. 13-6. 26-7. 39. 41-9. 51 Areth.

20. rec (for οι μετ' αυτου ο) μετα τουτου ο, with 1. 30 Andr-a: μετ' αυτου ο ℵ h 32-7. 49[2] B[r], μετ' αυτο ο 38 vulg Synops Andr-p Primas: ο μετ' αυτου B rel: ο μετ' αυτου ο [P(Tischdf, expr)] 33: txt A 34(omg ὁ) 41. for τη εικονι, το χαραγμα B, την εικονα ℵ[1] 38. βληθησονται 1. 38. rec την καιομενην, with B rel, *stagnum ardens igne* Promiss: txt A [P(Tischdf, expr)] ℵ, *ignis ardentis* vulg, *ignis ardentis igne* Primas. rec ins τω bef θειω, with d(perhaps) m 1. 30[2]-4-6 (c 6. 32. 49, e sil) Andr: om A[P]ℵ B rel Andr-p Areth.

on them, and the flesh of all, free as well as bond, both small and great (this proclamation is evidently not to be pressed into a place in the prophecy, nor are its details to be sought in the interpretation, as has been done by Andreas and Primasius, who hold the birds to be angels, and Brightm., who holds them to be nations and churches. The insertion is made, as above, to shew the greatness and universality of the coming slaughter). **And I saw the beast** (ch. xiii. 1) **and the kings of the earth and their armies gathered together** (as above under the sixth vial, ch. xvi. 12 ff., on the field of Harmagedon) **to make their war** (viz. that predicted above, ch. xvi. 14, xvii. 14) **with Him that sitteth upon the horse and with his army** (**στρατεύματος**, sing. probably as being *one*, and having one Head, whereas *they* are many, and under various leaders). **And the beast was taken** (reff.), **and those with him** (to wit, the **ψευδοπροφήτης**, and **οἱ λοιποί**, ver. 21: or, **and with him the false prophet**),—**the false prophet who wrought the miracles in his presence** (cf. ch. xiii. 11—17, by which it clearly appears that this false prophet is identical with that second beast), **with which he deceived those who received** (not necessarily nor probably, who *had* received, as E. V.: the aor. part. is contemporary, as usual, with the aor. verb: and is probably here used because the receiving the mark is one act, the worship (**προσκυνοῦντας**) a continued habit) **the mark of the beast and those who worshipped his image** (cf. ch. xiii. 14, 16): **the two were cast alive into the lake of fire which burneth** (the extraordinary concord, **τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς καιομένης**, appears to have been in the original text, and must be simply accepted as it stands) **with brimstone** (viz. into

a ver. 17. o Rev., here only. John vi. 26. Matt. v. 6. xiv. 20 al. Ps. ciii. 13. p ch. i. 18 reff. q ch. ix. 1, 2 reff. r Rev., here only. Mark v. 3, 4 || L. Acts xii. 6, 7 al.† Wisd. xvii. 17 only. s = ch. v. 1. 2 Cor. iii. 15. see ch. iii. 20 reff. t = Rev., here only. Mark xiv. 49, 51 al. Ps. cxxxvi. 9. u nom., ch. i. 5. v ch. xii. 9.

τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου τῇ [m] ἐξελθούσῃ [m] ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ [n] ὄρνεα [o] ἐχορτάσθησαν ἐκ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῶν.

XX. [1] Καὶ εἶδον ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα τὴν [p] κλεῖν τῆς [q] ἀβύσσου καὶ [r] ἅλυσιν μεγάλην [s] ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ. [2] καὶ [t] ἐκράτησεν τὸν [u] δράκοντα, [u] ὁ [v] ὄφις ὁ [v] ἀρχαῖος, ὅς ἐστιν διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν χίλια ἔτη, [3] καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν

—σαρ. Κ.ε. P. —χχw i. AN x b to m. 1. 2. 4. 9. 10-3 12 to 1? 35. 7. 39. 32 to 35. 37 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B[r].

21. rec (for εξελθουσῃ) εκπορευομενῃ: txt A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth.

CHAP. XX. 1. aft ειδον ins αλλον ℵ[3a] 32: aft αγγελον 39. (λον of αγγελον is not in the text of Tischdf's edn of ℵ.) om εκ του ουρανου ℵ[1]. rec κλειδα, with l 1 (f(and 92) 13. 39, e sil) Andr Areth: κλειδαν 16: txt Aℵ B rel Andr-coisl. αλυσεσιν ℵ[1]. for επι τ. χειρα, εν τῃ χειρι ℵ 38.

2. rec τον οφιν τον αρχαιον, with ℵ B rel Andr Areth: txt A. for ος, ο ℵ. ins ο bef διαβ. ℵ j 38. rec om ὁ (bef σατανας), with rel Andr: ins Aℵ B c h j m 9. 10-3-8. 27. 34-5-7-8. 41-2-7. 90. add ο πλανων την οικουμενην ολην (*from ch* xii. 9) B rel syr-dd Andr Areth: om Aℵ c g 1(e sil) 32. 47 vulg copt Andr-a Vict Aug Tich Promiss Primas. homœotel in ℵ αυτον to 1st αυτον ver 3.

Gehenna, or hell properly so called, Matt. v. 22; where also, after the millennium, Satan himself is cast, ch. xx. 10, and when their work is finally accomplished, Death and Hades, ib. 14 a. This lake of fire constitutes the second death, ib. 14 b, xxi. 8. These only, and not the Lord's human enemies yet, are cast into eternal punishment. The latter await the final Judgment, ch. xx. 11 ff.). **And the rest** (the *βασιλεῖς* and their *στρατεύματα*) **were slain with the sword of Him that sitteth on the horse, which (sword) goeth forth out of His mouth** (see Isa. xi. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 8. De Wette remarks, that it is a hint of the spiritual nature of this victory, that no battle seems actually to take place, but the Lord Himself, as in 2 Thess., destroys the adversaries with the sword out of his own mouth. But clearly, *all* must not be thus spiritualized. For if so, what is this gathering? what is indicated by the coming forth of the Lord in glory and majesty? Why is His personal presence wanted for the victory?): **and all the birds were satiated with** (out of, as the material of the satiety) **their flesh.**

CH. XX. 1—10.] THE VICTORY OVER SATAN. The next enemy now remaining is the Arch-fiend himself, who had given his might and his throne and great power (ch. xiii. 2) to the beast: whose instruments the other enemies were. The blow given to him by their overthrow is followed by his binding and incarceration for 1000 years (vv. 1—3): during which period the Saints live and reign with Christ, and judge the world, and the first resurrection takes place (vv. 4—6). But his malice and his power are not yet at an end. One final effort is permitted him at the end of that time (ver. 7), and he once more succeeds in deceiving the nations (ver. 8), who come up against the camp of the saints, and are destroyed by fire from heaven (ver. 9). He is then cast into the lake of fire with the beast and false prophet, there to be tormented for ever (ver. 10).

1—3.] *The binding of the dragon.* **And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven** (not Christ himself, as Aug., Andr., Calov., Vitr., Hengstb., al.: nor the Holy Spirit, as Joachim, Cocceius (al.?): but a veritable angel, as always before in this book) **having the key of the abyss** (of hell, the abode of the devil and his angels: see ch. ix. 1. *For this abyss* apparently is distinct from the lake of fire, a further and more dreadful place of punishment: see on ver. 10. This key had been for the purposes of God's judgments given to Satan (= Abaddon, Apollyon), and by him the locusts were let forth, ch. ix. 1—11. Now it is entrusted to other hands, and for another purpose), **and a great chain in** (so in English: Gr., *resting on, hanging upon*, as a chain naturally would be: see reff.) **his hand. And he laid hold of the dragon** (already well known from ch. xii. 3 ff., 9; xiii. 2, 4; xvi. 13), **the ancient serpent** (for the expres-

εἰς τὴν [q] ἄβυσσον, καὶ ἔκλεισεν καὶ [w] ἐσφράγισεν [x] ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ [y] πλανήσῃ ἔτι τὰ ἔθνη, ἄχρι [z] τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη· μετὰ ταῦτα [a] δεῖ [b] λυθῆναι αὐτὸν [c] μικρὸν [c] χρόνον.

[4] Καὶ εἶδον [d] θρόνους, καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, καὶ [ef] κρῖμα [f] ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς· καὶ τὰς [g] ψυχὰς τῶν [h] πεπελεκισμένων [i] διὰ τὴν [i] μαρτυρίαν [i] Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸν [i] λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ [k] οἵτινες οὐ [l] προςεκύνησαν τὸ θηρίον οὐδὲ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔλαβον τὸ [m] χάραγμα ἐπὶ τὸ [mn] μέτωπον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν [m] χεῖρα αὐτῶν, καὶ [o] ἔζησαν καὶ

w = John iii. 33 only. (cf. Matt. xxvii. 66.) Dan. vi. 17.
x Rev., ch. vi. 8 only (reff.).
y ch. ii. 20 reff.
z = ch. x. 7 reff.
a = Matt. xxiv. 6 ‖. xxvi. 54. Dan. ii. 28.
b Mark vii. 35. Luke xiii. 16. John xi. 44. ver. 7. Ps. civ. 20.
c John vii. 33. xii. 35. ch. vi. 11. Isa. liv. 7.
d Dan. vii. 9. Matt. xix. 28
e see Acts xxiv. 25. ch. xvii. 1. f Dan. vii. 22. g = Acts ii. 27 (from Ps. xv. 10), 31. ch. vi. 9 only. Wisd. iii. 1. Jos. Antt. vi. 14. 2. h here only. 3 Kings v. 18 Ald.(Tromm. -κειν, AB). i = ch. i. 9. k = ch. i. 7 reff. l w. acc., ch. xiii. 8 reff. m ch. xiii. 16 (reff.) n ch. vii. 3 reff. o = Rom. xiv. 9. ch. ii. 8. 4 Kings xiii. 21.

3. for εκλεισεν, εδησεν 1. 12. rec aft εκλεισεν ins αυτον, with 1: om Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd arm Synops Andr Areth. for επανω αυτου, εμμενως αυτον A. πλανα (for πλανηση) B rel Andr Areth: txt A g 1. 17[1](appy) Andr-a, πλανησει ℵ. rec τα εθνη bef ετι: om ετι f(perhaps, not 92) 1. 40 Andr-a Tich: txt Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Vict Primas. om τα (bef χιλια) 1. rec ins και bef μετα, with h 1. 4. 10-7. 51 (c k m 13. 26-7. 37-9. 41-2-8-9 Br, e sil) copt Andr Areth: om Aℵ B rel am(with fuld lips-4-5 tol) Vict Aug Tich Promiss Primas. rec αυτον bef λυθηναι, with ℵ h 1. 10-7 (c 49. 51 Br, e sil) Andr: αυτον λυθηναι αυτον 40: txt A B rel Areth.

4. for πεπελεκισμενων, πεπολεμημενων A: πεπελεκημενων b: txt ℵ B rel. for και οιτινες, ειτινες ουν ℵ: κ. οιτοινες (sic) 1. ου is written over the line by ℵ[1]. rec τω θηριω, with rel Andr Areth: txt Aℵ B b d f j k m 30-3-5-8. 40-2-7-8. 50. rec ουτε, with rel Andr: txt Aℵ B e f g l 2. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 30-3-5-8. 40-1-2-7-8. 50. 90 Areth. elz (for την εικονα) τη εικονι, with c e f(? not 92) g h l 9. 10-6. 33-7-9. 49. 51 Andr-a[2] p Areth: txt Aℵ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec aft μετωπον ins αυτων, with 1. 10-3-7 (h 2. 37. 49 Br, e sil) copt: om Aℵ B rel

sion and the construction, see reff.), **who is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut and sealed over him** (shut the door or cover at the top, and sealed it down. Notice, that the same absolute use of σφραγίζω in the active is found in ref. John, and apparently there only: see Palm and Rost, sub voce), **that he might deceive the nations no more** (there does not appear to be the least ground for Düsterd.'s idea, that the reading πλανᾷ was adopted in order to suit the views of the later Fathers who regarded the millennium as present), **until the thousand years shall be** (*shall have been:* futurus exactus) **accomplished: after that he must** (the δεῖ of prophecy; must, according to the necessity of God's purposes) **be loosed for a little time** (see below, ver. 7).

4—6.] *The Millennial reign.* **And I saw thrones** (combine the two passages in the reff.), **and they sat upon them** (who? the Apostles, as in ref. Matt.: the Saints, as in 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3,—οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινοῦσιν; . . . οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἀγγέλους κρινοῦμεν; Notice well, that there is nothing to hinder this in the souls of the saints not being seen till the next clause: for there is no mark of temporal sequence connecting the two verses: nay, such an idea is precluded by the specification at the end of ver. 4, that those very souls of the saints are they who reigned with Christ, and were His assessors in reigning and judging, during this time), **and judgment** (κρῖμα, the act and decision of judgment) **was given to them** (so in ref. Daniel (Theod.), ἕως οὗ ἦλθεν ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν, καὶ τὸ κρῖμα ἔδωκεν ἁγίοις ὑψίστου. That is, they were constituted judges). **And I saw the souls of them who had been beheaded** (the word πελεκίζω, to smite with the axe, is found in Polybius (i. 7. 12, xi. 30. 2), Strabo, Plutarch, and Diodorus Siculus, in the sense of beheading) **on account of the testimony of Jesus and on account of the word of God** (ref.), **and** (of those) **the which did not worship** (during life) **the beast nor yet his image, and did not**

p = Rom. v. 17 (b). 1 Cor. iv. 8. ch. v. 10. xxii. 5.
q w. gen., ch. ix. 20 reff.
r ver. 3.
s here (bis) only.
t = John xiii. 8 only. (see Luke xi. 36. xii. 46. Acts viii. 21.)
u = ch. xxi. 8. xxii. 19. Eccl. v. 18.

ᵖ ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ χίλια ἔτη. ⁵ οἱ ᵠ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ᵒ ἔζησαν ἄχρι ʳ τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη. αὕτη ἡ ˢ ἀνάστασις ἡ ˢ πρώτη. ⁶ μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ᵗ ἔχων ᵗᵘ μέρος ἐν τῇ ˢ ἀναστάσει τῇ ˢ πρώτῃ· ᵛ ἐπὶ τούτων ὁ ʷ δεύτερος ʷ θάνατος οὐκ ἔχει ᵛ ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἔσονται ˣ ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ᵖ βασιλεύ[σ]ουσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ [τὰ] χίλια ἔτη.

AN s b & n. 1. 2. 4. 8. 10-3. 16 to 1. 2. 7. 32 to K. 37 to 47 to ... 90 Br.

v see ch. ii. 26 reff. w ver. 14. ch. ii. 11. xxi. 8. x ch. i. 6.

vulg(with am demid fuld, agst lips-4 tol) syr-dd Andr Areth Cypr Vict Aug. Steph om του (bef χριστου), with 1. 32 Andr-p: ins AN B rel Andr Areth. rec ins τα bef χιλια, with B rel Areth: om AN h 1. 12-7. 32-4. 49 Br Andr.

5. homœotel, ετη at end of ver 4 and in this ver, N b d e f j k l 2. 9. 13-6¹-8-9. 27. 30-3. 9. 40-1-2-7. 50-1. 90 syr-dd. rec aft οι ins δε, with rel æth: ins και bef οι B c g h 1. 4. 10-6-7. 26. 32-4-7-8. 48-9 Br copt Andr Areth: om A vulg(with am fuld tol lipss, agst demid lips-4) Vict Aug Primas. for νεκρων, ανθρωπων B 32-4 Andr-coisl; *eorum* Vict Aug Primas. rec ανεζησαν, with rel æth: ανεστησαν 1 Andr-a: txt A B c g h m 4. 10-2-3-6-7-8. 26. 32-4-5-7-8. 48-9 Br vulg copt Andr Areth Aug Primas. rec (for αχρι) εως, with rel: txt A B c g h m 1. 10-3-6. 26. 32-4-7-8. 48-9 Br.

6. rec ο θανατος ο δευτερος, with 1 (49, e sil) syr-dd copt: δευ. ο θαν. Br: txt AN B rel Hip Andr Areth. αλλα N. ins και bef του θεου N. rec βασιλευσουσιν, with N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Vict Aug Primas Fulg: βασιλευουσιν A. ins τα bef χιλια N B 38. 92 syr-dd.

receive the mark (mentioned ch. xiii. 16) on their forehead and upon their hand: and they lived (i. e. "*lived again;*" ἔζησαν = ἀνέζησαν, as in reff.: and, as the act is presently described as the first *resurrection*, with their bodies, perfect and complete) and reigned with Christ (took part in His Kingdom; see ch. i. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 12: also 1 Cor. iv. 8 and note) a thousand years (it would certainly appear that this reigning includes the office of judgment. Many interpreters suppose that these saints are the judged: so recently Düsterd.: but there is nothing in the context, nor in other parts of Scripture, to favour this idea. Nay, it is expressly negatived by our Lord's saying in John v. 24, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν). The rest of the dead lived not (*again*, as above) until the thousand years be completed. This (αὕτη is not the *subject*, as De Wette, but the *predicate*, as in all such cases: the reduction of the proposition to the logical form requiring its inversion) is the first resurrection (remarks on the interpretation of this passage will be found in the Prolegomena, § v. par. 33. It will have been long ago anticipated by the readers of this Commentary, that I cannot consent to distort words from their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy, on account of any considerations of difficulty, or any risk of abuses which the doctrine of the millennium may bring with it. Those who lived next to the Apostles, and the whole Church for 300 years, understood them in the plain literal sense: and it is a strange sight in these days to see expositors who are among the first in reverence of antiquity, complacently casting aside the most cogent instance of consensus which primitive antiquity presents. As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where *two resurrections* are mentioned, where certain ψυχαὶ ἔζησαν at the first, and the rest of the νεκροὶ ἔζησαν only at the end of a specified period after that first,—if in such a passage the first resurrection may be understood to mean *spiritual* rising with Christ, while the second means *literal* rising from the grave;—then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to any thing. If the first resurrection is spiritual, then so is the second, which I suppose none will be hardy enough to maintain: but if the second is literal, then so is the first, which in common with the whole primitive Church and many of the best modern expositors, I do maintain,

[y. λυθησεται 33. AN B b to m, 1. 2. 4. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30-2-4-5. 37 to 42. 47 to 51. 60 Br. P. πολιν ...]

7 Καὶ ὅταν [x] τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη, [y] λυθήσεται ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐκ τῆς [z] φυλακῆς αὐτοῦ 8 καὶ ἐξελεύσεται [a] πλανῆσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ἐν ταῖς [b] τέσσαρσιν [b] γωνίαις τῆς γῆς, τὸν [c] Γὼγ καὶ [c] Μαγώγ, [d] συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς [d] εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, [e] ὧν ὁ ἀριθμὸς [e] αὐτῶν ὡς ἡ [f] ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης. 9 καὶ ἀνέβησαν [g] ἐπὶ τὸ [gh] πλάτος τῆς [g] γῆς, καὶ [i] ἐκύκλευσαν τὴν [k] παρεμβολὴν τῶν [l] ἁγίων καὶ τὴν [m] πόλιν τὴν [m] ἠγα-

y ver. 3. z = Acts xii. 4, 5 al. fr. Gen. xl. 4. a ch. ii. 20 reff. b ch. vii. 1. Ezek. xliii. 20. (vii. 2.) c Ezek. xxxvii. 2. d ch. xvi. 14, 16. xix. 17. 1 Kings xiii. 5. e constr., ch. iii. 8 reff. f ch. xii. 18 reff. g Hab. i. 6. h Eph. iii. 18. ch. xxi. 16 (bis) only. i here only †. 2 Kings v. 23 Symm. (-λοῦν, Heb. xi. 30.) k = Heb. xiii. 11, 13 (Acts xxi. 34, 37. xxii. 24. xxiii. 10, 16, 32. Heb. xi. 34) only. Exod. xxix. 14. l = ch. xi. 18 reff. m here only. see Ps. lxxvii. 68. lxxxvi. 2. Hos. ii. 23 B.

7. for *οταν τελεσθη*, *μετα* B b e f j l 2. 4. 9. 13-6-9. 26-7. 30-3-9. 40-1-2-7-8. 50-1. 82. 90-2 arm Areth: *οτε ετελεσθησαν* 1: txt Aℵ rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Aug Jer Primas.—ℵ[1] wrote *τελεσθησε* but marked *σε* for erasure.

8. aft *πλανησαι* ins *παντα* ℵ 79. om 2nd *τα* ℵ e m. om *ταις* f(Mill &c.) 1. 37. *τετρασι* ℵ: *τεσαρσιν* 1. om *της γης τον* ℵ[1]. rec ins *τον* bef *μαγωγ*, with ℵ[3a] B rel Andr Areth: om Aℵ[1] 1. aft *μαγωγ* ins *και* ℵ c (11) 12. 32 vulg. rec om *τον* (bef *πολεμον*), with 1. 10-7[2]. 35 (c 32. 49, e sil) Andr: ins Aℵ B rel Areth. rec om *αυτων*, with h 1. 10. 34-8 (c 4. 17. 37. 48-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: ins Aℵ B rel.

9. rec *εκυκλωσαν*, with ℵ rel Andr Areth: txt A B b d e h k 2. 9. 10-3-7[1]-9. 27. 30-7. 40-2-7-9. 50. 90-2. aft *αγιων* ins *και την πολιν των αγιων* B j.

and receive as an article of faith and hope). **Blessed** (see ch. xiv. 13, xix. 9) **and holy is he that hath part in** (ref., the expression is peculiar to St. John) **the first resurrection: over such persons the second death** (see reff.: and bear in mind what is said of our Lord Himself, Rom. vi. 9) **hath not power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and they [shall] reign with Him** (Christ) **a** (or, **the**) **thousand years.**

7—10.] *Loosing of Satan at the end of the millennium: gathering together and destruction of the nations: final condemnation of Satan.*

And when the thousand years are completed, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison (see ver. 3. The prophetic future is here used: but in ver. 9 the historic form with aorists is resumed) **and shall go forth to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of the earth** (there will be nations on earth besides the saints reigning with Christ, who during the binding of Satan have been quiet and willing subjects of the Kingdom, but who on his being let loose are again subjected to his temptations, which stir them into rebellion against God), **Gog and Magog** (compare Ezek. xxxviii. and xxxix. throughout. This which is here prophesied is the great final fulfilment of those chapters. And the names Gog and Magog, taken from there, had been used in the rabbinical books to signify the nations which should in the latter days come up to Jerusalem against the Messiah. So the Jerus. Targum on Num. xi. 27, in Wetst., "In fine extremitatis dierum Gog et Magog et exercitus eorum adscendent Hierosolyma et per manus regis Messiæ ipsi cadent et vii. annos dierum ardebunt filii Israel ex armis eorum:" and Avoda sara, 1: "quando videbunt bellum Gog et Magog, dicet ad eos Messias: ad quid huc venistis? Respondebunt, Adversus Dominum et adversus Christum ejus." This name Magog occurs Gen. x. 2, as that of a son of Japhet, in company with brethren whose names mostly belong to northern and north-eastern nations: Gomer (Kimmerians), Madai (Medians), Meshech (Muscovites), &c. With these however are joined in Ezek. xxxviii. 5, Persians, Ethiopians, Libyans. Josephus renders the word Σκύθαι (Antt. i. 6. 3), *Μαγώγης δὲ τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Μαγώγας ὀνομασθέντας ᾤκισε, Σκύθας δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν (τ. Ἑλλήνων) προσαγορευομένους*, and so Jerome: Suidas, "Persians (*Μαγώγ, ὁ Πέρσης*)." It seems to be a general name for the northern nations, and Gog, if at least we may follow the analogy of Ezekiel, xxxviii. 2, is their prince), **to gather them together to the (well-known) war: of whom the number (of them) is as the sand of the sea. And they went up** (the historical aor. is here resumed) **upon the breadth of the earth** (i.e. entirely overspread it; see ref.) **and encompassed the camp of the saints, and the beloved city** (by these two is probably meant one and the same thing, the

n ch. xiii. 13. Ezek. xxxviii. 22. xxxix. 6.
o 4 Kings i. 10, 12, 14. see 3 Kings xviii. 38.
p ch. x. 9, 10 reff.
q ch. xix. 20. vv. 14 (bis), 15. ch. xxi. 8.
r ch. ix. 17, 18 reff.
s ch. xvi. 13. xix. 20.
t ch. ix. 5 reff.
u ch. iv. 8 reff.
v Isa. vi. 1.
w = Ps. xcvi. 5. see Acts iii. 19.
x ch. xii. 8 reff.
y ch. xi. 18 reff.

πημένην· καὶ [no] *κατέβη* [no] *πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ* [op] *κατέφαγεν αὐτούς·* [10] *καὶ ὁ διάβολος ὁ* [s] *πλανῶν αὐτοὺς ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν* [q] *λίμνην τοῦ* [q] *πυρὸς καὶ* [r] *θείου, ὅπου καὶ τὸ* [s] *θηρίον καὶ ὁ* [s] *ψευδοπροφήτης, καὶ* [t] *βασανισθήσονται* [u] *ἡμέρας καὶ* [u] *νυκτὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.*

[11] Καὶ *εἶδον* [v] *θρόνον μέγαν λευκὸν καὶ τὸν* [v] *καθήμενον ἐπ᾿ αὐτοῦ, οὗ* [w] *ἀπὸ τοῦ* [w] *προσώπου ἔφυγεν ἡ γῆ καὶ ὁ οὐρανός, καὶ* [x] *τόπος οὐχ* [x] *εὑρέθη αὐτοῖς.* [12] *καὶ εἶδον τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς* [y] *μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς* [y] *μικροὺς ἑστῶτας*

—vers g. APℵ b1 to f. h x m. 1. 2. 4. 9 11. 13. 15 to 19. 26. 30-2-4-5. 37 to 42. 47 to 50. 90 Br.

rec ins *απο του θεου* bef *εκ του ουρανου*, with [P]ℵ3a g l (27, e sil) vulg syr-dd Jer: aft *εκ τ. ουρ.*, B rel copt arm Andr Areth Vict Aug Tich1: om A 12-8 lips-4 Andr-a Primas Tich1.—for *εκ*, *απο* 18.—*εκ του θεου απο του ουρανου* 1.—om from *πυρ* to *λιμνην* next ver ℵ1.

10. om *ὁ* (bef *διαβολος*) 1. ins *του* bef *θειου* ℵ g l(omg *και*) m 32-4-5-9. 47. rec om 3rd *και*, with ℵ 1. 18 (Br, e sil) copt Andr (and some lat-ff): ins A[P] B rel vulg(with am lipss, agst demid tol) syr-dd Andr Areth Vict Aug Primas. ins *οπου* bef *ο ψευδοπ.* ℵ. om *εις τ. αιωνας τ. αιωνων* 1.

11. rec *λευκον* bef *μεγαν*, with 1. 34 (c 32. 49, e sil) Ephr Andr Iren-int: *μεγαν και λευκον* 50: om *μεγαν* 26. 51. 90: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Areth Aug Primas. *επ᾿ αυτον* [P] B rel Ephr2 Andr-a Areth: *επ᾿ αυτω* Ephr1 Andr-p: *επανω αυτου* ℵ 38: txt A g 1. rec om *του* (bef *προσωπου*), with B rel Ephr Andr Areth: ins A[P]ℵ g.

12. rec *μικρους και μεγαλους*, omg the articles, with (39. 40-1, e sil) spec copt, *τους μικρους κ. τους μεγ.* B c 4. 26. 32. 48: om b d e j k 1. 2. 9. 19. 27. 42. 50. 90: *τους μεγ. και μικρους* Br: txt A[P]ℵ3a rel vulg syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth Iren-int Aug

καί being epexegetical; or at all events the camp must be conceived as surrounding and defending the city. The *πόλις ἡ ἠγαπημένη* is Jerusalem (reff.): not the *new* Jerusalem, but the earthly city of that name, which is destined yet to play so glorious a part in the latter days). **And there came down fire out of heaven** (so in reff. Ezek.), **and devoured them: and the devil that deceiveth them** (the pres. part. merely *designates:* the devil their deceiver) **was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where also are the beast and the false prophet** (ch. xix. 20). **And they shall be tormented by day and by night to the ages of the ages.**

11—15.] *The general judgment.* **And I saw a great white throne** (great, in distinction from the thrones before mentioned, ver. 4: white, as seen in purest light, and symbolizing the most blameless justice), **and Him that sitteth on it** (viz. God: the Father: see ch. iv. 3, xxi. 5. It is necessary to keep to the well-known formula of the book in interpreting *τὸν καθήμενον ἐπ᾿ αὐτοῦ*, even though some expressions and sayings seem better to belong to the Son. Be it also remembered that it is the Father who giveth all judgment to the Son: and though He Himself judgeth no man, yet He is ever described as present in the judgment, and mankind as judged before Him. We need not find in this view any difficulty, or discrepancy with such passages as Matt. xxv. 31, seeing that our Lord Himself says in ch. iii. 21, *ἐγὼ . . . . ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ.* Nor need we be surprised at the sayings of our Lord, such as that in ch. xxi. 6 b, being uttered by Him that sitteth on the throne. That throne is now the throne of God and of the Lamb, ch. xxii. 1. Cf. also ch. xxi. 22), **from whose face the earth and the heaven fled, and place was not found for them** (these words again seem to indicate the presence of One who has not hitherto appeared: whereas Christ in glory has been long present on earth. This fleeing away of heaven and earth is elsewhere described as their consumption by fire, 2 Pet. iii. 10—12. Both descriptions indicate the passing away of their present corruptible state and change to a state glorious and incorruptible). **And I saw the dead** (viz. the *λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν* of ver. 5: those who rose as described below, ver. 13), **the great and the small, standing before the throne, and books were opened** (see ref. Dan.), **and another**

[z] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ [a] βιβλία [ab] ἠνοίχθησαν· καὶ ἄλλο [c] βιβλίον ἠνοίχθη, ὅ ἐστιν [c] τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ ἐκρίθησαν οἱ νεκροὶ ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις [d] κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν. [13] καὶ [e] ἔδωκεν ἡ θάλασσα τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ὁ [f] θάνατος καὶ ὁ [f] ᾅδης [e] ἔδωκαν τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐκρίθησαν ἕκαστος [d] κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν. [14] καὶ ὁ [f] θάνατος καὶ ὁ [f] ᾅδης ἐβλήθησαν εἰς τὴν [g] λίμνην τοῦ [g] πυρός. οὗτος ὁ [h] θάνατος ὁ [h] δεύτερός ἐστιν, ἡ [g] λίμνη τοῦ [g] πυρός. [15] καὶ εἴ τις οὐχ

z ch. i. 4 reff. a Dan. vii. 10. b plur., ch. i. 19. c see ch. iii. 5 reff. d Rom. ii. 6. 2 Cor. xi. 15 al. Ps. xxvii. 4. e = here only. see Matt. xiii. 8. Mark iv. 7, 8. Ps. lxvi. 6. f ch. i. 18. g ver. 10. h ver. 6. ch. ii. 11. xxi. 8.

Primas.—και μεγ. και τ. μ. ℵ[1]. for ενωπιον, επι ℵ[1]: ενωπιον επι ℵ[3a]. rec (for θρονου) θεου, with 1 (k, e sil) Andr: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth spec. rec ηνεωχθησαν, with (47, e sil) Andr: ηνεωχθη ℵ: ανεωχθησαν 10-7. 37-8. 49 B[r]: ηνοιξαν b d e j k 2. 19. 26. 40-1-2. 50-1. 90, ανοιξαν 30: ηνοιξεν 9. 13-6. 27. 39: txt A[P] B c f m 1. 4. 18. 32-4(-5, e sil). 48. 92 Andr-coisl Areth. om και αλλο βιβλιον ηνοιχθη ℵ[1] 1. rec βιβλιον bef αλλο: txt A[P]ℵ[3a] B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas spec. rec ηνεωχθη, with ℵ[3a] B rel Andr-coisl: ανεωχθη h j 10-8. 37-8. 49 B[r]: txt A[P] e m 17. 35. 40.

13. rec τους εν αυτ. νεκρους (twice), with h 1. 10-7 (41-9, e sil), 1st (e sil) 37 Andr Promiss: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Meth Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int spec. —for αυτη, αυτοις 1.—τους εαυτων νεκρους (2nd) 37. (om from 1st τους εν to 2nd 38; from 2nd και to 3rd 39: homœotel in B[r], αδης in this ver and next.) τα is written bef θανατος but marked for erasure by ℵ[1]. for εδωκαν, εδωκεν A 1 2. 48: txt [P]ℵ B rel vss Meth Andr Areth Iren-int Aug Primas. κατεκριθησαν ℵ. for αυτων, αυτου B c d e f j k l 2. 18-9. 30-2. 47. 51. 90-2 Andr-p-coisl.

14. homœotel in b c j 41-2 copt Primas Promiss, πυρος 1st and 2nd: homœotel 18, τ. λ. τ. πυρος vv. 14, 15. ins και bef ουτος ℵ. om ουτος ο θ. ο δ. εστιν b c j 1. 18(?) 41-2. rec εστιν ο δευτερος θανατος, with lips-4: εστιν ο θ. ο δευ. h 10. 37. 49: ο δευτ. θαν. εστιν ℵ 38: ο δευ. εστιν, omg θ., e: ο δευ. k: txt A[P] B rel am(with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd Andr-coisl. rec om η λιμνη του πυρος, with 1. 39: ins A[P]ℵ B rel vss Hip Andr Areth Iren-int Fulg.—εν τη λιμνη του πυρος k, *in stagno ignis* am: *stagnum et ignis* lips-4.

book was opened, which is (the book) of life (Düsterd. remarks that the order of proceedings indicated seems to be that the contents of the books in which were written the works of men indicated whether they were to be found in the book of life. But this could hardly be: for in that case, what need for the book of life at all? Rather should we say that those books and the book of life bore independent witness to the fact of men being or not being among the saved: the one by inference from the works recorded: the other by inscription or non-inscription of the name in the list. So the 'books' would be as it were the vouchers for the book of life): **and the dead were judged out of the things written in the books according to their works** (reff.: and 2 Cor. v. 10). **And the sea gave forth the dead that were in her** (the citation in Wetst. from Achilles Tatius, v. p. 313 B, λέγουσι δὲ τὰς ἐν ὕδασι ψυχὰς ἀνῃρημένας μηδὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβαίνειν ὅλως, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἔχειν τὴν πλάνην, is no illustration of this passage, which simply imports that the dead contained in the sea shall rise), **and Death and Hades** (see ch. i. 18, vi. 8) **gave forth the dead which were in them** (i. e. all the dead, buried and unburied, rose again), **and they were judged each according to their** (his) **works. And Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire** (Death and Hades are regarded as two dæmons, enemies of God. So in 1 Cor. xv. 26, ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος: and in Isa. xxv. 8, Heb. and E. V., not LXX, "He will swallow up death in victory," cf. 1 Cor. xv. 54. Hades, as in ch. vi. 8, is Death's follower and the receiver of his prey. The punishment of sin is inflicted on both, because both are the offspring of and bound up with sin). **This is the second death, the lake of fire** (thus then our Lord's saying, ch. ii. 11, and that of the Apostle in our ver. 6, are explained. As there is a second and higher life, so there is also a second and deeper death. And as after that life there is no more death

ch. iii. 5 reff. k 2 Pet. iii. 13. Isa. lxv. 17. lxvi. 22. l Heb. viii. 13. vv. 4, 5. m = ch. ix. 12. xi. 14. ver. 4 only. n ch. xi. 2 reff. o ch. iii. 12. see Gal. iv. 26. Heb. xi. 22. p = ch. xix. 7. q ver. 9. ch. xxii. 17. r Matt. xii. 44 || L. xxiii. 29. xxv. 7. Luke xxi. 5. 1 Tim. ii. 9. Tit. ii. 10. 1 Pet. iii. 5. ver. 19 only. Ezek. xvi. 11. s ch. xiii. 6. Levit. xxvi. 11 Ed-vat.(not AB), 12. (Ezek. xxxvii. 27. xliii. 7.)

εὑρέθη ἐν τῇ ⁱβίβλῳ τῆς ⁱζωῆς γεγραμμένος, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν ᵍλίμνην τοῦ ᵍπυρός.

XXI. ¹ Καὶ εἶδον ᵏοὐρανὸν ᵏˡκαινὸν καὶ ᵏγῆν ᵏˡκαινήν· ὁ γὰρ ˡπρῶτος οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ ˡπρώτη γῆ ᵐἀπῆλθαν, καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι. ² καὶ τὴν ⁿπόλιν τὴν ⁿἁγίαν εἶδον, ᵒἹερουσαλὴμ ᵒκαινὴν ᵒκαταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ᵖἡτοιμασμένην ὡς ᑫνύμφην ʳκεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς. ³ καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου λεγούσης Ἰδοὺ ἡ ˢσκηνὴ τοῦ

f. APℵ B b c d e h 80 m. 1. 2. 4. 10-3. to 1. 7. 3... 4-5. ... to 42 47 to 51. 90 Br.

15. ευρεθησεται ℵ¹. for -η βιβλῳ, τῳ βιβλιῳ B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]ℵ h 1 10-7. 38 (1. 37-9. 41-2-9. 51, e sil) Andr. εγεγραμμενος (i. e. εγγεγρ.?) 1.

Chap. XXI. 1. rec (for απηλθαν) παρηλθε, with h 1 1. 10-7. 49. 51 (16. 37-9 Br, e sil) Andr(Del): απηλθεν [P] c k m 2. 4. 35. 47: απηλθον B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt Aℵ.

2. rec aft και ins εγω ιωαννης: om A[P]ℵ B rel am(with demid tol) syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth Iren-int. rec ειδον bef την πολιν τ. α., with copt: ιερ. καινην bef ειδον [P]ℵ 1(Del, expr) Br: txt A B rel am(with demid fuld tol) syr-dd æth gr-lat-ff. rec απο του θεου bef εκ του ουρανου, with [P] h 1. 10-7. 49 (37 Br, e sil) Andr-a: om απο τ. θεου 41: txt Aℵ B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff.

3. φωνη μεγαλη . . λεγουσα, omg ηκουσα, ℵ¹. rec (for θρονου) ουρανου, with [P] B rel vss Andr Areth: txt Aℵ 18 vulg arm-ed-marg Iren-int Aug Ambr.

(ch. xxi. 4), so after that death there is no more life, ver. 10; Matt. xxv. 41). **And if any was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire** (there was no intermediate state).

Ch. XXI. 1—XXII. 5.] *The new heavens and new earth: the glories of the heavenly Jerusalem.* The whole of the things described in the remaining portion of the book are subsequent to the general judgment, and descriptive of the consummation of the triumph and bliss of Christ's people with Him in the eternal kingdom of God. This eternal kingdom is situated on the purified and renewed earth, become the blessed habitation of God with his glorified people. **And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first** (i. e. old, see ref.) **heaven and the first earth were departed: and the sea exists no longer** (see on the whole, Isa. lxv. 17. The vision does not necessarily suppose the annihilation of the old creation, but only its passing away as to its outward and recognizable form, and renewal to a fresh and more glorious one. And though not here stated on the surface, it is evident that the method of renewal is that described in 2 Pet. iii. 10 ff.; viz. a renovation by *fire*. This alone will account for the unexpected and interesting feature here introduced, viz. that the sea exists no longer. For this the words mean (see ver. 4), and not as Düsterd., that the (former) sea, as well as the former heaven and earth, had passed away). **And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem** (see especially ref. Gal., ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσ., and note), **coming down out of heaven from God** (Schöttg. quotes from the remarkable Jewish book Sohar, Gen. f. 69, c. 271, "R. Jeremias dixit, Deus S. B. innovabit mundum suum, et ædificabit Hierosolymam, ut ipsam descendere faciat in medium sui de cœlo, ita ut nunquam destruatur." See Schöttg.'s dissertation "de Hierosolyma cœlesti," in his vol. i. 1205 ff.), **prepared as a bride adorned for her husband** (as in our common discourse, so here with the Evangelist, the name of the material city stands for the community formed by its inhabitants. But it does not follow in his case, any more than in ours, that both material city and inhabitants have not a veritable existence: nor can we say that the glorious description of *it*, presently to follow, applies only to *them*. On the figure, see Isa. lxi. 10—lxii. 5). **And I heard a great voice out of the throne saying, Behold, the tabernacle** (i. e. dwelling: the allusion being to the tabernacle in the wilderness, in which God dwelt in symbol only) **of God**

θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ [t] σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ αὐτοὶ [u] λαοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔσονται, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔσται, αὐτῶν θεός. [4] καὶ [v] ἐξαλείψει [ὁ θεὸς] πᾶν [w] δάκρυον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, οὔτε [x] πένθος οὔτε [y] κραυγὴ οὔτε [z] πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, [ὅτι] τὰ [a] πρῶτα [a] ἀπῆλθαν. [5] καὶ εἶπεν ὁ [b] καθήμενος [b] ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ Ἰδοὺ [c] καινὰ [c] ποιῶ πάντα. καὶ λέγει Γράψον ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι [d] πιστοὶ καὶ [d] ἀληθινοί εἰσιν. [6] Καὶ εἶπέν μοι [e] Γέγονα[ν.] ἐγώ [εἰμι] τὸ [f] ἄλφα

t ch. vii. 15 reff. u plur., ch. vii. 9 reff. v ch. iii. 5 reff. w sing. -ον, ch. vii. 17 only. Eccl. iv. 1. Isa. xxv. 8 only. x James iv. 9. ch. xviii. 7 (bis), 8 only. (Isa. xxxv. 10.) Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 13. (-θεῖν, ch. xviii. 11.) y = Heb. v. 7 (ch. xiv. 18 reff.). Isa. lxv. 19.

z ch. xvi. 10, 11 reff. a = ver. 1 (reff.). b w. dat., ch. v. 13 reff. c Isa. xliii. 19. (Jer. xxxviii. [xxxi.] 22.) d ch. iii. 14 reff. [e = Luke xiv. 22. ch. xvi. 17.] f ch. i. 8. xxii. 13. see Isa. xliv. 6.

εσκηνωσεν א[1] lips-4. *λαος* B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth Aug Primas: txt A[P]א 1. 18 (42. 92, e sil) Andr Iren-int. om last *και* א. rec *εσται* bef 2nd *μετ' αυτων*, with [P]א h 1. 10-7. 34. 47-9 (c 2. 9. 32-7 Br, e sil) copt Andr Aug Primas: txt A B rel vulg syr-dd Areth Iren-int Ambr. rec *θεος* bef *αυτων*, with [P] 17[1]. 34. 47 (c j 13. 37, e sil) vss Andr-a: om *αυ. θ.* א B rel copt Andr Areth lat-ff: txt A vulg syr-dd Iren-int Ambr.

4. *απ' αυτων* (for *ο θεος*) B b (d?) e j m 16. 30-5-9. 41-2. 50-1. 90-2: *εξ αυτων* k: om [P]א rel syr-dd copt æth arm Andr Areth Iren-int$_2$ Ambr$_4$: *ο θεος* A 34 (1 Br, e sil) vulg Andr-p Aug Primas. *δακρυ* א[1]. rec (for *εκ*) *απο*, with [P] B rel vulg: txt Aא: *ex* tol. (om *απο των οφθ. αυτων* 41-2.) om *ο θανατος* c h l: om *ο* [P]א. om *ουτε πενθος*, reading *πενθος* for *πονος* below, א. homœotel in k m, *ετι* to *ετι*. om 2nd *ετι* 1: om *οτι* A[P]: א[1] seems to have written *ετι* and to have altered it to *οτι*. *προβατα* א[1]. rec *απηλθον*, with [P] rel Andr: *απηλθεν* א B b c e j k 2. 4. 13-6. 26-7. 32-4-8. 42-7-8. 82: txt A.

5. rec *του θρονου*, with h 1. 10 (18-9. 37 to 40. 42-9 Br, e sil): *εν τω θρονω* m 35 Andr-a: txt A[P]א B rel Andr Areth. ins *και* bef *ιδου* A: *ιδου ιδου* 41. rec *καινα παντα* bef *ποιω*, with 1 Andr: *καινοποιω παντα* 17. 36(Del) Andr-p: *παντα καινα ποιω* B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]א h m 10. 35-7-8. 49 Br Iren-int Aug Primas. rec aft *λεγει* ins *μοι*, with [P]א 1. 10-8-9. 34-8. 47 (c h 26. 35-7. 41-2-8-9 Br, e sil) fuld copt æth Andr Areth Tich: om A B rel am(with tol al) syr-dd Iren-int. rec *αληθινοι και πιστοι*, with [P] 1. 10-7. 34. 49 (c h 32-7 Br, e sil) Andr: txt Aא B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Areth Iren-int. at end ins *του θεου* B c 2. 4. 9. 13-6-9. 26-7. 32. 92: ins *του θ.* bef *εισι* 30-5-9. 41-2-8. 50-1. 90.

6. for *ειπεν*, *λεγει* א 47. rec *γεγονε*, with (b 41, e sil): *γεγονα* 17: so, omg *ειμι* follg, [P]א[1](א[3a] added *ν*, making *γεγοναν*, but afterwards erased *ν*, and disapproved the whole word) B c d e h j k l m 30-2. 47-8 syr-dd Andr-a Areth, and, omg *εγω ειμι*, 1. 10. 37. 40-2-9. 50-1. 90-2 Br: *γεγονασι* 38; *γεγοναν* A, *facta sunt* vulg Iren-int. rec [for *αλφα*] *α'*, with e 1. 10: txt A[P]א B b c d h k m 8. 13. 34(-5?) 51.

is with men, and He shall dwell (tabernacle) **with them, and they shall be his people** (plur., because, as in ver. 24, many nations shall now partake in the blessed fulfilment of the promise), **and He shall be God with them** (the name Emmanuel, *μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός*, first then being realized in its full significance), **their God** (so the ancient promises are fulfilled, Exod. xxix. 45; Lev. xxvi. 11; Ezek. xxxvii. 27): **and [God] shall wipe away every tear from their eyes** (reff.): **and death shall exist no longer** (ch. xx. 14), **and** (Gr. nor) **mourning** (Isa. lxv. 19) **and** (nor) **crying and** (nor) **pain shall exist no longer: [because] the first** (former state of) **things are passed away. And He that sitteth on the throne** (see note, ch. xx. 11) **said, Behold, I make all things new. And he** (probably the angel, or voice from heaven, that gave the Seer similar commands before, ch. xiv. 13, xix. 9. This seems probable on account of the change to the formula *λέγει*, as well as from the nature of the command: for we have *εἶπέν μοι* resumed immediately with the *ἐγώ*, leaving no doubt Who speaks) **saith, Write: because these words are faithful and true. And He said to me** (viz. *ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου*), **[They are fulfilled** (viz. *οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι*: or, but I prefer the other, *πάντα*).**] I am** (or,

g ch. xxii. 17. John iv. 13, 14. vii 37. Isa. lv. 1. h constr., ch. vi. 4 reff. i ch. vii. 17 reff. k Matt. x. 8. John xv. 25 (from Ps. lxviii. 4). Rom. iii. 24. 2 Cor. xi. 7. Gal. ii. 21. 2 Thess. iii. 8. ch. xxii. 17 only. Isa. lii. 3. l ch. ii. 7 reff. m Rev., here only. = Matt. v. 5. xix. 29 al. fr. Isa. lvii. 13.

καὶ τὸ Ω, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. ἐγὼ τῷ [g] διψῶντι δώσω [h αὐτῷ] ἐκ τῆς [i] πηγῆς τοῦ [gi] ὕδατος τῆς [i] ζωῆς [k] δωρεάν. [7] [l] ὁ νικῶν [m] κληρονομήσει ταῦτα, καὶ [n] ἔσομαι αὐτῷ θεὸς καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι υἱός. [8] τοῖς δὲ [o] δειλοῖς καὶ [p] ἀπίστοις καὶ [q] ἐβδελυγμένοις καὶ [r] φονεῦσιν καὶ [st] πόρνοις καὶ [u] φαρμακοῖς καὶ [tv] εἰδωλολάτραις καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς [w] ψευδέσιν τὸ [x] μέρος αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ [y] λίμνῃ τῇ [y] καιομένῃ [y] πυρὶ καὶ [y] θείῳ, [z] ὅ ἐστιν ὁ [a] θάνατος ὁ [a] δεύτερος.

[9] Καὶ ἦλθεν εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐχόντων τὰς ἑπτὰ [b] φιάλας τῶν [c] γεμόντων τῶν ἑπτὰ [d] πληγῶν τῶν

APN B b c d e h to m. 1. 2. 4. 6. 10-3. 15 to 19. 26-7. 30-1. 4-5. 37 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

n see Heb. i. 5, from 2 Kings vii. 14. o Matt. viii. 26 ‖ Mk. only. Judg. vii. 3. ix. 4 B. (-λία, 2 Tim. i. 7. -λιᾷν, John xiv. 27.) p = Matt. xvii. 17 ‖. Luke xii. 46. John xx. 27. (Isa. xvii. 10 bis only.) q = here (Rom. ii. 22) only. Hos. ix. 10. (-υκτός, Tit i. 16. -υγμα, ver. 27.) r 1 Pet. iv. 15 reff. s Eph. v. 5 al.† Sir. xxiii. 16, 17 only. t ch. xxii. 15. 1 Cor. v. 10, 11. vi. 9. Eph. v. 5. u ch. xxii. 15 only. Exod. vii. 11 al. (see ch. xviii. 23 reff.) v as above (t). 1 Cor. x. 7 only †. w = ch. ii. 2. Acts vi. 13 only. Prov. xxx. 9. x see ch. xx. 6 reff. y ch. xix. 20 (reff.). z constr., Matt. xii. 4 (Col. ii. 17). a ch. ii. 11. xx. 6, 14 only. b ch. v. 8 reff. c ch. iv. 6 reff. d ch. xv. 1.

[om ἡ and 3rd το P c h 32-7. 48-9 Areth : om το 46. om τω P.] rec om αυτω, with A[P]ℵ 1 (h k l 13. 32-7-9. 47-9. 51, e sil) Andr : ins B rel Andr-coisl Areth. om της πηγης A. δωρεας ℵ[1].

7. for κληρονομησει, δωσω αυτω B rel Andr-coisl Areth : txt A[P]ℵ l 1. 10-2-7. 37-8. 47-9 (h 9, e sil). rec (for ταυτα) παντα, with 1 : txt A[P]ℵ B rel vss gr-lat-ff. for αυτω, αυτων A 1. αυτοι εσονται μοι υιοι 1.—om αυτος A. rec ins ο bef υιος, with (but see Delitzsch i. p. 49) 34 (37. 40-1, e sil) : om A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth.

8. rec δειλοις δε, omg τοις (with Br, e sil) : so 1, but with an abbreviated τοις written above the line in red : [τοις δειλοις, omg δε, P :] txt Aℵ B rel Andr Areth.—ℵ[1] has written and erased ως bef δειλοις and π bef φονευσει (sic). aft απιστοις ins και αμαρτωλοις B rel syr-dd Andr Areth : om Aℵ 1. 51. om 2nd και 1. 12. rec φαρμακευσι : txt A[P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. for ψευδεσιν, ψευσταις A. rec (for ὁ θ. ὁ δευ.) δευτερος θανατος, with 1 Andr-a : θαν. δευ. 92 : ο δευ. θαν. 17. 49 Andr-p(Del) : θαν. ο δευτ. (omg 1st ὁ) 41-2-8 : [θανατος (only) P(Tischdf expr) :] txt Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl.

9. rec aft ηλθεν ins προς με, with (37-9. 41-2, e sil) arm : om A[P]ℵ B rel vulg(with am fuld, agst lips-4). rec om εκ, with 1. 47 (30. 40, e sil) Andr : ins A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth.—for εις εκ, ο πρωτος m 35-8. rec (for των γεμοντων) τας γεμουσας, with l m 1. 34 (37. 40-1-2-7 Br, e sil) Andr-a : γεμουσας (only) B rel Areth : τας εχουσας 35 : txt A[P]ℵ[1] 12. 79 Andr-b : των γεμουσων ℵ[3a]. om 4th των B b c d e j k 2. 9. 13. 26-7. 30-2[1]-8-9. 40-7-9. 51. 92 Andr-coisl Areth : ins

excluding the portions in brackets, I have become) **the Alpha and the Omega** (see above, ch. i. 8), **the beginning and the end** ("the Unchangeable and Everlasting One, by Whom the old was and the new shall be, by Whom the old is fulfilled in the new, and with it all hope and all promise." De Wette). **I to him that thirsteth will give** [**to him**] **of the fountain of the water of life freely** (cf. ch. vii. 17, and reff. Isa. and John: cf. also Matt. v. 6). **He that conquereth shall inherit these things** (the glories to be shewn in the heavenly Jerusalem), **and I will be to him** (a) **God, and he shall be to me a son** (this will be the full performance to the sons of God of the promise in ref. 2 Kings: which being first made to Solomon, received its chief fulfilment in the great Son of David and of God (ref. Heb.), and now in Him to them that are His). **But to the cowardly** (the contrast to νικῶντες: the ὑποστελλόμενοι of Heb. x. 38: those who shrink timidly from the conflict), **and the unbelievers, and the polluted with abominations** (those who have partaken of the βδελύγματα in ch. xvii. 4,—of idolatries, &c.), **and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers** (the form φαρμακός, found only in ref. in the N. T., is the common one in the LXX. See besides ref. and other places in Exodus, Deut. xviii. 11; Dan. ii. 2; Mal. iii. 5. The form φαρμακεύς does not occur in the LXX), **and idolaters, and all the false** (i. e. all liars), **their part** (the construction is changed: instead of οὐκ ἔσται μέρος ἐν κ.τ.λ., it proceeds in the affirmative, implying that negative and expressing more) (**shall be**) **in the lake that burneth with**

[d] ἐσχάτων, καὶ ἐλάλησεν μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων [e] Δεῦρο, δείξω σοι τὴν [f] νύμφην τὴν [g] γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρνίου. [10] καὶ [h] ἀπήνεγκέν με [h] ἐν πνεύματι ἐπὶ [i] ὄρος μέγα καὶ [i] ὑψηλόν, καὶ ἔδειξέν μοι τὴν [k] πόλιν τὴν [k] ἁγίαν Ἱερουσαλὴμ [k] καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, [11] ἔχουσαν τὴν [l] δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ [m] φωστὴρ αὐτῆς ὅμοιος [n] λίθῳ [no] τιμιωτάτῳ, ὡς λίθῳ [p] ἰάσπιδι [q] κρυσταλλίζοντι, [12] [r] ἔχουσα [s] τεῖχος μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν, ἔχουσα [t] πυλῶνας δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς [t] πυλῶσιν ἀγγέλους δώδεκα, καὶ [u] ὀνόματα ἐπιγεγραμ-

e ch. xvii. 1 reff.
f ver. 2.
g = ch. xix. 7. Matt. i. 20. Deut. xxii. 24.
h ch. xvii. 3 (reff.).
i Matt. iv. 8 ‖ (L. v. r.). xvii. 1 ‖ Mk. Ezek. xl. 2.
k ver. 2.
l = ver. 23. 2 Chron. vii. 1 al. fr.
m Phil. ii. 15 only. Gen. i. 14, 16.
n ch. xvii. 4 reff.

o superl., ch. xviii. 12. p ch. iv. 3. vv. 18, 19 only. Ezek. xxviii. 13. q here only †. (-λος, ch. xxii. 1.) r constr., ch. iv. 1 al. fr. s here, &c. (6 times) only, exc. Acts ix. 25. 2 Cor. xi. 33. Heb. xi. 30, from Josh. vi. 20. Isa. ii. 15. t Matt. xxvi. 71. Luke xvi. 20 al. 3 Kings xvii. 10. (Ezek. xlviii. 30—34.) u Ezek. l. c.

A[P]ℵ rel Andr. rec *την νυμφην του αρνιου την γυναικα*, with 1 lips-5 Andr: *την γυναικα την νυμφην του αρνιου* B rel Areth: txt A[P]ℵ m 17. 34-5-8.

10. (*επι*, so Aℵ: *εν* 92.) rec ins *την μεγαλην* bef *την αγιαν*, with c h (1) 10-7. 32-4 (35-7. 49 Br, e sil) Andr-p: om A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Areth Cypr Primas.—*τ. μεγ. και τ. αγ.* c, *τ. μεγ. και αγ.* 1. for *απο*, *εκ* B c d e j k m 2. 4. 9. 11-3-6-9. 26-7. 32-4-5. 40-1-2-8. 50-1. 90: txt A[P]ℵ rel Andr. (but for *εκ*, *απο* c 32-4. 51. 90.)—om *απο του θεου* 92.

11. om *εχ. την δοξ. τ. θεου* (*homœotel*) A k 30. ins *απο* bef *του θεου* ℵ. rec ins *και* bef *ο φωστηρ*, with 1. 35 (l m, e sil) æth Andr: om A[P]ℵ B rel am(with fuld lips-5 tol) Andr-coisl Tich.—om *ως λιθω* 1.

12. rec (for 1st *εχουσα*) *εχουσαν τε*, with m 34 (35. 41, e sil) Areth: *εχουσαν* 42 Br: *εχουσα τε* 1: *εχοντι* ℵ: txt A[P] B rel Andr.—homœotel k 30-9, *εχ.* 1st and 2nd. rec (for 2nd *εχουσα*) *εχουσαν*, with l m 34 (35 Br, e sil): *εχουσας* ℵ[3a]: *εχοντας* ℵ[1]: txt A[P] B rel Andr-a. for *τοις πυλ.*, *τους πυλωνας* ℵ: *τοις πυλεωσιν* 1. om from *δωδεκα* to *δωδεκα* A fuld. aft 1st *ονομ.* ins *αυτων* ℵ. for *επιγεγρ.*,

fire and brimstone, which is the second death (reff.).

9—XXII. 5.] *More particular description of the heavenly Jerusalem.* **And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, which** (namely the angels, however strange it may seem) **were full of the seven last plagues** (one of these angels had before shewn the Apostle the great harlot, ch. xvii. 1. The contrast to that vision is maintained throughout these opening verses), **and he talked with me, saying, Hither, I will shew thee** (hitherto verbatim as in ch. xvii. 1) **the bride, the wife of the Lamb** (here likewise note the contrast to the succeeding context in ch. xvii. 1,—in the faithfulness and purity implied in these words). **And he carried me away in the spirit** (ch. xvii. 3) **to** (**ἐπί**, as we say in some parts of England, *on to*, combining motion towards and position upon) **a mountain great and high** (so likewise when the vision of the heavenly city is vouchsafed to Ezekiel, Ezek. xl. 1, 2), **and shewed me the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God** (this vision had begun in ver. 2, but the Apostle is now carried to this "specular mount" to have a nearer and fuller view of it. The city must not be conceived of as *on* or covering the mountain, but as seen descending to a spot close by it: so in Ezek. xl. 2, whether we read "by" or "upon" as in our margin), **having the glory of God** (i. e. not merely brightness of a divine and celestial kind, but the glorious presence of God Himself, the Shechinah, abiding in her: see ver. 23: also ch. xv. 8): **her brightness** (henceforward the description goes on independent in construction of ἔδειξεν, and changes several times: so in ch. i. 15 ff. See Winer, edn. 6, § 59. 11. **φωστήρ**, from ver. 23, is the effect of the divine glory shining in her: see reff. Gen., where it is used of the heavenly bodies) (**was**) **like to a stone most precious, as it were to a jasper stone, crystal clear** (Wetst. quotes from Psellus, ἡ ἴασπις φύσει κρυσταλλοειδής. See this "crystallizing" jasper discussed in note on ch. iv. 3. Ebrard thinks it is the diamond); **having** (on the construction, see above) **a wall great and high, having** (**also**) **twelve gates** (see Ezek. xlviii. 30 ff., where the same features are found in the description), **and at the gates** (dat. after **ἐπί**, of close

v Luke xiii. 29. Ezek. l. c. (πρός.)
w Matt. viii. 11.
x = πρὸς θάλασσαν, Ezek. l. c.
y ver. 19. Heb. xi. 10. Ps. lxxxvi. 1. (neut., Acts xvi. 26. Isa. xxviii. 16.)
z = Matt. vii. 2 al. Ezek. xlvii. 3.
a ch. xi. 1 reff. Ezek. xl. 5, 8.
b ch. xi. 1, 2 reff.
c here only. Ezek. xliii. 16. xlviii. (16) 20.
d here (bis) and Eph. iii. 18 only.
e Eph. ...

μένα, ἅ ἐστιν [τὰ ὀνόματα] τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶ...
ραήλ, 13 ἀπὸ [vw] ἀνατολῆς πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπ...
πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ [v] νότου πυλῶνες τρε...
[wx] δυσμῶν πυλῶνες τρεῖς. 14 καὶ τὸ [s] τεῖχος τ...
ἔχων [y] θεμελίους δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκ...
τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀρνίου. 15 καὶ ὁ λ...
ἐμοῦ εἶχεν [z] μέτρον [a] κάλαμον χρυσοῦν, ἵνα [b] μ...
πόλιν καὶ τοὺς [t] πυλῶνας αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ [s] τεῖ...
16 καὶ ἡ πόλις [c] τετράγωνος κεῖται, καὶ τὸ [d] μ...

γεγραμμενα ℵ lipss. rec om τα ονοματα, with [P]ℵ h 1. 10-7. 34 ...
e sil) : om τα B rel Andr-coisl : ins A m 35 (vulg) syr-dd copt. ...
υιων, with [P] h l 1. 10-7. 30² (37-9. 41-9 Br, e sil) : om Aℵ B rel A...
illeg.)—om των υιων 12. 27.—for τ. υι., του b 32 Andr.
13. rec (for 1st απο) απ', with 1. 2. 4. 13-9. 27. 30-2 : txt A[P]ℵ B r...
ανατολων B rel Andr-coisl Areth : txt A[P]ℵ 1 (13. 32, e sil) An...
και (thrice), with 1 (32, e sil) fuld(with demid tol lips-4) Andr Primas I...
B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth(but om 1st) arm Andr-coisl Areth Jer. ...
δυσμ. A (1) am arm : om κ. απο νοτ. c 79 : δυσμ. . . κ. α. Βορ. κ. α. νοτ. ...
νοτ. . . κ. α. βορ. . . κ. α. δυσμ. k : txt [P]ℵ[3a] B rel.—ℵ[1] reads βορρ...
νοτου, and νοτου for δυσμων : for νοτ., μεσημβριας 1.
14. το and -χος(of τειχος) are written above the line in 1. rec ...
rel : ειχε 38 : om ℵ[1] : txt A[P] B j k l 1. 32. rec (for επ' αυτων, ...
vulg : txt A[P]ℵ B 1-marg rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Tich Primas.—...
l 1-txt. rec om 2nd δωδεκα, with l 1-txt : ins A[P]ℵ B rel vulg sy...
Areth, ιβ' B 1-marg 37. 92 ; δεκαδυο 18-9 : δωδεκα τα 42.
15. rec om μετρον, with 1 (k Br, e sil) copt Andr-a : ins A[P]ℵ B ...
æth Andr Areth Primas(*arundinem auream ad mensuram, ut* . .).
(11) vulg. μετρησει B l. om from 1st to 2nd αυτης (homœ...
A[P]ℵ c (1, e sil) 38.—om 1st αυτης also d.
16. aft πολις ins αυτης, ℵ(omg it aft μηκος). om 2nd to 4th κα...

juxtaposition, primarily of *addition*) **twelve angels, and names inscribed** (contrast to the ὀνόματα βλασφημίας, ch. xvii. 3), **which are [the names] of the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel** (it does not follow from this description either, 1. that the angels must necessarily be guardians, seeing that no foes remain to be guarded against : they are for the completeness and adornment of the city after the idea of a beautiful fortress, adopted to set it forth :—or, 2. that, as in the Jewish books (see De Wette here), each gate is to be imagined as used by each tribe : the twelve tribes of Israel represent the whole people of God, and the city the encampment of Israel : see below). **From** (on the side entering from) **the sun-rising three gates** (Joseph, Benjamin, Dan, in Ezek. xlviii. 32. In ch. vii. 6, Manasseh is substituted for Dan, which is omitted. See there), **from the north three gates** (Reuben, Judah, Levi), ... **south three gates** (Simeon, Issa... ...ulun), **from the sun-setting**

three gates (Gad, Asher, Na... ibid. In Numbers ii., the ... campment is thus set do... Judah, Issachar, Zebulun : ... ben, Simeon, Gad : *West*,— ... nasseh, Benjamin : *North*,— ... Naphtali). **And the wall of** ... wall surrounding the city) ... for masc. of the part., see ... **twelve foundation-stones** (i... each portion of the wall joini... had a conspicuous basement... stone. Four of these, as ... serves, would be corner-stones ... third gate on one side to the ... the next), **and upon them** (ge... perhaps extending all their len... **names of the twelve apostles** ... (cf. Eph. ii. 20, where howeve... idea is a different one, see the in... in the note. No inference can ... has been drawn by some from t... Writer was not himself an Apost... legg. § i. 84 ff.). **15—17.**] *It... ment* : cf. Ezek. xl. 3—5. **An**...

| τὸ ef πλάτος. κα b ἐμέτρησεν τὴν πόλιν τῷ
g ἐπὶ h σταδίους δώδεκα χιλιάδων· τὸ de μῆκος
πλάτος καὶ τὸ ei ὕψος αὐτῆς k ἴσα ἐστίν. 17 καὶ
ν τὸ s τεῖχος αὐτῆς ἑκατὸν τεσσερακοντατεσσά-
χων, s μέτρον m ἀνθρώπου, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγγέλου.
l ἐνδόμησις τοῦ s τείχους αὐτῆς o ἴασπις· καὶ ἡ

f ch. xx. 9 reff. g see Acts iv. 17. so of time, Luke iv. 25. Acts xiii. 31 al. h ch. xiv. 20 reff. i James i. 9 reff. k Matt. xx. 12. Mark xiv. 56, 59. Luke vi. 34. John v. 18. Acts xi. 17. Phil. ii.

Ezek. xl. 5. l Matt. vi. 27. Luke xii. 25. John xxi. 8 only. Ezek. l. c. m = ch. xiii. viii. 1. n here only †. Jos. Antt. xv. 9. 6. o ch. iv. 3. ver. 11 only. Isa. liv. 12.

ν εστιν bef οσον, with vulg Primas: om A[P]ℵ B rel syr-dd æth Andr
οσον as well Br. om 3rd και [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: ins A (32. 40-2,
yr-dd copt Primas Jer. ins εν bef τω καλ. [P] c 1(11). 12. 32 Andr.
ph σταδιων, with ℵ1 1. 35 Andr: σταδιου(sic) ℵ3a: txt A[P] B rel Andr-
. for δωδεκα, δεκαδυο rel Andr-coisl: txt A[P]ℵ h 10. 92 (l 37, e sil)
reth: ιβ′ B 1. 17. 32. ins και bef χιλιαδων B 92. aft χιλ. ins
l (ιβ′ B 92 al) syr-dd: om A[P]ℵ l 1. 17-8. 35-7-8-9.
μετρησεν B rel Andr-coisl: ins A[P]ℵ h l 4 (1. 16. 32-7-9. 49, e sil) Andr
nas. for τειχος, χιλος(sic) ℵ. πηχεων ℵ.
(aft και) ins ην, with B rel Andr Areth Primas: om A[P]ℵ3a syr-dd æth
η, ην ℵ1. ενδωμησις Aℵ3a j: ενδωμασι ℵ: εκδομησις k. om from

n me **had as a measure a golden**) **that he might measure the** her **gates and her wall. And** ieth **four-square** (so E. V. well; tetragonal), **and her length is** s [**also**] **her breadth** (see below). **measured the city with the reed** ength **of stadii of the amount** e **thousands** (such appears to onstruction. On the ἐπί, '*over*,' , see Winer, edn. 6, § 49, l. 3, have it in the adverbial phrase ἐφ' m. xi. 13. The 12,000 stadii are obability the whole circumference, each space between the gates); gth **and the breadth and the** of it **are equal** (the supposition of positors, that the city thus formed rous cube, 3000 stadii in length, lth, and in height, really does not to be necessarily included in these Nay, it seems to be precluded by ext follows, where the angel *mea*-e *height* of the wall. For Düster- idea that the *houses* were 3000 n height, while the wall was only bits, is too absurd to come at all uestion. The words are open, this onsideration being taken into ac- to two interpretations: 1) that the ncluding the hill or rock on which placed, and which may be imagined cending with it, formed such a cube ns here described: or 2) that there e looseness of use in the word ἴσα, hat we must understand that the n and breadth were equal to each and the height equal all round: y so De Wette, al. Of these two I prefer the former, as doing no violence to the words, and as recalling somewhat the form of the earthly Jerusalem on its escarpment above the valley of the Kedron. Some such idea seems also to be pointed at in the rabbinical books, e.g. Bava Bathra, f. 75. 2, "Dixit Rabba, R. Jochananem dixisse, Deum S. B. tempore futuro Hierosolyma evecturum in altitudinem xii. milliarium S. D. Zach. xiv. 10. Quid est 'in loco suo?' talem esse futuram superne, qualis est infra. Rabba dixit, senex mihi narravit, se vidisse Hierosolymam priorem, quæ xii. milliarium erat. Dices, difficilem fore adscensum? sed scriptum est, Isa. lx. 8." And in Schir R. vii. 5, "Jerusalem tempore futuro dilatabitur ita ut pertingat usque ad portas Damasci, Zach. ix. 1. . . . . et exaltabitur ut pertingat usque ad thronum gloriæ, donec dicatur, locus mihi angustus est." See more citations in Wetst.). **And he measured the wall of it** (i. e. the *height* of the wall of it), **of an hundred and forty-four cubits, the measure of a man, which is that of an angel** (meaning that in this matter of measure, men and angels use the same. The interpretation, that in this particular case, the angel used the measure current among men (De Wette, al.), is ungrammatical. As to the height thus given, it may be observed that the height of Solomon's porch, the highest part of his temple, was 120 cubits, 2 Chron. iii. 4, and the general height of his temple, 30 cubits, 1 Kings vi. 2).

18—27.] *Material*, and further description of the city. **And the building-work** (Jos. in ref. is speaking of the harbour of

p Tobit xiii. 16. q ver. 21 only. Job xxviii. 17 only. r (-λιωος, ch. iv. 6. xv. 2.) r ver. 14. s vv. 12, 14, &c. t ch. xvii. 4 reff. u ver. 2 reff. v Exod. xxviii. 17—20. xxxix. 11—14 F. Ald. &c. [xxxvi. 17—20, AB]. Ezek. xxviii. 13. w here only. Exod. xxiv. 10. Ezek. i. 26. x here only †. y here only. (-δινος, ch. iv. 3.) z here only †. Gen. ii. 12 Aq. a ch. iv. 3 only. b here only. c here only. Tobit xiii. 17. d here only. e here only †. see Gen. ii. 12.

πόλις [p] χρυσίον [p] καθαρὸν ὅμοιον [q] ὑάλῳ καθαρῷ. [19] οἱ [r] θεμέλιοι τοῦ [s] τείχους τῆς πόλεως παντὶ [pt] λίθῳ [pt] τιμίῳ [u] κεκοσμημένοι· ὁ [r] θεμέλιος ὁ πρῶτος [ov] ἴασπις, ὁ δεύτερος [prw] σάπφειρος, ὁ τρίτος [x] χαλκηδών, ὁ τέταρτος [pry] σμάραγδος, [20] ὁ πέμπτος [z] σαρδόνυξ, ὁ ἕκτος [va] σάρδιον, ὁ ἕβδομος [vb] χρυσόλιθος, ὁ ὄγδοος [vc] βήρυλλος, ὁ ἔνατος [vd] τοπάζιον, ὁ δέκατος [e] χρυσόπρασος, ὁ ἑνδέκατος

APℵ B c d e … k l 1 …

του τειχους to τ. τειχ. next ver 40. rec ομοια, with 1. 7 (26, e sil) Primas: ομοιω l: ομοι(sic) 50: txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg Andr Areth Tich. [om καθαρω P.]

19. rec ins και (bef οι), with ℵ[1] h 1. 10-7. 35 (l 30-7. 49 B[r], e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr: om A[P]ℵ[3a] B rel am Andr-coisl Areth lat-ff. [P is def after τιμιω, but there seems not space enough for κεκοσμημενοι.] for πρωτος, εις ℵ. aft ιασπις ins και ℵ. σαπφερος B, σαπφηρος l. aft σαπφ. ins και ℵ. χαρχηδων 35, χαρκητον copt; λυχνιτης j, χαλκιδων B e k 1: χαλχεδων 38.

20. σαρδιονυξ A: -δωνυξ c e 10. 48 B[r] Andr-coisl: txt [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth. (d illeg.) rec σαρδιος, with h l 1. 10-7-8. 51 (37-8. 40-1-9 B[r], e sil) Andr, *sardinus* vulg: txt A[P]ℵ B rel (copt) Andr-coisl Areth. βηρυλλιος B(Mai) c l 92 Areth; [βηρυλλιον P:] κηρυλλος k: βηριλλιος 1: βηριλλος e: βυριλλος 49: txt Aℵ B(Tischdf) rel am(with fuld). (ενατος, so A B b d h j l 1. 27. 92 Andr-coisl, εθ' ℵ[1], but ε erased.) τοπαδιον ℵ[1][: τοπαυζιον(sic) P]. χρυσοπρασον A: txt [P]ℵ[1] B rel Andr Areth: -πρασιος(sic) ℵ[3a]: -πρασσος l, *-prassus* or *-prasus* vulg lat-ff; -παστος(sic) 92: -πασος e j(-σσ-) k 2. 30. 50.

Cæsarea, as built by Herod the Great: he describes it as being τῇ δομήσει περίβλεπτον, because the materials were costly and brought from a distance: and says, ἡ δὲ ἐνδόμησις ὅσην ἐνεβάλετο κατὰ τῆς θαλάττης εἰς διακοσίους πόδας. This would be, as appears when he afterwards describes (as here) its materials, a mole or breastwork, against the sea. The word seems to be no where else found) **of the wall of it (was) jasper** (ch. iv. 3, note), **and the city (was) pure gold** (χρυσός, the metal itself: χρυσίον, the same wrought into any form for use: so with ἄργυρος and ἀργύριον) **like to pure glass** (i. e. ideal gold, transparent, such as no gold is here, but surpassing it in splendour). **The foundation-stones of the wall of the city** (see above, ver. 14) **(were) adorned with every** (cf. πᾶν, ch. xviii. 12) **precious stone** (not that the stones were merely set on the θεμέλιοι, but that the θεμ. themselves *consisted* of them: see below, and cf. Isa. liv. 12): **the first foundation-stone (was) jasper** (the material of the upper building of the wall, ver. 18), **the second, sapphire** (סַפִּיר, reff. The stone described under this name by Pliny seems to be our lapis lazuli: he says, xxxvii. 39, "Sapphirus et aureis punctis collucet. Cæruleæ et sapphiri, raroque cum purpura." But the sapphire of the Scriptures seems more like the present hard sky-blue stone known by that name: see ref. Ezek. i.: and Winer, Realw., Edelstein, 5), **the third, chalcedony** (this name is unknown: corresponding perhaps to שְׁבוֹ, Exod. xxviii. 19, xxxix. 12 [xxxvi. 18], which the LXX and Josephus render ἀχάτης, agate. There seems to have been an agate brought from Chalcedon. It is described as semi-opaque, sky-blue, with stripes of other colours: "morientibus arboribus similes," Plin. xxxvii. 30. See Winer, ut supra, 8, and 16), **the fourth, emerald** (note, ch. iv. 3), **the fifth, sardonyx** (שֹׁהַם, Exod. xxxix. 11; Ezek. xxviii. 13: Pliny, xxxvii. 24, says, "Sardonyches olim ut ex nomine ipso apparet, intelligebantur candore in sarda, hoc est velut carnibus in ungue hominis imposito, et utroque translucido." The ancient versions and Josephus call it onyx. See Winer, ut supra, 6), **the sixth, sardius** (ch. iv. 3, note), **the seventh, chrysolith** (תַּרְשִׁישׁ: reff. al. and Josephus thus render it. The stone at present so called is pale green, transparent, and crystallized with shifting colours. But the ancient chrysoliths are described by Pliny as "aureo fulgore translucentes," and have been supposed the same as our topaz: or by some, as amber: see Winer, ut supra, 10), **the eighth, beryl** (שֹׁהַם. ref. Exod.: rendered by the LXX in Gen. ii. 12, λίθος ὁ πράσινος, and variously in other places. Epiphanius in Wetst. says, βηρύλλιον

[f] ὑάκινθος, ὁ δωδέκατος [v g] ἀμέθυστος. [21] καὶ οἱ δώδεκα [h] πυλῶνες δώδεκα [i] μαργαρῖται· [k l] ἀνὰ [l] εἷς [l] ἕκαστος τῶν [h] πυλώνων ἦν ἐξ ἑνὸς [i] μαργαρίτου. καὶ ἡ [m] πλατεῖα τῆς πόλεως [n] χρυσίον [n] καθαρὸν ὡς [n] ὕαλος [o] διαυγής. [22] καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ· ὁ γὰρ [p] κύριος ὁ [p] θεὸς ὁ [p] παντοκράτωρ [ὁ] ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστιν, καὶ τὸ ἀρνίον. [23] καὶ ἡ πόλις οὐ [q] χρείαν [q] ἔχει τοῦ ἡλίου οὐδὲ τῆς σελήνης, ἵνα [r] φαίνωσιν αὐτῇ· ἡ γὰρ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ [s] ἐφώτισεν αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ [t] λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἀρνίον· [24] καὶ

f here only ‡. Ezek. xvi. 10 al.
g here only. Exod. & Ezek. as above (v) only.
h ver. 12.
i ch. xvii. 4 reff.
k Luke ix. 3. x. 1. John ii. 6. ch. iv. 8.
l here only.
m sing., ch. xi. 8. xxii. 2 only. Esth. vi. 9, 11. plur., Matt. vi. 5. xii. 19 al.
n see ver. 18.
o here only †. Prov. xvi. 2 Aq. (-γάζειν, 2 Pet. i. 19.)
p ch. i. 8 reff.
q Matt. vi. 8 al. fr. Prov. xviii. 2.
r = John i. 5. v. 35. 1 John ii. 8. ch. i. 16. viii. 12. xviii. 23. John only, exc. 2 Pet. i. 19. Gen. i. 17. 1 Macc. iv. 50.
s ch. xviii. 1 reff. Isa. lx. 19.
t John v. 35. Luke xi. 36 al. Exod. xxvii. 20.

αμεθυσος (for *-στος*) ℵ[3a] b c e h j l 1. 13. 32-7-8. 40-1-7-8-9. 82, *αμεθυστινος* ℵ[1].

21. om 2nd *δωδεκα* ℵ[1]. for *ανα*, *ινα* A. [add *και* P.] aft *πυλωνων* ins *ων* ℵ[1](ℵ[3a] disapproving). aft *ην* ins *ως* [P] B 92. rec (for *διαυγης*) *διαφανης*: txt A[P](ℵ) B rel Andr Areth.—*διαυτης* is corrd to txt in ℵ

22. for *ο γαρ κ. ο θ.*, *οτι ο $\overline{κς}$ ο $\overline{θς}$* ℵ[1]: *ο γαρ ο $\overline{κς}$ $\overline{θς}$* (sic) ℵ[3a]: *ει μη $\overline{κς}$ ο θ.* 90. rec om *ο* (bef *ναος*), with [P]ℵ B rel Andr Areth: ins A.

23. rec aft *φαινωσιν* ins *εν*, with ℵ[3a] h 17. 30[2] (37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg: om A[P]ℵ[1] B rel Andr Areth Primas.—om *αυτη* 92. *γαρ* bef *η* B rel: txt A[P]ℵ h 10-7. 38 (1. 37. 49, e sil).

γλαυκίζων μέν ἐστι θαλασσοβαφής, ἔχων εἶδος καὶ τῆς ὑδαρεστέρας ὑακίνθου: and Pliny xxxvii. 20, "viriditatem puri maris imitantur," Winer, ut supra, 11), **the ninth, topaz** (פִּטְדָה, reff. and al. Strabo describes it as *διαφανής, χρυσοειδὲς ἀπολάμπων φέγγος*, xvi. p. 770, Wetst., where see more testimonies. But Plin. xxxvii. 32, says "egregia etiamnum topazio gloria est, suo *virenti* genere:" whence some have supposed it our chrysolith: see above. Cf. Job xxviii. 19: and Winer ut supra, 2), **the tenth, chrysoprasus** (this word is found only in Pliny, xxxvii. 20, "vicinum genus huic (beryllo) est pallidius, et a quibusdam proprii generis existimatur, vocaturque chrysoprasus:" and 21, "amethysti fulgens purpura"), **the eleventh, jacinth** (לֶשֶׁם: so alii apud Tromm. in Exod. xxviii. 19, where the LXX have *λιγύριον*, which again occurs in Ezek. xxviii. 13, where לֶשֶׁם is not found: while in Exod. xxviii. 20 Symm. renders תַּרְשִׁישׁ by *ὑάκινθος*. The word is not found in LXX as the name of a gem. Pliny, xxxvii. 41: "ille emicans in amethysto fulgor violaceus dilutus est in hyacintho"), **the twelfth, amethyst** (אַחְלָמָה reff. Pliny, xxxvii. 40, reckons the amethyst among the purple stones, and says of the best, the Indian, "absolutum felicis purpuræ colorem habent . . . . perlucent autem omnes violaceo colore." So that it seems to be the stone now known by that name). **And the twelve gates, twelve pearls** (Isa. liv. 12, "carbuncles." Wetst. quotes from the Rabbinical Bava Bathra, f. 75. 1: "Deus S. B. adducet gemmas et margaritas, triginta cubitos longas totidemque latas: easque excavabit in altitudinem xx cubitorum, et latitudinem x cubitorum, collocabitque eas in portis Hierosolymorum." See many more in Wetst. and Schöttgen), **each one separately** (reff.) **of the gates was** (made) **out of one pearl. And the street** (generic: the street-material, throughout) **of the city** (was) **pure gold like transparent glass** (see above on ver. 18). **And a temple I saw not in it: for the Lord God Almighty is the temple of it, and the Lamb** (i. e. the inhabitants need no place of worship or sacrifice, the object of all worship being present, and the great Sacrifice Himself being there). **And the city hath not need of the sun nor yet of the moon, that they should shine on her** (*αὐτῇ*, dat. commodi): **for the glory of God** (the brightness of His presence, the Shechinah: see above, ver. 11) **lightened her, and her lamp was the Lamb** (see Isa. lx. 19, 20. No assignment of the members of the sentence must be thought of, such as that *ἡ δόξα τ. θεοῦ* is her Sun, and *τὸ ἀρνίον* her Moon: so Grot. and Ewald (not De Wette, as Düsterd., who only thinks that *φωτίζειν* corresponds to the sun and *λύχνος* to the

[u] περιπατήσουσιν τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ [v] βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς φέρουσιν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτήν, 25 καὶ οἱ [w] πυλῶνες αὐτῆς οὐ μὴ [v] κλεισθῶσιν [v] ἡμέρας, νὺξ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ, 26 καὶ [v] οἴσουσιν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς αὐτήν. 27 [x] καὶ [y] οὐ μὴ εἰςέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν [y] πᾶν [z] κοινὸν καὶ [abc] ποιῶν [bd] βδέλυγμα καὶ [c] ψεῦδος, [e] εἰ μὴ οἱ [f] γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ [fg] βιβλίῳ τῆς [fg] ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου.

XXII. 1 Καὶ ἔδειξέν μοι ποταμὸν [h] ὕδατος [h] ζωῆς [i] λαμπρὸν ὡς [k] κρύσταλλον, [l] ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου

u ch. ii. 1. iii. 4. Isa. lix. 9. (Isa. lx. 3.)
v Isa. lx. 11 ff.
w ver. 12.
x Isa. xxxv. 8.
y 1 John ii. 21 reff.
z = Acts x. 14. xi. 8 al.‡ 1 Macc. i. 47, 62.
a constr. masc., ch. iv. 1 al.
b Jer. viii. 12 compl. (not in ABℵ).
c ch. xxii. 15. Jer. viii. 10 compl. P (not in ABℵ).
d ch. xvii. 4 reff.
e constr., ch. ix. 4.
f see ch. xx. 15.
g see ch. iii. 5 reff.
h ch. vii. 17 reff.
i ch. xv. 6. xviii. 14. xix. 8 al.† Wisd. xvii. 20 al.
k ch. iv. 6 only. Num. xi. 7. Ezek. i. 22.
l ch. iv. 5 al. fr. Ezek. xlvii. 1.

24. rec (for *περιπατ.* to *φωτος αυτης*) *τα εθνη των σωζομενων εν τω φωτι αυτης περιπατησουσι*, with 18 Andr-comm: *και περιπατησουσι αυτης* 39: *τα εθ. των σωζ. τω φωτι αυτης περιπ.* (*τα* in red) *εθνη δια του φωτος αυτης* 1(sic): txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg copt Andr Areth lat-ff.—aft *περιπ.* ℵ[1] wrote *δ* but marked it for erasure. for *την* (bef *δοξαν*), *αυτω* B rel: *αυτων* 5: om 92: txt A[P]ℵ h l 1. 10-7-8. 34-8 (17-8. 35-7. 47-9 B[r], e sil). rec (aft *δοξαν*) ins *και την τιμην*, with B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth (but of these B b c d e j k 19. 39. 40-1-2-8. 51. 92 Areth om *την*): om A[P]ℵ h l 1. 17-8. 38. 47 B[r]. for *αυτων*, *των εθνων* B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl: txt A[P]ℵ h l 1. 10-7-8. 38 (37. 47-9 B[r], e sil) vulg copt Andr Areth Ambr Primas

25. for *ημερας*, *ημερα* (sic) ℵ[1].

26. (om ver B[r]?) at end add *ινα εισελθωσιν* B rel Areth: om A[P]ℵ h l 2. 10. 34 (1. 35-7. 47-9, e sil).

27. *εισελθωσιν* ℵ. rec *κοινουν*, with 26-7: *κοινων* 1: txt A[P]ℵ B rel. rec *ποιουν*, with [P] B c h 1. 2. 4. 10-7. 34 (26. 32-5-7. 42-8-9, e sil) Andr Areth: *ο ποιων* rel copt: *ο ποιωσει* (sic) ℵ[1]: txt Aℵ[3a] 18. 41. 92. for *αρνιου*, *ουνου* (sic) ℵ.

Chap. XXII. 1. rec ins *καθαρον* bef *ποταμον*, with 1: aft *ποτ.*, c h l 4. 10-7. 26. 32-4-8. 48-9 B[r] Andr Areth: om A[P]ℵ B rel Hil Primas. om 1st *του* ℵ.

moon, but protests against applying these to the divine Persons separately)): **and the nations shall walk by means of her light** (i. e. she shall be so bright as to serve for light,—for sun and moon both,—to the world that then is, and her inhabitants. For such inhabitants are clearly supposed; see below, and ch. xxii. 2). **And the kings of the earth** (no longer hostile to Christ) **bring** (pres. of habit and certainty, as so often in this prophecy) **their** (the kings', not the nations', as ver. 26) **glory** (cf. Isa. lx. 3: all in which they glory) **into her: and her gates shall never be shut by day** (i. e. in *meaning*, shall never be shut, seeing it will always be day: shall never be shut, for if they were, they must be shut by day): **for night shall not exist there. And they** (men) **shall bring the glory and the costliness of the nations into her** (Isa. lxvi. 12. Among the mysteries of this new heaven and new earth this is set forth to us: that, besides the glorified church, there shall still be dwelling on the renewed earth nations, organized under kings, and (ch. xxii. 2) saved by means of the influences of the heavenly city). **And there shall never enter into her, every thing unclean, and working abomination and falsehood, but only** (lit. except) **they that are written in the book of life of the Lamb** (if then the kings of the earth, and the nations, bring their glory and their treasures into her, and if none shall ever enter into her that is not written in the book of life, it follows, that these kings, and these nations, are written in the book of life. And so perhaps some light may be thrown on one of the darkest mysteries of redemption. There may be,—I say it with all diffidence,—those who have been saved by Christ without ever forming a part of his visible organized Church).

Ch. XXII. 1—5.] *The end of the description:* the means of healing for the nations (1, 2): the blessedness, and eternal reign of the glorified servants of God (3—5).

And he shewed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal, coming forth out of the throne of God and of the Lamb (which throne is one and the same: see ch. iii. 21, and note on ch. xx. 11. The

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου. [2] ἐν μέσῳ τῆς [m] πλατείας αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ [n] ἐντεῦθεν καὶ [n] ἐκεῖθεν [o] ξύλον [o] ζωῆς, [p] ποιοῦν [p] καρποὺς δώδεκα, κατὰ μῆνα ἕκαστον [q] ἀποδιδοῦς τὸν [q] καρπὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ [r] φύλλα τοῦ [o] ξύλου εἰς [s] θεραπείαν τῶν ἐθνῶν. [3] καὶ [t] πᾶν [u] κατάθεμα [t] οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι. καὶ ὁ θρόνος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσται, καὶ οἱ [v] δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ [w] λατρεύσουσιν αὐτῷ, [4] καὶ [xy] ὄψονται τὸ [y] πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν [z] μετώπων αὐτῶν. [5] καὶ [a] νὺξ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, καὶ οὐχ [b] ἕξουσιν [b] χρείαν φωτὸς [b] λύχνου καὶ φωτὸς ἡλίου, ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεὸς [bc] φωτιεῖ ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ [d] βασιλεύσουσιν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

..καρπον e. ΑΡℵ Β c d h j l 1. 2. 9. 10- 16 to 9. 26-7. 0-2-4-5. 7 to 42. 7 to 51. 0-2 Br.

m ch. xxi. 21 reff. n see John xix. 18. Dan. xii. 5. Ezek. xl. 34, 37. o ch. ii. 7 reff. p Gen. ii. 9. Matt. iii. 8 & passim. (Luke also.) Gen. i. 11, 12. (John elsewhere, καρπ. φέρειν.) q Matt. xxi. 41. Heb. xii. 11. Lev. xxvi. 4. r Matt. xxi. 19 ‖ (bis). xxiv. 32 ‖ only. Gen. iii. 7. s = Luke ix. 11 (xii. 42. Matt. xxiv. 45 v. r.) only ‡. see Esth. ii. 12. Ezek. xlvii. 12. t 1 John ii. 21 reff. u here only †. see Matt. xxvi. 74. Zech. xiv. 11. v ch. i. 1. ii. 20. vii. 3 al. Ps. xxxiii. 22. w ch. vii. 15. Acts vii. 7 (from Exod. iii. 12) al. x 1 John iii. 2 reff. y = here only. (Acts xx. 25.) see Ps. xvi. 15. z ch. vii. 3 reff. a ch. xxi. 25. Zech. xiv. 6, 7. b ch. xxi. 23. c ch. xviii. 1 reff. constr., here only. d = ch. xx. 4, 6 reff.

2. εμμεσω A: εκ μεσου 92. txt [P]ℵ B rel. rec (for εκειθεν) εντευθεν, with h 1. 10-7-8-9. 35 (37. 47-9 Br, e sil) Andr: om και εκειθεν 92: txt A[P] B rel syr-dd arm Andr-coisl Areth.—ℵ[3a] has ενθεν και ενθεν και, ℵ[1] ενθεν και (once only), both omitting ξυλον ζωης. ποιων A 18: ποιουντα e: txt ℵ B rel Andr Areth. [P def.] μηναν A. [P def.] rec (aft μηνα) ins ενα, with 1 (j, e sil) Andr-p(Del) Areth: om Aℵ B rel Andr. [P def.] εκαστω B 39. 40; εκαστος d: om 35: txt Aℵ rel Andr Areth. [P def.] rec αποδιδουν, with A b 32-4 (30. 47, e sil) Andr: αποδιδοντα e 1. 29 am fuld Primas: txt ℵ B rel Areth. [P def.] αποδ. bef εκαστ. B b d e k l 9. 17-9. 32-9. 40-1-2. 92 syr-dd: txt A [P(from the space)] ℵ rel Andr Areth. τους καρπους ℵ: om τον 1. 40. 90. [P def.] των ξυλων ℵ. om των (bef εθνων) ℵ.
3. rec καταναθεμα: καταγμα (sic) ℵ[1]: txt A[P]ℵ[3a] B rel Andr Areth. for ετι, εκει 1: om ℵ[1]. om ο ℵ.
4. ins και bef επι ℵ.
5. rec (for ετι) εκει, with h l 1. 4. 10-7-8. 34 (16. 32 5-7-9. 47-8-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: om rel copt Promiss: txt A[P]ℵ B 2. 19 vulg syr-dd lat-ff(some). rec χρειαν ουκ εχουσιν, with [P] 1. 4. 10-7. 34 (c h 32-7. 47-8-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: ουκ εχουσιν χρειαν ℵ: ου χρεια B rel (syr-dd) Primas Promiss: txt A vulg. rec om φωτος (bef λυχνου), with [P] B rel Andr Areth Ambr$_2$: ins Aℵ 18 (38) 47 vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr-a Ambr$_1$ Tich Primas. λυχνον(sic) 1. for 2nd φωτος, φως A[P] 32-5. 48 am: om lips-5. om ηλιου B rel: ins A[P]ℵ c h 1. 10. 30-4. 48 (4 17-8-9. 35-7-8. 47-9 Br, e sil) gr-lat-ff. rec φωτιζει, with c 4. 34 (32. 48, e sil) am syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: φωτισει A[P] 12. 42: txt ℵ B rel (vulg copt) Andr (Primas Ambr). rec om επ, with [P] B rel Andr Areth: ins Aℵ Ambr Tich Primas. for τους, αυτους 1.

O. T. passages in view are Gen. ii. 10; Ezek. xlvii. 1 ff.). **In the midst of the street of it** (the city), **and of the river, on one side and on the other** (the gen. ποταμοῦ is governed by ἐν μέσῳ as Ewald and Düsterd. al., not by ἐντεῦθεν κ. ἐκεῖθεν, as De Wette: the meaning being that the trees were on each side in the middle of the space between the street and the river. See Ezek. xlvii. 7), **(was) the tree of life** (ch. ii. 7; Ezek. ut supra ff., i. e. *trees* of the kind described: as in Ezek.), **producing twelve fruits** (kinds of fruit, Ezek. xlvii. 12), **according to each month yielding its fruit** (Ezek. ut supra): **and the leaves of the tree (are) for healing of the nations** (so exactly, Ezek. ver. 12: "and the leaf thereof (φύλλον is read for ἀνάβασις, in LXX, by "alii apud Tromm.") for medicine." On the sense of ἐθνῶν, the nations *outside*, see above, ch. xxi. end). **And every curse** (accursed thing, see below. κατάθεμα, another form of κατανάθεμα; in ref. Matt. we have the verb καταθεματίζειν) **shall exist no longer** (cf. ref. Zech. There shall no more be those accursed things which bar the residence of God among His people: see Josh. vii. 12, which shews that these words are in close connexion with what follows): **and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in her, and His servants shall serve Him** (in

e 1 Tim. i. 15. iii. 1. iv. 9. 2 Tim. ii. 11. Tit. iii. 8.
f ch. iii 14. xix. 11. xxi. 5.
g Num. xvi. 22. xxvii. 16.
h 1 Cor. xiv. 32.
i ch. i. 1 (reff.).
j ch. iii. 11. vv. 12, 20.
k 1 John ii. 5 reff.
l vv. 10, 18 (ch. i. 3).
m see ch. xix. 10.
n ver. 19. see above (l).

6 Καὶ εἶπέν μοι Οὗτοι οἱ [e] λόγοι [ef] πιστοὶ καὶ [f] ἀληθινοί, καὶ ὁ κύριος ὁ [g] θεὸς τῶν [gh] πνευμάτων τῶν [h] προφητῶν [i] ἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ [i] δεῖξαι τοῖς [*] δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ [i] δεῖ [i] γενέσθαι ἐν [i] τάχει. 7 καὶ ἰδοὺ [j] ἔρχομαι [j] ταχύ· μακάριος ὁ [k] τηρῶν τοὺς [kl] λόγους τῆς [l] προφητείας τοῦ [l] βιβλίου τούτου.

8 Κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα· καὶ ὅτε ἤκουσα καὶ ἔβλεψα ἔπεσα [m] προςκυνῆσαι ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ δεικνύοντός μοι ταῦτα. 9 καὶ λέγει μοι [m] Ὅρα μή· [m] σύνδουλός σου εἰμὶ καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῶν [k] τηρούντων τοὺς [kn] λόγους τοῦ

AN B : c d : k l 1 : 4. 9. ... 19. 2 ... 47 ... 90-2 Br.

6. for *ειπεν*, *λεγει* B rel : txt A[P]ℵ 4. 34 (1. 32. 48, e sil) vss gr-lat-ff. rec om *ο* (bef *κυριος*), with [P] B rel Andr Areth : ins Aℵ 92. rec (for *πνευματων των*) *αγιων*, with 1. 34 Andr : *των πν. των αγ.* 35(Del) Andr-coisl : txt A[P]ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr-comm Areth Primas Idac. aft *απεστ.* ins *με* ℵ[1](ℵ[3a] disapproving).

7. rec om *και*, with h 1. 4. 10-7. 34-8 (37. 40-8-9 Br, e sil) copt Andr Primas : ins Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd æth Andr-a Areth. *ερχονται* ℵ[3a].

8. rec *και εγω*, with rel Andr-coisl Areth : om *εγω* 92 : txt Aℵ B b d h j k 9. 10-3-6. 26-7. 35-8. 47-9. 50. 90 Br Dion Andr. rec *ο βλεπων ταυτα και ακουων*, with 1 : *ο βλ. κ. ακ. ταυτα* ℵ c 4. 32-4. 48 copt Dion Andr Areth : txt A B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-p lat-ff. *οτε ειδον* (for *εβλεψα*) B rel ; *ειδον* (alone) b k 16. 38 : txt ℵ 1. 4. 10-7. 34 (c h 18. 32-7. 48-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth ; *εβλεπον* A : *vidi* vulg Primas. elz *επεσον*, with B rel : txt Aℵ 1. 16-8. 30-5. for *εμπροσθεν των*, *προ* A. *δικνυντος* ℵ h j l 49. 50.

9. rec (aft *σου*) ins *γαρ*, with 30[2] : om Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Ath Andr Areth Cypr. om 2nd *και* 1. om last *και* b c h 1. 12. 32[1]-7. 47-8-9.

ministration and holy service, see ch. vii. 15), **and they shall see His face** (be close to Him, and know Him even as they are known, Matt. v. 8), **and His name (shall be) on their foreheads** (ref.). **And night shall not be any more** (ch. xxi. 25), **and they shall have no need of the light of a lamp or (and) of the light of the sun** (ch. xxi. 23), **because the Lord God shall shine** (shed light) **upon them: and they shall reign** (De Wette well remarks, in a higher sense than in ch. xx. 4, 6) **to the ages of the ages.**

6—21.] Concluding assurances and exhortations: and herein, 6, 7, *assurance by the angel of the truth of what has been said*, in the terms of ch. i. 1. **And he** (the angel) **said to me, These sayings** (the whole book, by what follows) **are faithful and true** (see on reff.): **and the Lord** (Jehovah) **the God of the spirits of the prophets** (i. e. of those spirits of theirs, which, informed by the Holy Spirit, have become the vehicles of prophecy) **sent His angel to shew to His servants what things must come to pass shortly** (on the whole of this see on ch. i. 1, from which place it is repeated at the close of the book of which that is the opening). **And behold, I come quickly** (the speech passes into the words of Christ Himself, reported by the angel: so in ver. 12, and in ch. xi. 3): **Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book** (the speech is a mixed one: in τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, the Writer has in view the roll of his book now lying all but completed before him: but the words are the saying of the angel: τῆς προφητείας ταύτης would express it formally). **And I John (was he) who heard and saw these things** (pres. participles without temporal significance—was the hearer and seer of these things): **and when I heard and saw, I fell down** (as in ch. xix. 10, where see notes) **to worship before the feet of the angel who shewed me** (pres. part. as above) **these things. And he saith to me, Take heed not: I am a fellow-servant of thine, and (a fellow-servant) of thy brethren the prophets, and of those who keep the sayings of this book: worship God** (the same feeling again prevailed over the Apostle as before, and is met with a similar rebuke. I hardly can with Düsterd. see any real distinction implied, in the ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν here, between the situation of the Seer then and now. D. thinks, the

[n] βιβλίου τούτου. τῷ θεῷ προσκύνησον. 10 καὶ λέγει μοι Μὴ [o] σφραγίσῃς τοὺς [l] λόγους τῆς [l] προφητείας τοῦ [l] βιβλίου τούτου, ὁ [p] καιρὸς γὰρ [pq] ἐγγύς ἐστιν. 11 ὁ [r] ἀδικῶν [r] ἀδικησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ [s] ῥυπαρὸς [t] ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος [u] δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ἅγιος [v] ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι. 12 ἰδοὺ [w] ἔρχομαι [w] ταχύ, καὶ ὁ [xy] μισθός μου [y] μετ' ἐμοῦ [z] ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ ὡς τὸ [a] ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ. 13 ἐγὼ τὸ [b] ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ω, [ὁ] [c] πρῶτος καὶ [ὁ] [c] ἔσχατος, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. 14 μακάριοι οἱ [d] πλύνοντες τὰς [de] στολὰς αὐτῶν, ἵνα [f] ἔσται ἡ [g] ἐξουσία αὐτῶν [g] ἐπὶ τὸ [h] ξύλον

o = ch. x. 4. Dan. viii. 26 Theod. xii. 4, 9.
p ch. i. 3. Matt. xxvi. 18. see Luke xxi. 8.
q = John ii. 23. Phil. iv. 5. Zeph. i. 7.
r = Col. iii. 25. Ps. cv. 6. see Ezek. iii. 27.
s James ii. 2 only. Zech. iii. 4, 5 only. (-πος, 1 Pet. iii. 21. -παρία, James i. 21.)
t here only †.
u 1 John ii. 29. iii. 7, 10. Matt. vi. 1.
v Rev., here only. see Dan. xii. 10.
w vv. 7, 20. ch iii. 11.
x Matt. v. 12. xx. 8. 2 John 8.
y Isa. xl. 10. lxii. 11.
z Matt. xvi. 27. Rom. ii. 6. Prov. xxiv. 12.
a = Heb. vi. 10. 1 Pet. i. 17 al.
b ch. i. 8. xxi. 6.
c ch. i. 17 reff.
d ch. vii. 14.
e Mark xii. 38 ‖ L. xvi. 5. Luke xv. 22. ch. vi. 11. vii. 9, 13, 14 bis only. Isa. lxiii. 1.
f constr., ch. iii. 9 reff.
g usages of ἐξουσ. w. ἐπί, ch. ii. 26 reff.
h ver. 2.

10. om και 1. aft λογους ins τουτους ℵ[1](but marked for erasure). rec ins οτι bef ο καιρος (omg γαρ), with 1. 10-7 (37. 49 Br, e sil) 91 æth Andr-p Cypr$_2$ Primas: ο γαρ καιρος 18. 40 Andr-a: ο καιρος (only) 4. 16. 27. 39. 48: txt Aℵ B rel.

11. homœotel in A j 34-5. 68 Andr-coisl from 1st ετι και to 2nd: in 1 from 1st to 3rd. rec ρυπων ρυπωσατω: ρυπαρωθητω 92: ρυπαρευθητω B rel Andr Areth: txt ℵ 18[1]. 32 Orig$_2$. rec (for δικ. ποιησ.) δικαιωθητω, with 38 (37, e sil) vulg-ed ep-of-ch-of-Lyons(in Eus) Aug$_3$: txt Aℵ B rel am(with demid fuld tol lips-4) syr-dd copt Andr Areth Cypr$_2$. (ποιητω 1.)

12. rec at beg ins και, with 1 æth Andr-p: om Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd copt arm Andr Areth Cypr. αποδοθηναι ℵ[1]. rec εσται, with B(Mai) rel Andr Areth: om 39: txt Aℵ B(Tischdf) 38 syr-dd. (d illeg.)—rec αυτου bef εστ., with l 1. 4. 17. 34-8 (32-5. 48, e sil) Andr Areth: txt Aℵ B rel syr-dd. (d illeg.)

13. rec aft εγω ins ειμι, with 34 (10. 37-9. 40, e sil) vulg Orig$_2$(γεγονα$_1$) lat-ff(some); δε 16: om Aℵ B rel am(with fuld[2]) Ath Andr Areth Cypr-ms Primas. rec α (for αλφα), with B rel Orig Ath Andr: txt Aℵ b c d h j l 9. 32. 90 Andr-coisl Areth. rec ins ο (twice, bef πρωτος and bef εσχ.), with ℵ B rel Andr-coisl: bef πρ. (only) h 32: om A d 9.—rec om η bef αρχη and το bef τελος, with 1. 19 (c h 10. 32 Br, e sil): om το bef τελος 34: ins Aℵ B rel.—rec αρχη κ. τελος bef ο πρωτ. κ. ο εσχ., with 1. 4. 17-8 (c h 10. 32-7. 41-8-9 Br, e sil) Orig$_2$ Andr Areth: txt Aℵ B rel vulg syr-dd æth Orig$_1$ Ath Cypr.

14. rec (for πλυνοντες τας στολας αυτων) ποιουντες τας εντολας αυτου, with B rel syr-dd copt (Andr Areth) Cypr Tert Tich(: for αυτου, εμου Andr-p-c Areth-ms:) txt Aℵ l(πλυναντες) 38(πλυνουντες) vulg æth arm-ming Ath Fulg Primas. aft 2nd

intention now is to exalt his prophetic office and character). **And he saith to me, Seal not up the sayings of the prophecy of this book** (cf. ch. x. 4, where the command is otherwise: also reff. Daniel): **for the time is near** (in Dan. viii. 26, the reason for sealing up the vision is that the time shall be *for many days*). **Let him that is unjust** (pres. part. as above) **commit injustice** (aor. of acts, not of a state, which would be pres.) **still: and let the filthy** (reff.: morally polluted) **pollute himself** (in the constant middle sense of passive verbs when the act depends on a man's self) **still: and let the righteous do righteousness still, and the holy sanctify himself still** (see Ezek. iii. 27: and cf. Matt. xxvi. 45, "Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand:" also Ezek. xx. 39. The saying has solemn irony in it: the time is *so* short, that there is hardly room for change —the lesson conveyed in its depth is, "Change while there is time"). **Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me** (reff. Isa.) **to render** (this infin. may be either of purpose, dependent jointly on ἔρχομαι and ὁ μισθ. κ.τ.λ., or epexegetic of that which is wrapped up in the word μισθός itself. No very satisfactory account is given of this last construction in Winer, edn. 6, § 44. 1) **to each as his work is** (these words sound as if spoken by our Lord Himself: perhaps at the conclusion, the Apostle puts together, in prophetic shortness, many divine sayings of warning and consolation, with the replies to them). **I am the Alpha and the**

i ch. xxi. 12 reff. dat., see James ii. 25. j = Phil. iii. 2. Matt. vii. 6 (Luke xvi. 21. 2 Pet. ii. 22, from Prov. xxvi. 11) only. Ps. xxi. 16. k ch. xxi. 8 (reff.). l ch. xxi. 27. m constr., ver. 20. ch. i. 2. 1 Tim. vi. 13. n dat., = Heb. x. 15. Gen. xliii. 3 Ed-vat. (B def.) o = Matt. xxiv. 33. John iv. 6. v. 2. Acts iii. 11. ch. ix. 14. xxi. 12. r ch. ii. 28 only. see Sir. l. 6. v ch. xxi. 6 reff.

τῆς [h] ζωῆς, καὶ τοῖς [i] πυλῶσιν εἰςέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν. 15 ἔξω οἱ [j] κύνες καὶ οἱ [k] φαρμακοὶ καὶ οἱ [k] πόρνοι καὶ οἱ [k] φονεῖς καὶ οἱ [k] εἰδωλολάτραι καὶ πᾶς φιλῶν καὶ [l] ποιῶν [l] ψεῦδος. 16 ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψα τὸν ἄγγελόν μου [m] μαρτυρῆσαι [n] ὑμῖν [m] ταῦτα [o] ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ [p] ῥίζα καὶ τὸ [q] γένος Δαυείδ, ὁ [r] ἀστὴρ ὁ [s] λαμπρός, ὁ [rt] πρωινός. 17 καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ [u] νύμφη λέγουσιν Ἔρχου· καὶ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω Ἔρχου· καὶ ὁ [v] διψῶν ἐρχέσθω, ὁ θέλων λαβέτω [v] ὕδωρ [v] ζωῆς [v] δωρεάν. 18 [w] Μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ [w] παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς [x] λόγους τῆς [x] προφητείας τοῦ [x] βιβλίου

p ch. v. 5. see Rom. xv. 12, from Isa. xi. 1, 10. q = Acts xvii. 28, 29. Jer. xliii. (xxxvi.) 31. s ver. 1 reff.+ Ep. Jer. 60. t Hos. xiii. 3. u ch. xxi. 2, 9. w dat., = ver. 16 reff. or Rom. x. 2. Gal. iv. 15. x vv. 7, 10.

αυτων ins *ως δε η εξουσια* ℵ[1](ℵ[3] disapproving). *πυλεωσιν* 1.

15. rec aft *εξω* ins *δε*, with (d ?) lips-5 copt Fulg Primas: om Aℵ B (k ?) rel Hip Ath Andr Areth Cypr Tich. *αι πορναι* 12: om *οι* 1 Hip. rec aft *πας* ins *ο*, with l 1. 4. 30[2]-8. 41-8 Andr Areth: om Aℵ B rel Hip. *ποι. και φιλ.* ℵ e 4. 32-4. 48 Hip Ath Andr-coisl Areth.—for *π. ο φ. κ. ποι.*, *οι ποιουντες το* 18.

16. for *επι*, *εν* A 18. 21. 38 vulg copt Ath Andr: om c 1. 4. 47-8 arm Andr-p Areth Primas: txt ℵ B rel syr-dd. rec ins *του* bef *δαυειδ*, with d e l 1. 9. 13. 30[2]: om Aℵ B rel Ath Andr Areth.—*δᾱδ* bef *και το γεν.* b: in 1 *του δᾱδ* is written above the line in red. rec aft *λαμπρος* ins *και*, with A (k ?) vulg: om ℵ B rel vss Ath Andr Areth Tich Idac. rec (for *ο πρωινος*) *ορθρινος*: txt A(*προ-*) ℵ B rel Ath Andr.—om *ο λαμπ.* 35.—*ο πρω.* bef *ο λαμπ.* c (d ?) 4. 32. 40-8 Andr-coisl Areth.

17. om *το* and *η* ℵ.—ℵ[1] wrote *π* in place of *το* but marked it for erasure. rec (for *ερχου*, twice) *ελθε*, and (for *ερχεσθω*) *ελθετω*: txt Aℵ B rel Ath Andr Areth. rec ins *και* bef *ο θελων*, with 34 (d 40, e sil) vulg syr-dd arm Primas: om Aℵ B rel am(with tol lips-5-6) copt æth Ath Andr Areth. rec (for *λαβετω*) *λαμβανετω τα*, with 34(omg *το*) (4. 17, e sil): txt Aℵ B rel Ath Andr Areth.

18. rec (for *μαρτ. εγω*) *συμμαρτυρουμαι γαρ*, with vulg: *μαρτυρομαι γαρ* 34-5 spec Andr-coisl Areth, *μαρτυρομαι εγω* c 48: txt A(ℵ) B rel Andr.—ins *η* bef *μαρτ.* ℵ. rec om 1st *τω*, with d h 10-7 B[r] (26-7. 37. 49. 51, e sil) Andr-p: ins Aℵ B rel Andr

Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end (these words have hitherto been said by the Father: see above, ch. i. 8, xxi. 6, and notes. And in all probability it is so here likewise, whether we assume the words to be spoken by Christ in God's name, or by the Eternal Father Himself). **Blessed are they that wash their robes** (see the digest. The vulg. addition "in sanguine agni," after ch. vii. 14, is of course the right supplement), **that they may** (on ἵνα with fut. see reff., and ch. xiv. 13 note. It is a mixed construction: between "that they may have" and "for they shall have") **have the power** (licence) **over the tree** (to eat of the tree: ἐπί of the direction of their reaching for the fruit) **of life, and may enter by the gates into the city. Outside are the dogs** (impure persons, reff.), **and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters, and every one loving and practising falsehood** (see on these, ch. xxi. 8).

I Jesus (our Lord now speaks directly in His own person) **sent my angel to testify these things to you in** (the ἐπί of addition by juxtaposition, see reff.) **the churches. I am the root** (reff.) **and the race** (the *offspring*, as E. V. So Virg. Æn. iv. 12, "genus esse Deorum") **of David, the bright morning-star** (that brings in the everlasting day).

And the Spirit (in the churches, and in the prophets) **and the Bride** (the Church herself) **say Come** (see on ch. vi. 1, &c.): **and let him that heareth** (the cry of the Spirit and Bride) **say Come: and let him that thirsteth come; let him that will, take the water of life freely** (this verse is best understood as a reply of the Apostle to our Lord's previous words).

18—20.] *Final solemn warning of the Apostle.* **I** (emphatic) **testify to every one** (or, "*of* every one," by a very common N. T. construction: see reff. for both usages) **who heareth the sayings of the prophecy of this book, If any one add**

τούτου, ἐάν τις [y] ἐπιθῇ ἐπ' αὐτά, [z] ἐπιθήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς [a] πληγὰς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ· [19] καὶ ἐάν τις [b] ἀφέλῃ [b] ἀπὸ τῶν [c] λόγων τοῦ [c] βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης, [b] ἀφελεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸ [d] μέρος αὐτοῦ [b] ἀπὸ τοῦ [e] ξύλου τῆς [e] ζωῆς, καὶ [ἐκ] τῆς [f] πόλεως τῆς [f] ἁγίας, τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. [20] Λέγει ὁ [g] μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα [h] Ναί, [i] ἔρχομαι [i] ταχύ. [k] Ἀμὴν ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ.

[21] Ἡ [k] χάρις τοῦ [k] κυρίου Ἰησοῦ [kl] μετὰ τῶν [l] ἁγίων.

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ.

y = here only. = προστιθ. Prov. xxx. (see xxiv.) 6. Sir. xviii. 6.
z = Luke x. 30. Acts xvi. 23. Deut. vii. 15.
a ch. ix. 18, 20 reff.
b Luke [x. 42. xvi. 3. Deut. iv. 2. xii. 32.
c ver. 9.
d ch. xx. 6 reff.
e ver. 2.
f ch. xi. 2. xxi. 2, 10. Matt. iv. 5. xxvii. 53. Isa. xlviii. 2. Dan. ix. 24 Theod.
g constr., ver. 16 reff.
h ch. i. 7. 2 Cor. i. 20.
i ch. iii. 11. vv. 7, 12.
k Rom. xvi. 20 [24]. 1 Cor. xvi. 23 al.
l see note.

Areth. rec (for *επιθη επ αυτα*) *επιτιθη προς ταυτα*: *επιθη προς ταυτα* 27: *επιθη επ' αυτω* k 30: *επιθησει επ αυτω* Andr-a: *επιθησει επ αυτα* ℵ[3a]: *επιτιθη επ' αυτα* 34: txt A B rel Andr.—ℵ[1] has passed from *επιθ.* to *επιθ.* *επιθησαι* b c d h j k l 9. 10-3-6. 26-7. om *επ αυτον* A[1]: *επ αυτω* A[2] 11[2]. 92.—*επ αυτον* bef *ο θεος* ℵ h 10. 30-4-7. 48 B[r] Andr(but Andr-a has *αυτω*) Areth Ambr. ins *επτα* bef *πληγας* B c h 10. 32-4-7. 48-9 B[r] arm Andr Areth: om Aℵ rel vss Ambr Tich Primas. rec om 2nd *τω*: ins Aℵ B rel Andr Areth.

19. for *εαν*, *αν* ℵ. rec (for *αφελη*) *αφαιρη*: *αφελειται* B: *αφελοι* 47. 51: txt Aℵ rel Andr Areth. aft *λογων* ins *τουτων* ℵ. rec (for *του βιβλιου*) *βιβλου*: txt Aℵ B rel Andr (but b Andr-a have *τ. προφ.* bef *τ. βιβλ. τουτου*) Areth. rec (for *αφελει*) *αφαιρησει*: *αφελοι* rel Andr-p: *αφελαι* j 9. 16. 27. 41: txt Aℵ B 4. 92 Andr Areth, *αφελη* e[1] k 26. 39. 42-8. rec (for *του ξυλου*) *βιβλου*, with vulg-ed (and fuld lips-4-5) Andr-p Ambr Primas: txt Aℵ B rel am(with demid lips-6) syr-dd copt æth arm Andr Areth Tich. om *εκ* A 10. 38: ins ℵ B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Tich Primas. rec aft *αγιας* ins *και*, with (d?) 34(-5?) vulg: om Aℵ B rel syr-dd copt æth arm Andr Areth Tich Primas. rec om last *τω*: ins Aℵ B rel Andr Areth.

20. aft *ταυτα* ins *ειναι* ℵ[1]. om *αμην* ℵ Primas. rec ins *ναι* bef *ερχου*, with rel Andr-a-p (Primas?): *και* l: om Aℵ B c 2. 4. 18. 32. 48. 92 Andr-coisl Areth. aft *ιησ.* ins *χε̄* ℵ[3a].

21. rec aft *κυριου* ins *ημων*, with 30-2. 41 vulg syr-dd copt Andr-p: om Aℵ B rel vulg-ms æth Andr.—om *κυρ. ιησ.* c Areth.—rec aft *ιησ.* ins *χριστου*, with B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth (see above): om Aℵ 10. 26.—*χριστου* (alone) 32. rec (for *των αγιων*) *παντων υμων*, with vulg-ed(and fuld &c): *παντων των αγιων* B rel Andr Areth: *παντων* (alone) A am: txt ℵ. rec at end adds *αμην*, with ℵ B rel vss Andr Areth-txt: om A fuld Andr-a Areth-comm.

Subscription. om B b h j l: *αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου* 9: *ιωαν. αποκ.* 18: txt A ℵ(-*ψεις*).

(aor. = futurus exactus, *shall have* added) **to them, God shall add to him** (lay upon him, as he has laid his own additions upon them: the verb being from ref. Deut., where the plagues of Egypt are threatened to the Israelites in case of their disobedience) **the plagues which are written in this book: and if any one shall take away from the sayings of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his portion from the tree of life** (strike out his portion from the aggregate of those of which the whole participation of that tree is made up), **and [out of] the holy city, which are written in this book** (see Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32. The adding and taking away are in the application and reception in the heart: and so it is not a mere formal threat to the copier of the book, as that cited from Irenæus in Eus. H. E. v. 20, *ὁρκίζω σε τὸν μεταγραψάμενον τὸ βιβλίον τοῦτο . . . . ἵνα ἀντιβάλῃς ὃ μετεγράψω, καὶ κατορθώσῃς . . . .* All must be received and realized. This is at least an awful warning both to those who despise and neglect this book, and to those who add

to it by irrelevant and trifling interpretations).]

20, 21.] Final assurance *of the Lord, and* reply *of the Apostle on behalf of the Church:* and benediction. **He who testifieth these things** (the Lord Jesus) **saith, Yea, I come quickly. Amen** (the reply of the Apostle, not the conclusion of our Lord's saying), **Come, Lord Jesus.**

The grace of the Lord Jesus be with the saints (i. e. with the church of God. This, the reading of the Codex Sinaiticus, is no where else found as a parting formula).

THE END.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.

14 DAY USE

RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

RENEWALS ONLY—TEL. NO. 642-3405

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed. Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

APR 16 1968 2 3	
REC'D LD JUN 19 '69 -1 PM	
Due end of SPRING Quarter subject to recall after	JUN 1 8 '73
REC'D LD JUN 3 '73 -4 PM 5 0	
FEB 1 7 1974	
[illegible] 1 7 [illegible] 4	
REC'D LD JAN 2 2 '74 -12 PM	
JUN 1 1976 7 2	
Returned by	
[illegible] 2 1976	
Santa Cruz Jitney	
[illegible] CIR. [illegible] '76	

LD 21A-40m-2,'69 (J6057s10)476—A-32

General Library University of California Berkeley

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES

C005066366